

THE 27.5-PERCENT DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives the following statement which I submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, to express my views on "a very special tax benefit," the 27.5-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas:

There are numerous inequities or loopholes in the present tax structure, but the worst of all, in my opinion, is the 27.5-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas. This allowance enables the taxpayer to deduct each year 27.5 percent of the gross income from the sale of oil and gas from a producing property up to 50 percent of net income. The justification is that oil and gas companies are entitled to an allowance for exhaustion of this natural resource in computing their taxable income, just as other firms are entitled to a depreciation allowance for wear and tear on the capital they use. With respect to most expenditures for fixed capital, the tax law limits total deductions for capital recovery to the amount actually invested by the taxpayer and requires that these deductions be spread over the useful life of the property. By using the percentage depletion allowance, the oil and gas company may recover its capital costs several times over.

By the use of the percentage depletion allowance primarily, as well as other special tax benefits, the oil and gas industry pays

a lower rate of tax than that borne by other industries, and the Federal Government suffers a serious revenue loss. The Treasury Department estimates that in fiscal year 1968 for all extractive industries \$1.3 billion in revenue was lost because of the excess of percentage depletion over what cost depletion (deductions equaling actual cost or investment) would have totaled. Most of that dollar benefit went to the very large oil companies.

Figures published in the August 5, 1968 issue of Oil Week for 23 of the largest oil refiners in the United States show that from 1962 through 1967 the average Federal tax payment in every one of the 6 years for these companies was less than 10 percent. In 1967 Standard Oil of New Jersey, the largest of them all, paid \$166 million in Federal taxes on net income before taxes of \$2,098 million, or 7.9 percent. The Atlantic Refining Company, now known as Atlantic-Richfield, had a net profit in 1967 of \$130 million and paid no Federal income tax at all. Most corporations in other industries paid Federal taxes at a rate of 48 percent, and even the individual taxpayer in the lowest bracket paid at the rate of 14 percent.

The Treasury Department under the previous Administration estimated that 2.2 million families in poverty are subject to income tax. I think it is an outrage that they as well as the heavily burdened middle income taxpayer should be required to subsidize oil and gas interests.

Therefore, I recommend most strongly that the percentage depletion allowance for the oil and gas industry be eliminated. The claims that the industry is unusually risky and costly do not warrant such a bonanza. There are other industries which must risk large sums without any special tax deductions. It is also argued that the percentage depletion allowance is necessary because of the strategic importance of oil and gas to our national security. There are many other

industries of equal importance to our security which receive no special benefits. I do not believe it is in our national interest to continue this special privilege to the oil and gas industry.

The President has asked Congress to extend the surcharge for another year in order to raise the revenue this country needs for the Vietnamese conflict as well as the pressing problems here at home. Quite frankly I have difficulty justifying the extension of this tax when a "loophole" such as the oil depletion allowance remains in our tax structure.

If we are to restore the faith of the American people in their tax system, we cannot continue to allow these special interests to benefit at the expense of the majority. The elimination of the 27.5 percent oil depletion allowance would be a giant step toward achieving greater equity and fairness in our tax system which are the ultimate goals of tax reform.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, another area which relates to this matter is the need for immediate action by the Internal Revenue Service, to rescind their administrative ruling which provides an additional tax advantage enjoyed by American oil companies which deprives our national treasury of an estimated hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

For many years the entire sum of the royalties which United States companies pay foreign governments for oil produced abroad is deducted from gross income for tax purposes—dollar for dollar. In addition to the oil depletion allowance enjoyed by oil companies, this ruling makes it a fact that the oil companies have "struck it rich."

If the "equal taxation" policy is to be adopted, then it is necessary that we must enact proper amendments to the Internal Revenue Act—and to eliminate highly inequitable administrative rulings of the Internal Revenue Service.

SENATE—Thursday, May 1, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Dr. George Othell Hand, pastor, the First Baptist Church, Columbus, Ga., offered the following prayer:

From a New England rope factory of colonial days has come a brief poem entitled "The Ropes of Gold":

"Our lives must be anchored with golden ropes,

Which give us purpose, meaning, hopes. Know the ropes and you will be free, To know them not means slavery.

What are these precious golden strands, Holding freedoms unknown in other lands?

These, Friend, are the ropes of gold, Which all our priceless treasures hold...

"To look ahead, at horizons far . . .
To look around, at a distant star . . .
To look upward, to the coming dawn . . .
To trust in God and carry on!"

Let us pray:

Eternal God, in all our ways we would acknowledge Thee—

"Thy glory which surrounds us,
Thy grace which sustains us."

For ourselves and our fellow men we ask for the enlightenment of divine direction.

In gratitude for the dedication of these distinguished statesmen, we simply ask that they may be daily endowed with responsible judgment in their resourceful pursuit of the common good for America and the world. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 29, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

PROPOSED GRANT CONSOLIDATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-112)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States received on April 30, 1969, under the authority of the Senate of April 29, 1969, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the administration of Federal programs, one of the principal needs today is to improve the delivery systems: to ensure that the intended services actually reach the intended recipients, and that they do so in an efficient, economical and effective manner.

As grant-in-aid programs have proliferated, the problems of delivery have grown more acute. States, cities, and other recipients find themselves increasingly faced with a welter of overlapping programs, often involving multiple agencies and diverse criteria. This results in confusion at the local level, in the waste of time, energy and resources, and often in frustration of the intent of Congress.

As a major step toward improved administration of these programs, I urge

that Congress enact a Grant Consolidation Act.

Under our present fragmented system, each one of a group of closely related categorical grants is encumbered with its own individual array of administrative and technical requirements. This unnecessarily complicates the planning process; it discourages comprehensive planning; it requires multiple applications, and multiple bookkeeping both by the Federal agencies and by State and local governments.

The legislation I propose would be patterned in part after procedures used successfully for the past 20 years to reorganize Executive Branch functions. It would give the President power to initiate consolidation of closely related Federal assistance programs, and to place consolidated programs under the jurisdiction of a single agency. However, it would give either House of Congress the right to veto a proposed consolidation within 60 days, and it would establish stringent safeguards against possible abuse.

In order to make consolidation possible, it would be necessary in many cases to make changes in the statutory terms and conditions under which individual programs would be administered. Formulas, interest rates, eligibility requirements, administrative procedures, and other terms and conditions of the various programs being consolidated would have to be brought into harmony. The proposed legislation would empower the President to do this in drawing up his consolidation plans—but only within carefully defined limits. For example:

- Only programs in closely related functional areas could be consolidated.
- Terms and conditions could be changed only to the extent necessary to achieve the purposes of the consolidation plan.
- In setting new terms and conditions, the President would be limited by the range of those already provided in the programs being consolidated. Thus, if a program providing for a 10 percent State matching share were being merged with one providing a 20 percent matching share, he would have to propose a matching share between 10 and 20 percent.
- No consolidation plan could continue any program beyond the period authorized by law for its existence.
- No plan could provide assistance to recipients not already eligible under one of the programs being merged.
- Responsibility for the consolidated program could not be vested in an agency or office not already responsible for one of those being merged.

The effect of these limits would be to safeguard the essential intent of Congress in originally establishing the various programs; the effect of consolidation would be to carry out that intent more effectively and more efficiently.

The number of separate Federal assistance programs has grown enormously over the years.

When the Office of Economic Opportunity set out to catalogue Federal assistance programs, it required a book of

more than 600 pages even to set forth brief descriptions. It is an almost universal complaint of local government officials that the web of programs has grown so tangled that it often becomes impermeable. However laudable each may be individually, the total effect can be one of government paralysis.

If these programs are to achieve their intended purposes, we must find new ways of cutting through the tangle.

Passage of the Grant Consolidation Act would not be a substitute for other reforms necessary in order to improve the delivery of Federal services, but it is an essential element. It would be another vital step in the administrative reforms undertaken already, such as establishing common regional boundaries for Federal agencies, creating the Urban Affairs Council and the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, and beginning a streamlining of administrative procedures for Federal grant-in-aid programs. Its aim, essentially, is to help make more certain the delivery and more manageable the administration of a growing complex of Federal programs, at a time when the problems they address increasingly cross the old jurisdictional lines of departments and agencies.

This proposal would permit rapid action, initiated by the President, while preserving the power of Congress to disapprove such action. It would benefit the intended beneficiaries of the programs involved; it would benefit State and local governments, which now have to contend with a bewildering array of rules and jurisdictions; and it would benefit the American taxpayer, who now bears the cost of administrative inefficiencies.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1969.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 29, 1969, the following favorable executive reports of nominations were submitted, on April 30, 1969:

- By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:
 - Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;
 - Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of the Peace Corps;
 - C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Brazil;
 - William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey;
 - Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain;
 - Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India;
 - William Leonhart, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;
 - Val Peterson, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Finland;
 - Alfred Puhon, of Virginia, a Foreign Serv-

ice officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Hungary; and

Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary to Norway.

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

James E. Allen, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Robert D. Moran, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor;

Laurence H. Silberman, of Hawaii, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor; and

Arthur Fletcher, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

By Mr. ALLOTT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Edward E. Johnston, of Hawaii, to be High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

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

William Hill Brown III, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the nomination of Walter J. Hickel to be Secretary of the Interior;

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document studies and hearings on the Alliance for Progress; and

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill (H.R. 4153) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator;

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs;

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of Dartmouth College;

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the book, "Our American Government," as a House document;

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of school prayer hearings;

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution to reprint brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; and

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol," and providing for additional copies.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4153) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore

and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of Dartmouth College.

The following concurrent resolutions were severally referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator;

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs;

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the book, "Our American Government," as a House document;

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of school prayer hearings;

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution to reprint brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made"; and

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol," and providing for additional copies.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) be recognized to speak for a period not to exceed 20 minutes immediately after the conclusion of the morning hour. However, I ask that this recognition be given to the Senator earlier if a lapse occurs before the morning hour is concluded.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, with the exception of the nominations in

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in order to make a statement—

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Pennsylvania will be able to make his statement later.

Mr. SCOTT. I withdraw the reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Labor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The bill clerk read the nomination of Edward E. Johnston, of Hawaii, to be High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

THE PEACE CORPS

The bill clerk read the nomination of Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that the acting minority leader indicated that he would withhold his reservation of objection in taking up the nominations, on the assurance that he would be recognized in his capacity at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I withdrew my reservation in order to obtain an opportunity to make a statement with regard to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

President Nixon has sent to Capitol Hill the name of Mr. William Hill Brown III to be a member of that Commission. Mr. Brown is a constituent of mine and a longtime friend. He has been endorsed by both Senators from Pennsylvania, and therefore no question of senatorial courtesy is involved within the meaning of the Senate procedures.

Mr. Brown is a fairminded and eminently qualified man; and, obviously, if any Senator wishes to interrogate him or speak to him, I think that is desirable; or, if any Senator wishes more information, I think that is desirable. But I think now is the time to indicate that I have always supported the nominations which have been sent to the Senate from the executive department, under the administration of President Johnson and the administration of President Nixon; that this is a nomination which was recommended by the two Senators from Pennsylvania in the 90th Congress, and no objection was lodged at that time; and that the nomination failed because of the lack of time at the end of the session. I believe it is the only nomination resubmitted by President Nixon.

Therefore, while I am fully in accord with the courtesy involved in deferring action when a name first appears, I do want it to be made crystal clear that I intend to pursue at a later date the recommendation of the President and to act in support of my President on this and on other nominations.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, so that the record can be made clear on the nomination of Mr. Brown, there is no "hold" on this side of the aisle in that matter.

Mr. SCOTT. And I hope there will be no "hold" on this side of the aisle, Mr. President.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON NOMINATION

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement to the Senate.

At the request of several Senators, it has been decided that the nomination of James E. Allen, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of HEW will not be taken up today, but rather when the Senate meets on Monday next.

THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on last Friday, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RUBINOFF) read a statement, signed by 48 Senators, on the 21st anniversary of Israel.

The name of the senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) was inadvertently omitted from the list, and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to include the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) as one of the signers of that statement.

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

PROBLEMS FACING THE ADMINISTRATION—VIETNAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the 100 days are up and friends and foe alike are analyzing the accomplishments of the Nixon administration and the problems which lie before it.

I personally believe that President Nixon must be given a large plus sign for the manner in which he has handled affairs of the Nation to date.

The final scoring of his administration, however, must be deferred until we see more clearly the manner in which he handles the problems of today, which are almost wholly problems handed down to him from the recent past.

To attempt to enumerate all the problems facing Government today would be a futile and unending task.

So I would reduce them to four—inflation, poverty, crime, and social unrest so extreme it sometimes becomes open rebellion.

They are, of course, all related to each other, and the causes overlap.

However, I would go further and maintain that most of these problems are also, directly or indirectly, an outgrowth of the war in Vietnam.

So we can logically say that the one great immediate problem facing us today is the war in Southeast Asia.

In analyzing our position in Southeast Asia today, it is advisable to go back a few years and consider what has brought us to the unenviable and seemingly fathomless predicament we find ourselves in.

Some say we had no business going into South Vietnam in the first place.

With this thesis, I disagree.

After the fall of Dien Bien Phu, the departure of the French from Indochina and the Geneva Conference, the United States was instrumental in helping to move nearly 1 million refugees from North Vietnam to the south.

Because we shared responsibility for their coming there, I have always felt that while we may have had no legal commitment to them, we certainly did have a moral obligation to help them get established.

We did give them help, and by 1961 there were in the neighborhood of 800 American technicians and advisers in South Vietnam.

We encouraged the creation of what we hoped would be a stable government under the leadership of President Diem.

Then, on November 1, 1963, President Diem was killed and chaos in the Saigon government followed.

Between that time and June 1965, when Nguyen Cao Ky took the reins of government, South Vietnam underwent 11 changes of administration.

By mid-1965 the number of American military personnel in South Vietnam had passed the 50,000 mark.

General Ky asked the United States for modern equipment, including modern fighter planes.

Instead of fighter planes, we sent him military personnel and trainer planes.

Only last week, we were advised that the United States is now sending to South Vietnam the first-class fighter planes which were requested in 1965.

We steadily increased the number of military personnel sent to South Vietnam until it reached a total of 550,000.

In December 1965, President Johnson, on the recommendation of his advisers, ordered the bombing of North Vietnam.

I think President Johnson really believed that such action would end the war in a short time, but he was terribly mistaken.

The war had now become not a Vietnamese civil war but an American war against North Vietnam.

From then on a formal agreement to end the fighting became quite impossible and, in my opinion, will remain that way until such time as the conflict again becomes localized.

The North Vietnamese Government asked Russia and China for materiel and equipment.

Russia and China did not make the mistake we did.

They did not send troops.

They sent equipment which was good enough to cause unexpected destruction to the American Air Force.

I note that recently some advocates of expanding the war against North Vietnam accredit our failure to achieve a military victory to the fact that we did not destroy Hanoi and put a stop to the international shipping at Haiphong Harbor.

These people are trying to alibi their own errors.

Most of the equipment used against us did not come through Haiphong Harbor and the destruction of the civilian population at Hanoi would have simply infuriated the rest of the world without contributing to a military victory on our part.

The excuse given for sending 550,000 men to South Vietnam, and nearly a million to Southeast Asia in all, including South Korea and the Philippines, was that we were fighting a monolithic Communist conspiracy which would first overwhelm South Vietnam and then Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, and finally Australia and New Zealand.

This was known as the domino theory. All countries which were threatened by this "monolithic Communist conspiracy" were theoretically thrown into a panic.

Let us see how they reacted, however.

Of course, Laos, which had suffered internal dissension for years, did not change materially.

In fact, Laotians probably felt easier, to the extent that our involvement in Vietnam slowed down their civil strife.

Cambodia, which claims to be strongly anti-Communist and indeed has resisted a takeover by China, has so far maintained a position of near neutrality.

Thailand, where large forces of Ameri-

can military have been stationed for some years, sent only 2,500 men to South Vietnam and then added more only when the United States agreed to pay the costs.

Malaysia and Singapore made no contribution whatever.

The Philippines contributed a small number of workers.

Australia, which in World War II gave 346,000 men to all theaters of war, has had less than 8,000 men stationed in South Vietnam at any one time.

New Zealand contributed 70,000 men in World War II but less than 600 New Zealanders have been in South Vietnam at any one time.

In other words, the domino theory was not accepted by the domino states, and the number of Americans killed in the Vietnamese war so far is greater than the total number of military personnel contributed by our allies, excluding South Vietnamese forces themselves.

It is true there have been some 40,000 South Koreans aiding us in South Vietnam but while they were there, we have had over 50,000 Americans stationed in South Korea.

That is the unenviable history of our participation in the Vietnamese war to date.

I do not intend to enumerate here the costs of this war in terms of men, money, and material because these staggering totals are already well publicized.

I do think, however, that the time has come when the present administration of the United States should decide what to do about the unhappy circumstances in which we find ourselves.

All kinds of suggestions are offered from "Pull everything we have out of Vietnam tomorrow," to "Let us use the atom bomb and show them who is running this world."

Both of these extreme proposals are quite ridiculous.

We cannot pull out of South Vietnam tomorrow unless we have a pretty good idea of the situation we are leaving behind.

And we cannot use the atom bomb without inviting the destruction of much of the world.

The division of sentiment which exists in the United States is undoubtedly reflected among the Vietnamese people themselves, both North and South, and within the Vietnamese Government.

There are people in Vietnam who wish the United States would get out and let them have their own war back, believing that only then will it be possible to bring the war to a reasonable conclusion.

Then there are those who simply do not want the war to end because of the exceptional income to Vietnamese and Vietcong alike which results from its continuance.

There are many brave South Vietnamese who have been killed, or suffered destruction, but there are others who have acquired much wealth.

In fact, this is the only war in which we have ever participated where the United States has financed both sides to such a degree.

The "slippage" of American materiel, food, fuel, and even PX goods into Communist hands has been outrageous.

The "kumsha" to local officials and protection money paid the enemy makes loyal Americans' blood boil.

It is safe to say that the people of South Vietnam will never willingly go back to their old standards of living.

It is safe to say also that with the end of the war a greatly increased development of all Southeast Asia could ensue, bringing at least a modicum of prosperity to all of these countries, including what is now North Vietnam.

I say "could" because this will depend on how wisely the resources and wealth now being spent on the war are diverted to peacetime uses.

Many things have happened in the last 5 years to make a withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam both feasible and advisable.

First, the domino theory has been well exploded by the domino states themselves.

The South Vietnamese people now appear to be strong enough to stand on their own feet, and much territory has been made livable again. If they are not strong enough to stand on their own feet now it is a safe bet they never will be.

There is little danger that South Vietnam could be taken over from the outside.

The people of South Vietnam and North Vietnam alike are sick and tired of the war.

The present South Vietnamese Government appears willing to conduct a national election and concede voting rights to many who up to now have been regarded as outcasts.

The country of Indonesia, formerly a potential threat from the south, is now firmly in the hands of an anti-Communist government.

Russia, presently enjoying strained relations with Communist China, apparently feels that there is no more to be gained by continuation of the American-Vietnamese war and seems to indicate a willingness to help bring it to an end.

So it is my belief that the United States would do well to advise the South Vietnamese Government immediately of our intentions and then start an orderly withdrawal of our military personnel, turning that country and that war back to its rightful owners.

It may take some time to complete this operation but it should be started without delay.

It may be in the interest of the United States and the free world to maintain a base somewhere in the Southeastern Asian area similar to the one we now have at Guantanamo Bay, but to continue to inject our economic and military strength on a massive scale without the wholehearted support of the nations of the area is, to say the least, shortsighted diplomacy.

I realize that a withdrawal of our forces would create some concern to those who have found the war to be a financial bonanza.

These people, however, are adroit and resourceful.

They will continue to do business.

The United States is not going to disarm.

To do so would invite aggression and disaster.

We are not going to stop doing business with the rest of the world.

In fact, this business is bound to increase.

Our withdrawal from the Southeast Asian war, however, would bring great rejoicing among those people who have in the past and may in the future suffer personal and economic distress.

It will also be a major factor in restoring respect for law and order in our own country.

Commonsense should tell us that we have now accomplished our purpose as far as South Vietnam is concerned.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the senior Republican in this body in years of service, has seen fit to make this extraordinary and eloquent speech today. It is good that it comes from a member of the administration now in office. It is good that the cards are laid out on the table, and that the Senator from Vermont tells it "as it is."

What the Senator from Vermont has done is to furnish the Senate, the administration, and the Nation with an analysis of the situation as it exists in Vietnam which few of us are aware of. He has done well to explode the domino theory, because it has always been exaggerated and overstressed. I believe that those who think it was because of what happened in Vietnam that Indonesia was able to overthrow Sukarno are mistaken in their thesis.

Then, of course, the distinguished Senator brings home the fact that a number of countries have furnished assistance of a kind in Vietnam. He also emphasizes that insofar as some of those countries are concerned, this Nation has borne the cost of the deployment of their troops in the conflict.

The Senator states—and this is something which I think should be made clear in view of some of the questions raised by the press prior to the Senate's convening today—that:

So it is my belief that the United States would do well to advise the South Vietnamese government immediately of our intentions and then start an orderly withdrawal of our military personnel, turning that country and that war back to its rightful owners.

The Senator is correct. The war will have to be settled by the South Vietnamese themselves. In conjunction with the North Vietnamese, eventually the settlement will have to be made there. It is their country. It is their future. It is their destiny which happens to be at stake. It is, therefore, about time that the American people and the American Government realize this to be a fact and recognize that this is not, or at least should not be, an American war.

Mr. President, I have maintained for a long time that South Vietnam is not vital to the security of the United States.

I make that same statement again.

There is one part of the Senator's speech with which I might disagree—and

perhaps I may have misinterpreted his statement. He states:

It may be in the interest of the United States and the free world to maintain a base somewhere in the Southeastern Asian area similar to the one we now have at Guantanamo Bay. . . .

There is more to follow but the part I have referred to is what I had in mind.

I would hope that once a peace settlement is arrived at, we would withdraw—lock, stock, and barrel—not only from Southeast Asia but also, whenever possible, from the mainland of Asia because I am sure that my distinguished friend would agree with me we are not an Asian power. We are primarily a Pacific power with peripheral interests on the Asian Continent.

But I do want the distinguished Senator to know that I am thankful he made his speech today, that I congratulate him on a well thought out and honest analysis and, as usual, I am certain that the remarks of the Senator from Vermont will be given the kind of consideration which they deserve—and, in my opinion, that is the most serious consideration.

You have done a good job, sir.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I want to thank the majority leader for the remarks which he has just made. I also want to agree with him that I should have used the word "Pacific" rather than "Southeastern Asian area," because we are a Pacific power rather than an Asian power at this time.

I would also like to point out that it was over 3 years ago the Senator from Montana pointed out to the President and the Senate the difficulties which we were entering into at that time, and also the probability that there was no satisfactory end in sight to the course which was then being charted for us.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may be allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Vermont yield at that point briefly?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that that was a report which the distinguished Senator and I both gave to the President on a confidential basis. I hope it is still down there, and that President Nixon will take the opportunity, if chance offers, to read that report, which was not too voluminous but did then, as the Senator has said, state a few things which are just as applicable today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it would be helpful if President Nixon would read that report which the Senator from Montana made to President Johnson 3 years ago last December.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, listened with great interest and great profit to the Senator from Vermont, our senior on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I think that the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. FULBRIGHT) at one time spoke of "unthinkable thoughts," and I believe that there is no more authoritative voice in this Chamber than that of the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) on the subject of foreign policy.

When he says the things which he said today, which need so urgently to be stated, he is especially speaking to those who would have us believe there is no other way except the stalemated quagmire in Paris, and that we are irretrievably bound to that, or that the heavens will fall in if we try something else which is unilaterally within our power.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, who has such a long-standing and beautiful friendship with the Senator from Vermont, that this kind of authority, from the source from which it comes, is indispensable to the country, to get us to thinking along lines which will free us instead of enslave us, and tie us so tightly to Saigon that they can, in effect, veto everything which we believe is in the interest of our own country.

I congratulate my colleague. It is characteristic of him to be so direct and so honest. As we know, in public life the source from which an idea comes is eminently important in order to strip it of suspicion that the idea was voiced by someone else. In that connection, I think the Senator from Vermont has rendered signal service to the Nation and the world.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York and wish to say that, of course, there is another way than through the Paris conference, which seems to be irretrievably bogged down, for bringing the war to a reasonable conclusion.

I also believe that our administration thinks there is another way, and that the South Vietnamese Government officials are also aware of it, and that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Government, as well, are aware of it.

I feel that until those people who are primarily concerned with the area and what goes on there are permitted to settle their own affairs to a greater degree than we have permitted them to do in the last few years, we are not going to see an end to the conflict and our involvement in Southeast Asia and the possibility that it may go on indefinitely.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I commend the Senator from Vermont for his statement here today. I think all of us who serve in this body are very much aware of the great contributions the Senator has made, particularly in the field of foreign policy. Today, before the Senate and the American people, I think the Senator from Vermont has brought that background, experience, knowledge, and deep interest to the Vietnam issue with a suggestion which makes great sense.

I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont whether he has had any opportunity to discuss this matter with the administration, or whether he has had an opportunity recently to communicate his ideas to responsible people within the administration.

Mr. AIKEN. That is a good question. The answer is a little more difficult.

The Senator from Vermont will have to admit that he has talked with many people, both from the administration and from other sources, and on the basis of the information which he has, he thought it might be helpful to the administration to make the statement which he has made today. I did not tell them until this morning, however, that I was going to speak. I thought it was better to keep that to ourselves. But the information upon which I base the statement I think was from quite responsible sources.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think all of us would take some heart if we were able to receive from the distinguished Senator from Vermont some assurance that the administration was going to pay heed to these suggestions and recommendations. They are not unlike the kinds of proposals that I suggested in August of last year. I would be interested in the reaction of the Senator from Vermont.

In August of last year I made a rather extensive statement on Southeast Asia. In that speech I spoke not only of the mutual withdrawal of United States and North Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam, but also suggested that to demonstrate to both Hanoi and Saigon the sincerity of our intentions, we should begin to significantly decrease both our military activity and military personnel in South Vietnam before the end of 1968. I think that suggestion runs very close to that which the Senator from Vermont is suggesting today.

Referring to page 10 of the Senator's speech, does the Senator set any kind of time factor or time limit as to when withdrawal of troops should take place? The Senator says that we ought to be about the process at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think we could set a definite date when it could take place. I might remind the Senator, however, that it was in October 1966, that I did recommend strongly to the administration that we should simply say at that time that we had won our objective, and withdraw. I think it would have been entirely possible at that time. Had it been done, I believe the war would have been virtually over by now. However, it was not done, and we still have the same problem facing us. I would not undertake to speak for the administration about this matter. I simply say I believe the administration is fully aware of the different possibilities by which the war might be brought to a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it the Senator's feeling that if we followed the course of decreasing the military activity and reducing our personnel there, it would convince our friends in Saigon that they ought to move into a more aggressive bargaining with the National Liberation Front? Is that part of the reason why the Senator is making his suggestion?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my belief that the South Vietnamese people and the Government are now tired enough of the war, and strong enough, to take over the situation and handle it themselves; but some of them, at least, realize they cannot bring the war to an end so long as it

is an American war, and the sooner they get their own war back, the sooner they will be able to make arrangements with the warring parties over there to get together. That will not be easy, but it can be done; and I feel that the various parties involved in the conflict over there are fully aware of it and are sick and tired of the war and are ready to do something about it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sure the Senator from Vermont has thought about the concept of two-track negotiations for trying to resolve the Southeast Asia dilemma. By two-track negotiations, I mean that there would be negotiations between the United States and the North Vietnamese with regard to the mutual withdrawal of troops. The other set of negotiations would be between the National Liberation Front and the South Vietnamese Government. It has long been felt that we might very well be able to get an agreement with the North Vietnamese to withdraw their troops with a corresponding withdrawal of U.S. troops, or perhaps we could set an example by withdrawing some of our own troops, thus getting a corresponding withdrawal of North Vietnam's troops. Then there would be at least the start of a settlement. The South Vietnamese Government and the National Liberation Front could simultaneously work out the destiny and the future of the south.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I seriously doubt that we could reach any formal agreement with the North Vietnamese, but we have already stopped the bombing of that country, and I feel that we might have a tacit understanding that we would get out if they go out. It would be gradual. It cannot be done tomorrow. It cannot be done this week. But I think that is the only way it can be settled. As far as the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese Governments are concerned, I notice the South Vietnamese Government has softened its attitude toward letting the enemy participate in elections.

I am very hopeful that we can let them have their own war back and that they can come to a reasonable conclusion within a reasonable time. Reasonable is a very valuable word.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think there is widespread agreement with the idea of the Senator from Vermont that to get a tacit understanding with the north about the withdrawal of their troops and the withdrawal of our troops, it may be necessary for us to take the initiative, and begin the process by withdrawing some American troops. That could create a climate in which the parties in the south would be able to resolve their differences in a much more expeditious manner. I believe it would demonstrate to our friends in the south that we really mean business in terms of having those parties negotiate, and that our commitment for the future, in terms of American soldiers, is not something guaranteed forever.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that course could be followed, but I do not think it would

be desirable or effective to set specific dates or specific terms at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on the subject discussed by my distinguished friend from Vermont, I wish to say I always listen with great interest to any expression of opinion which he makes, particularly in the field of foreign affairs. I think he has made a very important statement.

I do wish to call his attention to the fact, however, that if we want to help the Executive, we had better put the Senate in a more favorable position as a whole than it is now. The last two official pronouncements of the Senate on this subject are first, our ratification of the SEATO agreement, which imposes certain obligations on us, and second, our passage of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

I wonder whether the Senator has considered offering a resolution expressing the advice of the Senate to the Executive on this very important and difficult question which he has been discussing.

Mr. AIKEN. All I can say is that I do not think the SEATO agreement was very effective, and the Tonkin Bay resolution was grossly overinterpreted—put it that way. But as for a resolution to be submitted to the Senate, I am not sure that that would be fruitful at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator, of course, is mindful that there is a distinct division on this question in the Senate, and I am sure that the Executive knows that. I am sure that the way to attack this matter, is to attack it frontally, just exactly as the late Senator Vandenberg attacked the NATO question, by offering a resolution stating the advice of the Senate, which is a constitutional right and privilege of the Senate; and I am sure that the distinguished Senator realizes what I have said is true; the last two official actions of the Senate on this subject matter are represented in the SEATO agreement and the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

It does occur to me that strong and powerful as the Senator's voice is, and as are the other voices which have been raised in approval of his position, they are still individual voices of individual Senators; and it seems to me that if the Senate wants to be forthright about this matter, it should consider a resolution putting the Senate on record, because what the Senator is suggesting is putting the Executive on record in this highly controversial matter.

Mr. AIKEN. I have had a resolution submitted to me, which I have not had time to study up to this time. However, I am growing a bit weary of entering into agreements, treaties, and negotiations which are pretty much forgotten by some of the participants after they are entered into.

I should like to yield a moment to the junior Senator from Illinois, who has been patiently waiting for some time.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I commend the Senator on his remarks today.

I have just returned from Illinois, where I spent the last 5 days visiting 10 college campuses. I met and talked with thousands of Illinois students in open meetings and seminars. The open sessions were for the purpose of meeting

with all the interested students on campus; the seminars were conducted for the purpose of talking with campus leadership, including student government officials, editors of campus publications, and heads of both radical and nonradical campus organizations.

On the basis of my experiences with the students, I am convinced that they are, for the most part, responsible, responsive, earnest, serious, and dedicated young Americans; they are not the kind of so-called student we have seen on television recently. Most of the students I met in my 5-day campus tour are deeply concerned about the direction of this country, and it is for this reason I can say that the distinguished Senator's remarks would be received with overwhelming enthusiasm by the student bodies in Illinois. I cordially invite him to visit any campus in the State of Illinois; I assure him he would be just as welcome as he would be on the campuses in his own State.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I agree with him that the youth today are not all bad, in fact a very, very small percentage of them have wrong intentions.

NEED FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MAJOR HUNGER PROGRAM BY NIXON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there have been authoritative reports that the administration does not propose to increase materially the Federal food assistance programs to the Nation's poor beyond the present level of slightly more than \$1.5 billion. This is a deeply disturbing development if indeed such a decision has been made by the White House. I would hope very much that it has not yet been taken and that the subject will be most carefully reviewed in terms of what should be our national priorities.

The discovery—and it is for practical purposes a discovery—that hunger, and malnutrition amounting to hunger, afflict some of the poor across the Nation and not in the poverty pockets of the South alone—has seared the conscience of the country. It is likely to prove the most explosive element in transforming the war on poverty into a war fought with effective resources.

Should there be advisers to the President who feel that the problem is not as urgent and crucial as I have described, then I would hope that they will go out into the field, as I have done, to see the widespread, appalling conditions of hunger that demand much more comprehensive measures involving much greater expenditures than they now seem to have in mind.

No matter what may be provided from business and nonprofit sectors, a significant additional contribution of resources from the Federal Government is vital. This is especially so inasmuch as the Federal programs now dealing with the production and conservation of food have resulted in the storage of huge quantities of surplus foods at a cost in the magnitude of \$5 billion a year.

The introduction by Senator McGovern, chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, of his bill directed essentially toward providing

free food stamps to families whose annual income—families of four—is less than \$960, at an additional cost of \$1.5 billion to the food stamp program, is an indication of the direction of the thinking of the majority on the committee.

I, as ranking minority member of the committee, am sympathetic with the objectives of Senator McGovern's food stamp bill and support them as far as they go. However, I believe that the bill, by dealing almost exclusively with food stamps, does not go far enough in combating the conditions of hunger and malnutrition which plague our Nation. I plan to introduce within the next few weeks a more comprehensive bill with as many of the minority members as possible. The minority bill, which has been in preparation for several weeks now, will include and go beyond expansion of the food stamp program. It will also include provisions for involving private food companies in the development and distribution of fortified and enriched foods, for dealing with the problem of delivering commodity foods to recipients who lack their own transportation, for improving the administration of all food programs, including nutritional education of the poor, the school lunch program, and food assistance plans for expectant mothers and infants.

I believe it important to speak out at this time and to establish a timetable for legislation from the minority in the hope that the administration will neither crystallize its thinking nor make definitive decisions at least until these proposals are before the Congress. We should have an opportunity to convince the administration of the high priority we place on the relief of human misery through an effective campaign against malnutrition among the poor.

DECLARATION ON CAMPUS UNREST BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dr. Clark Kerr, the distinguished chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, while president of the University of California observed several years ago:

I find that the three major administrative problems on a campus are sex for the students, athletics for the alumni and parking for the faculty.

As reports of student unrest and violence mount—most recently at Columbia University—this observation would seem to have been made a century ago rather than a few years ago.

The reaction of college administrations to this student unrest has varied from tightfisted firmness to the other extreme of abject surrender of responsibility.

Occupying a constructive mainstream, which recognizes both need for reform, order on campus, and academic freedom, is the declaration on campus unrest adopted last month by the board of directors of the American Council on Education, the organization representing the vast majority of the accredited colleges and universities in the United States. This is a sensible approach, firm in its recognition of the rights of students, those who would voice protest and those who would pursue their studies without interruption. I ask unanimous consent

that the Declaration on Campus Unrest of ACE be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, illustrative of the breakdown which can occur when a college administration ignores the principles set forth in the American Council on Education's Declaration on Campus Unrest is the situation which developed at Cornell University as described by columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in the Washington Post this morning. I ask unanimous consent that this article also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not also include as part of my remarks at this time, to give balance to the views presented, the thoughtful comments of the distinguished civil rights leader, Bayard Rustin, himself black, presented at the annual meeting of the New York Chapter of the American Jewish Committee on April 27. Mr. Rustin spoke out against campus disorder, both black and white. He said:

A multiple society cannot exist where one element in that society out of its own sense of guilt and masochism permits any other segment of that society to hold guns at their head in the name of justice.

I ask that Mr. Rustin's address also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

A DECLARATION ON CAMPUS UNREST

The unprecedented, comprehensive, and often unpredictable changes that are taking place in this age both disturb and alarm large segments of our society. Most of the changes and attendant alarms affect the operations of our institutions of higher learning. They are also related to the values, concerns, and behavior of our young people. In coming to grips with the compelling issues, all who would think seriously about them must recognize that present-day society—in America and in many foreign lands—is in serious trouble on many fronts. We see around us racial conflict, continued poverty, and malnutrition midst unparalleled prosperity and seemingly unlimited promise. We are confronted by pollution of our environment, decay of our cities, the continuation of wars and the threat of war, and everywhere a vague but widespread discontent with the general quality of life.

These problems affect all of society, not the university alone or the young alone. We must all be concerned to deal intelligently and responsibly with these problems that are neither the exclusive discovery, nor the sole responsibility of the young. Yet the depth of feeling among young people in many countries today about the issues, their general dissatisfaction with the slow-moving ways of society, and the extreme behavior of a small minority of students are evidence of the profound crisis that involves our entire society and, specifically, the university community.

The university itself has often become the immediate target of student discontent, sometimes couched as legitimate complaints about the deficiencies of the universities, sometimes devised as a softening-up exercise for assault on the wider society.

How to deal with campus crises arising from the widespread protests has become a major public issue and the cause of confused and angry debate. That there should be deep anxiety about the course of the conflict and its possible outcome is understandable. No social, racial, or age group that perceives itself and its values to be seriously threatened will fail to strike back. Increasingly there are backlash temptations to enact strong, often ill-considered, and largely futile measures to cope with a youth rebellion that none of us fully comprehends, not even the youth themselves.

Certain balanced judgments are proper to make, however, as we search for understanding and solutions:

1. It is important for the public to understand that, despite the nationwide publicity given to student disorders, the great majority of American campuses have remained peaceful. On campuses where conspicuous disorders have occurred, educational programs generally have gone along their normal ways. Most students and faculty have continued to carry on their regular work. In the main, good teaching and good research, as traditionally defined, have been uninterrupted.

2. On the undisturbed campuses and among the majority of orderly students, however, there are widely shared discontents which extremists are at times able to manipulate to destructive ends. Moreover, even in the absence of violence, there has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strains attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communication. Within this cult there is a minute group of destroyers who have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university, and in the processes of orderly discussion and negotiation to secure significant change. Students and faculty are increasingly aware of the true nature of this group and are moving to deal with its destructive tactics. The necessity to deal with extremists, however, is placing an extraordinary burden upon the whole educational enterprise and upon those who man it. Consequently, universities are having to divert their energies and resources from central educational tasks in order to deal with student unrest in its various forms.

3. The spectacular events precipitated by the extremists should not be allowed to obscure the recent accomplishments of those students, faculty, and administrators who have serious interest in constructive changes in society and in the university. They have broadened the curriculum and improved teaching. They have moved toward a more open and participating pattern for university governance. And they have begun to make the work of universities more meaningful in dealing with the problems of society. Those efforts must continue. Reform and self-renewal in higher education are ongoing imperatives.

4. Meanwhile, the speed and scale of social change have imposed many kinds of demands upon educational institutions for which their programs, their capabilities, and their funding are not always adequate. Moreover, universities are increasingly asked to perform functions for society, particularly in reshaping the behavior, values, and life-styles of the young, on which the family and other social institutions have already had major influence—or lack of influence. Some of society's expectations for universities are quite unrealistic. Insofar as these expectations can be dealt with, they involve a sharing of responsibilities among diverse social institutions. Many of society's demands require new resources and fresh approaches to old and new problems.

5. Recognizing the right of and even the necessity for constructive dissent—and allowing for inevitable arguments over what is in fact constructive—certain axioms must be

accepted as basic to the operation of any university.

a. Disruption and violence have no place on any campus. The academic community has the responsibility to deal promptly and directly with disruptions. If universities will not govern themselves, they will be governed by others. This elementary reality is increasingly becoming understood by all components of the university community. Student and faculty groups, including the American Association of University Professors and the National Student Association, have recently joined in efforts to improve disciplinary procedures and to formulate clear and realistic codes for dealing with misconduct, and more particularly with violence and disruption. Also, by involving students and faculty effectively in the governance of the university, it can be demonstrated that there are better ways of getting views considered and decisions made than by disruption.

b. The historic concern of the university community with academic freedom needs to be restated, reaffirmed, and vigorously defended against all, within or without the university, who would obstruct the right of scholars to investigate, teachers to teach, or students to learn. This reiteration is not to claim for the university special privileges that put it above the law or that free it from critical public appraisal—rather it affirms that the university must maintain a basic institutional integrity to function as a university.

c. Violations of criminal law must be dealt with through the ordinary processes of the law—and universities must attempt to deal with disruptive situations firmly before they reach the stage of police action. Governmental attempts to deal with these problems through special, punitive legislation will almost certainly be counterproductive. Meanwhile, students and faculty whose consciences demand that they express dissent through law violation must be prepared to accept the due processes and the penalties of the law. They should not be encouraged to expect amnesty from the effects of the law. Such an expectation would be the ultimate use of the *in loco parentis* concept against which many young activists passionately protest. Nor should they expect amnesty from academic discipline, which is the most effective sanction in disruptive incidents.

6. The education community needs to undertake a far more comprehensive effort than ever before attempted to study the underlying bases of youthful discontent and alienation and the broad social problems to which they are related. As social critic, the university must help society understand and solve such problems.

7. All universities should give particular attention to a continuing search for ways, including new social inventions, by which the life of rationality and civility, shared concern, and mutual respect may be supported and strengthened within the university community. The survival of the university and its long-term contribution to society depend upon the ability of the institutions to make their everyday life reflect that spirit and pattern.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1969]
ANARCHY AT CORNELL AND HOW IT GREW FROM
MILITANT MOVES OF DECEMBER

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

ITHACA, N.Y.—The surrender last week of Cornell University's Administration to rifle-toting black militants, a new precedent in the national campus civil war, was no isolated incident but rather the climax of deepening anarchy here.

Despite the official Cornell line congratulating itself on a peaceful escape from bloodshed, there is no doubt that President James A. Perkins accepted the black demands in

an atmosphere of coercion. While armed Negroes were occupying a university building, lesser publicized events had so terrorized a majority of the faculty and student body that they were eager for appeasement.

Responding to threats broadcast over the radio, faculty members branded as "racists" were forced to evacuate their homes for the night. One black student who openly opposed the resort to force was spirited across the border into Canada for safekeeping by friends. Unidentified rifle shots fired at a classroom building aggravated the tension. Moreover, the burning cross which supposedly forced black militants into armed insurrection is widely believed here to have been set by Negroes themselves.

That this lovely upstate New York campus could be so deformed by strife is in part attributable, ironically, to Perkins' well-meaning liberalism in recruiting black students, many of whom were ill-equipped for Cornell's academic demands. This inadequacy led some young Negroes into increasingly more belligerent postures here. Cornell's administration, faculty, and students, bearing an immense guilt complex toward Negroes (freely admitted by Perkins), could not bring themselves to impose discipline.

The watershed event came in the spring of 1968 when three Negro students, infuriated by an economics professor's classroom contentions about the superiority of a Western civilization, seized the offices of the economics department and held the department's chairman prisoner. When the Perkins administration did not press charges against the students, it flashed the green light for anarchy.

Pushing an action campaign for an autonomous black studies program, the militants moved on many fronts last December: The takeover of a university building (actually promised them for a later date) with professors and their belongings dispossessed into the street, the theft of furniture to furnish the building, dancing on dining hall tables, disruption of library stacks.

Perkins' permissiveness and the black militants' contempt were graphically exhibited during these December demonstrations when black militants staged a sit-in outside Perkins' office. Trying to make friends, Perkins sent out doughnuts and milk. The militants responded by smashing the refreshments against the wall.

Even more bizarre was an incident two months later when the Afro-American Society demanded \$2000 from the administration to buy bongo drums to celebrate Malcolm X day. Within two days, the administration scraped together \$1700 and dispatched two black student leaders down to New York City in the university plane to purchase the drums.

But pressed by a few faculty members, the administration did reluctantly bring charges against six of the more flagrant December demonstrators. Consequently, once the blacks won their demand for an autonomous black studies program early this year, radicals stepped up direct action around a general theme of amnesty for the six demonstrators.

To the accompaniment of the university-purchased bongo drums, Perkins on Feb. 28 was physically pulled down from a speaker's platform at a conference on South Africa. A few days later, job recruiters from the Chase Manhattan Bank were physically assaulted. In mid-March, three white students were beaten at night on campus—one to the point of death; two of the victims identified their assailants as Negroes while the third was in no condition to identify anybody.

Thus, as spring came to Cornell, wholly non-political students decided it would be prudent not to stroll the quadrangle at night. Simultaneously, Perkins became the open target of derision by the black militants, who wore sheathed knives in their boots during conferences with him. In one such meeting, a leader of the Afro-American Society described Perkins to his own face

with an obscenity widely used in the black ghetto.

Behind the scenes, Perkins' lieutenants were quietly prodding the faculty to quash the charges against the six December demonstrators—a surrender the faculty finally agreed to last week in the atmosphere of armed insurrection.

In an interview, Perkins told us he intends to stay on as president of Cornell and feels he has full confidence from the board of trustees. If he is correct, his method of buying peace on the campus may well become the pattern for college administrators around the country. The implications for Cornell as an educational institution and for liberal education in America generally will be discussed in another column.

EXHIBIT 3

REMARKS OF BAYARD RUSTIN PRESENTED AT ANNUAL MEETING OF NEW YORK CHAPTER OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, APRIL 27, 1969

We are indeed, ladies and gentlemen, living in troubled times, and one of the things that Mr. Randolph has always made very clear is that it is precisely in troubled times that one had better be very clear about fundamentals, because in troubled times we seldom really know strategically what is the best thing to do, even when we make a very vigorous effort at it we are very often mistaken. The only real thing that can be done is to adhere to what one knows basic of basically social truths.

Now one of the social truths is that there's no need to talk about reconciliation before one talks about truth, because all reconciliation is based on what is fact, what is socially true. And therefore we ought to know that we are not going to have any peace in our time that is based on sentimentalism. And that is precisely our problem. We are trying to buy social peace cheaply, when in fact it can only be purchased at great price—both emotionally, financially, psychologically and in every other way we are going to pay.

Well we're living in a time when everybody is proposing what will make him feel good instead of what will solve the problem. So that a great debate takes place about the decentralization of schools. The community is brought to the place where you either love Shanker and hate McCoy, or love McCoy and hate Shanker. And that is the level of the debate. Ask the person sitting next to you what he feels about the financial problem in relation to decentralization and he will tell you he has not thought about it. Ask him about the due process issue and what it in reality means, whichever side of the fight he's on, he shall not have examined it.

Ask him what he proposes if he is against decentralization or for it, in terms of the actual accountability for teaching methods and for hiring and firing and he will give you great emotional response as to why he is for it or against it but he will not know a damned thing about the problem of accountability. And if he does, he's not able to express it.

We have a police problem, and we think we're really going to deal with that problem on the basis of are you for or are you against a police review board. We have the problem of joblessness in the—within the proposition that we support a government which claims 4% unemployment is good for the nation. We have the proposition whereby people are looking for cheap answers to the ghetto, and the latest one which Mr. Nixon and some of my good friends in CORE have indorsed, is black capitalism.

I put a proposition for you: if white capitalists manipulating billions and billions of dollars permit white poverty to exist in Appalachia who thinks black capitalists who manipulate hundreds of dollars, are going to solve that economic problem. (Applause) And yet anywhere you look, people are talking about the entrepreneurial opportunities.

Entrepreneurial opportunities what? Every imaginable marginal economic proposition, with no real opportunity at money making? They're not talking about the production of automobiles, or steel, or building material, or anything basic.

And so my friends, we get to the point where finally people see Negro youngsters carrying pistols and making demands at the university and a very interesting friend of mine who teaches at the college, says isn't it marvelous what the Negro youngsters are doing today? Pointing to the N.Y. Times as an example of real social progress. Well the fact of the matter is my friends, I just want to say a few words about what is happening on the campus. Well I'm saying it in this context, that if there is not an expensive way out, emotionally and financially, then the thing you will know is that that is no answer to the problem. You cannot have for 300 years compounded a problem, and then find a simple way out of it.

If it is not costly, if it is not emotionally wearing, then there is no answer. Now let's take the college campus and look at it for a moment. First of all you have the young professors on the campus, operating what I call revolution by proxy. Now here they sit, all working for their PH Ds—for what? to make it in this society, to take advantage of the opportunities of the capitalist society in which they live. They are all preparing to live in some nice suburb. They are all asking for more money; they are all wanting to make it in this society.

While they turn and look at the Negro students and say really, what we need is a revolution—this society with all of its dirty institutions that we so dreadfully want to be a part of. So you Negroes sick 'em—get the society for us, while we sit back and take advantage of it—revolution by proxy never has worked.

Well, they are the gravest danger because what is happening with our young people we had better understand, and that is that we are systematically teaching them that if they want any changes in the society, they must resort to violence to get them. Now once they resort to violence, we then call them in and say, we want to accept your non-negotiable demands. They should not have any respect for us. They should in fact force us, if that is the way we are going to behave, into more and more violence.

We would not—the business community in the United States never began to think about the problem of joblessness until Negroes rioted. Then they set up the urban coalition and don't really want to do anything. We get what we deserve. Now the fact of the matter is, my friends, we ought not any longer to mistreat young Negroes and Puerto Ricans. The idea that they should have separate dormitories, and separate course of study, which they themselves design is an indication of a social sickness.

First of all in them, and second of all in us for accepting it. Any time young Negroes and Puerto Ricans propose what has been proposed now at some of the colleges, that they select the courses, that every Negro or Puerto Rican who wants in, gets in, regardless of his status, that a degree is assured him whether he achieves or not—is not brilliance, is not self respect, it is the opposite. It is that the conflict between aspiration and the ability to achieve is still a very terrifying concept for many of these people who know they have not been properly prepared for college.

And to give them separate courses of study like soul music and soul poetry, things that they can just play with and pass—is no answer to their—their internal emotional tantrum, which society has created. And it's cheap—for what they are saying is the same old thing: it is cheaper to give people relief than to create public works and guaranteed income, free medical care and free college. That's of course cheap, so we take it.

I want you to know it is very cheap to turn

to young Negroes who are in internal agony about the difference between their aspirations and their poor equipment for achieving and give them the hopes of black studies that they can easily pass. It is unfair.

Furthermore, it will boomerang because that problem has to be worked through. Now what would be fair would be to say we accept young Negroes and Puerto Ricans who are not prepared into our colleges, but we then don't give them fake courses. We accept then on the responsible basis that we will give them every remedial opportunity they have, but they will not get a piece of paper from this university until we have in fact brought them up to par. (Applause.)

I will say also, my friends, that a multiple society cannot exist where one element in that society out of its own sense of guilt and masochism, permits any other segment of that society to hold guns at their head in the name of justice. It is a destructive thing to all involved, and if Stanley Isaacs knew anything this he would have known. For Stanley Isaacs knew that one is a Jew not because one is circumcized; that one is a Jew not because he holds the dietary laws. These things may be good but they are not the essence of Judaism.

Everyone knows who knows anything about the prophets that the fundamental lesson of Judaism is truth, and that the course that was followed by Isalah, and Jeremiah and Amos and the others—was to say I am not a Jew because I am circumcized, or because I refuse to mix milk and meat in the same pot—I am a Jew because I stand for social righteousness now. And we are not doing that for our young people by teaching them shortcuts and reliance upon violence.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, both Time and Newsweek have published articles in their business sections in the past week on cigarettes as a hazard to health, and on developments in Congress on cigarette advertising on TV and radio.

The discussions on both sides of the Capitol on these issues make the articles particularly pertinent, and I ask unanimously consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Time magazine, Apr. 25, 1969]
CIGARETTES AND SOCIETY: A GROWING
DILEMMA

There is a no longer much question that cigarette smoking is a hazard to health; the medical evidence is overwhelming. The real debate now centers on what to do about it. That debate involves some fundamental issues, and they affect not only an industry that likes to call itself the nation's oldest—tobacco—but also several other major lines of business, notably advertising and broadcasting. More basically, the issues go to the heart of the concept of freedom at a time when personal freedoms are being expanded.

Should an industry be at liberty to promote a product that 70 million U.S. smokers want, even if it endangers life? What is the responsibility of the cigarette makers to the public? And what restrictive actions, if any, should the Government take against them? These questions are crucial in the growing controversy over cigarette smoking and selling.

A CONFRONTATION

Last week the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee opened hearings aimed at providing some of the answers. Congress will need the answers soon. The Federal Communications Commission has voted 6 to 1 to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television, which it regulates, but

it needs congressional approval to enforce such an act. The Federal Trade Commission wants to strengthen the current ineffectual warning on cigarette packs, which now reads: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health."

If the FCC has its way, the new label will be: "Warning: Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Health and May Cause Death from Cancer and Other Diseases."

Both the FTC and the FCC also urge that this warning be appended to all cigarette advertisements and commercials. This week Joseph L. Cullman III, chairman of Philip Morris Inc., will testify for the nine companies that make U.S. cigarettes. He plans to say that, should the mandatory warnings be extended to all ads, the industry will abandon advertising entirely.

Why do critics go after cigarette advertising rather than attempt to outlaw the product itself? In practical terms, any sort of Volstead-style prohibition of cigarettes would be impossible to legislate, and any such legislation impossible to enforce. For all the difficult moral and legal questions involved, the anti-tobacco forces consider a drive on marketing to be the best way to confront the cigarette.

The federal regulatory commissions would have the power to do what they want without congressional approval if Congress had not passed a cigarette-labeling act in 1965, which obliged cigarette companies to put the current warning sign on all packages. As a concession to legislators from the tobacco-growing Southeast, a clause was added that specifically "pre-empted" for Congress the right to rule on cigarette advertising. That was a lucky stroke for the industry, which has been shielded from further action not only on the part of federal agencies but also by a number of state legislatures where anti-tobacco bills are now pending. The pre-emption clause will expire on June 30, however, and Congress must then decide where to go from there.

Opposition to cigarettes has grown appreciably on Capitol Hill since 1965. About the only staunch supporters of the industry left are Congressmen from the big tobacco states, notably the Carolinas, Kentucky and Virginia. Many other Congressmen are worried about the health dangers, and sensitive to the growing movement to protect consumers—a major new trend in American life.

In purely economic terms, the stakes are high. The tobacco industry accounts for 1% of the gross national product, contributes half of its \$8 billion annual sales to federal and local taxes and helps to support 85,000 manufacturing workers, 1,200,000 retailers and 700,000 farm families. Still, the question of regulation of cigarettes goes much beyond economics and has, in fact, created a curious liberal-conservative polarity. The conservative Dallas News accuses "the liberals in Washington" of crusading for "censorship, pure and simple." Adds the New York Daily News: "Nuts to you, Big Brother."

The controversy has more than its share of ironies, contradictions and curiosities. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spends \$2,100,000 a year to educate the public against smoking, while the Department of Agriculture annually pays out \$1,800,000 in price-support subsidies to tobacco farmers. To enlarge tobacco exports, which contribute about \$500 million a year to the U.S. balance of payments, Agriculture also promotes overseas sales. The Public Health Service encourages smokers to use filter cigarettes, but the Federal Trade Commission will not permit cigarette advertising that even faintly suggests that filters are preferable.

A POPULAR SOCIAL CAUSE

Washington is steadily increasing its efforts to retard the sale of cigarettes in the U.S. with the broadest and most direct campaign ever made against a legally marketable product. The U.S. Public Health Service re-

leases increasingly damning reports about smoking. U.S. Post Office trucks are covered with anti-cigarette posters (sample: "100,000 Doctors Have Quit Smoking"). The Department of Health, Education and Welfare distributes millions of pamphlets to public schools, warning of the hazards of smoking.

HEW has set up the National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health, which turns out anti-smoking tracts for civic groups. Money from the "Smokehouse," as staffers call it, has started several local anti-cigarette projects. In Bakersfield, Calif., teen-agers have been given a \$52,000 grant and professional help to prepare commercials, posters and bumper stickers (SMOKE, CHOKE, CROAK). The pilot project there has been so successful that it will be repeated in several other cities this fall. The director of the clearinghouse, Dr. Daniel Horn, a pioneer cancer researcher, urges medical men to deliver anti-smoking appeals while they treat patients in their offices. Horn figures that, in less than a minute, doctors and dentists can recite enough evidence to frighten a smoker.

The campaign against smoking, though directed from Washington, has become a nationwide popular social cause. It has been joined by growing numbers of teachers, businessmen, movie and TV stars and sports heroes. A few television stations have voluntarily dropped cigarette advertising, and some ad agencies—including Ogilvy & Mather and Doyle Dane Bernbach—turn down cigarette business. Among the athletes, Skater Peggy Fleming, Quarterback Bart Starr and Outfielder Carl Yastrzemski star in American Cancer Society ads proclaiming "I don't smoke cigarettes." Doris Day and Lawrence Welk refuse to appear on TV programs sponsored by cigarette companies. Tony Curtis recently became head of a cancer society organization named I.Q. (for "I Quit"), which passes out lapel buttons to people who do so and dispatches public speakers to spread the antismoking message far and wide.

THE CHILDREN'S CRUSADE

The antismoking campaign has become something of a children's crusade; now it is the youngsters who try to persuade their parents not to smoke. Teenagers and children have been strongly influenced by the American Cancer Society and other private health groups, which send touring displays to schools, showing how lungs are affected by smoking. Most of all, young people have responded to the persuasive antismoking television commercials, which the FCC has ordered all stations to carry. "People used to call their cigarettes 'cancer sticks,' but they never really believed it before," says Dr. Charles Dale, a Chicago pathologist. "Now their kids are bugging them, so they can't even smoke in peace any more."

It is indisputable that Americans are losing some of their taste for smoking. Pollster Louis Harris reports that in the past four years the smoking population has declined from 47% to 42% of those over 21. One reason is that, in the same period, the number of Americans who believe smoking is a "major cause" of lung cancer has risen from 40% to 49%. Harris found that, by a ratio of 5 to 4, Americans favor restrictions on TV and radio ads for cigarettes. Significantly, those who are "most convinced" that cigarettes are dangerous tend to be people under 30. The polls confirm suspicions that smoking is encountering a psychological reversal among the young. Although cigarettes are still a staple of adolescence, they are no longer the props for manliness and sophistication that they once were.

The tobacco industry is suffering. In 1968, cigarette sales declined for the third straight year. The decrease, from 572.6 billion cigarettes in 1967 to 571.7 billion last year, seems minuscule. But it is disturbing to an industry that had been able to count on steady growth before the 1964 Surgeon General's report linked smoking to cancer. In 1968, per

capita consumption of cigarettes among American adults dropped from 210 packs to 205. Overall industry profits remain high, but only because the tobacco men have been able to step up exports and sales of non-tobacco items.

A minor industry has developed to cater to the millions of people who want to stop smoking cigarettes. Bantron, Nikoban and other aids for quitters enjoy brisk sales. "Withdrawal clinics" have sprung up in several cities; they urge people to munch popcorn instead of smoking, emphasize the positive effects of quitting. Paul Newman and his wife Joanne Woodward are among the recent graduates of Sunset Boulevard's Smoking Control Center, one of several \$125 per course habit-breaking outfits that have opened lately in Los Angeles. Chicago's Mayor Richard Daley recently mailed circulars urging 36,000 city employees to attend similar clinics. Despite these efforts, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare estimates that only 45% of the people who want to quit really do so for as long as three weeks—and less than half of those are able to abstain for a full year.

THE ANTI ADS

For most of its momentum, the crusade against cigarettes is indebted to a regulatory windfall: the antismoking ads that are broadcast free on TV and radio under the FCC's "fairness doctrine." The ten-year-old doctrine, designed to ensure airing of opposing views on controversial issues, had never been applied to the advertising of a product until 1967. Then the FCC ruled that broadcasters must devote "significant" time to antismoking messages, meaning one of them for every three cigarette commercials.

The ads have proved devastating to the industry. They are prepared by the American Cancer Society and other groups, often with volunteer help from top ad agencies, and they usually have more punch than regular commercials. Cigarette ads must pass the industry's self-policing advertising code, which assures a certain blandness by ruling out appeals to youth and suggestions of athletic or social prowess. Often, pro- and anti-ads appear in startling juxtaposition. The American Tobacco Co. sponsors network broadcasts of NBC-TV's *Laugh-In*, but viewers can get the antismoking side during local station breaks.

The anticommicals themselves are sometimes just the reverse of cigarette ads; the smokers are miserable instead of happy, look stale instead of springtime-fresh, cough instead of smile. By far the most chillingly effective ad is an appeal by Actor William Talman, a longtime three-pack-a-day smoker. Talman, who played the prosecuting attorney in the *Perry Mason* series, looks gaunt and ill as he appears onscreen with his family. He tells viewers: "I have a family consisting of six kids and a wife whom I adore, and I also have lung cancer, which means that my time with this family I love is so much shorter." He died last August, six weeks after the commercial was taped.

THE POWER OF JUST ONE MAN

Tobacco men who are pained by such advertisements can blame one man. He is John F. Banzhaf III, the 28-year-old lawyer who, almost singlehanded, is responsible for all the free air time given to the antismoking messages. It was Banzhaf's "citizen's complaint" to the FCC about cigarette ads that prompted the commission to dust off the fairness doctrine. Banzhaf had almost idly come across that "little loophole," as he calls it, while working at a Manhattan law firm. He was astonished at the response from the FCC, which ordered broadcasters to make room for antismoking ads. "All it took was a letter—there were no hearings," says Banzhaf. "Suddenly, I created a \$75 million business"—which is what the free air time given to the antismoking messages is worth.

Banzhaf quit his law firm (one of its clients was Philip Morris) and moved to a Washington flat five blocks from the headquarters of the Tobacco Institute, the industry's Washington lobby. He organized a nonprofit foundation called ASH (for Action on Smoking and Health), which monitors radio and TV to see that antismoking ads are shown and distributes information on smoking and health. Bachelor Banzhaf is authorized to draw a salary of \$20,000 a year but manages to get by without it, living on his salary as an instructor at George Washington University Law School. He won a court test on the fairness case last fall, and ASH will provide the \$25,000 or so that he figures he will need to fight the industry's Supreme Court appeal in the fall.

PROSPECTS FOR CONGRESS

The immediate task of Congress is to determine what to do when the cigarette-labeling law's pre-emptive clause runs out in June. Congressmen can take any one of three courses:

1) They can extend the present law. The cigarette industry is lobbying for that because the law would block further action by the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission. One measure of the industry's diminished power on Capitol Hill is that the best it can hope for is a continuation of what it fought so adamantly in 1965. In the House of Representatives, 29 Congressmen have sponsored bills to extend the law.

2) They can pass new laws regulating the sale or advertising of cigarettes. Bills calling for more controls have been put forward by 54 sponsors in the House. Most of the bills are similar to a measure sponsored by the leading opponents of cigarettes in the House, California Democrat John Moss. He would toughen the cigarette label and order it into all ads, as the FTC urges, and he would also empower the commission to limit the length of cigarettes. That would probably shorten the future of the new 100-mm. cigarettes, which generally have more tar and nicotine than the king-sized brands.

3) They can simply do nothing. If the labeling law's pre-emptive clause expires, the FCC and the FTC would be free to take almost any action they wish. This possibility particularly excites the critics of cigarettes. No cigarette bills of any kind are pending in the Senate, where sentiment against smoking is even stronger than in the House. Washington's Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, and Utah's Frank Moss, head of the subcommittee on consumer affairs, promise that no bills will appear.

ON THE DEFENSIVE

The prospects are for a bristling fight in the House, where debate will intensify from now until the end of June. While the outcome is by no means certain, the industry's cause has been damaged by the retirement of some effective friends in Congress, notably Kentucky's Senator Thurston Morton. Nor have tobacco men particularly helped themselves by their response to the issue of smoking and health. The Tobacco Institute refuses to concede that much more than a health "controversy" exists. One reason for the industry's reluctance to concede a link between smoking and disease is its fear of health-hazard liability suits.¹

The industry's rather elaborate public relations effort has been something less than smooth. Manhattan's Hill & Knowlton, the world's largest public relations firm, had been

¹ No tobacco company has ever lost such a suit; there are not any known out-of-court settlements. Two years ago a New Orleans jury ordered American to pay \$250,000 damages in the case of a heavy smoker who had died of lung cancer in 1962, but two weeks ago American won a reversal on appeal.

tending the industry's image for 15 years, but it quit a few months ago in disagreement over fundamental tactics. Hill & Knowlton had engineered the defensive, low-profile approach, under which the industry minimized its public involvement in the health controversy. That put the firm at odds with some industry chiefs, who thought that it was time for a more aggressive approach in promoting the case for cigarettes.

The tobacco industry's main medical spokesman, Dr. Clarence Cook Little, is an 80-year-old retired biologist who headed the predecessor of the American Cancer Society in the 1930s. As chief of the industry's Council for Tobacco Research since 1954, he has steadfastly maintained that evidence linking smoking and disease consists largely of statistical associations, which cannot "prove" a causal relationship. The tobacco men ridicule the notion that cigarettes alone could be responsible for the two dozen or so diseases with which they have been associated. Much more research, they say, must be done on such factors as air pollution, urbanization and the stressful emotional environment that goes with it. Genetic and behavioral factors may be involved in causing disease, they contend. The Tobacco Institute cites surveys showing that smokers are unusually energetic, marry more often and drink more liquor and black coffee than nonsmokers. Smokers, the Institute concludes, are a "different kind of people" who are perhaps more susceptible to sickness. Supporters of the industry also point out that cigarette smoke has never induced lung cancer in laboratory animals, and that no one knows the mechanism by which smoking causes cancer.

EFFECTS OF A BLACKOUT

While that is true, other medical men point out that the statistics have reached an impressive total and continue to grow. They are backed up by laboratory evidence. Experiments, often sponsored by the industry, are continuing with mice, dogs, baboons and other animals. Tests on chickens at Arthur D. Little Co. in Boston have shown that smoke gases temporarily paralyze the tiny, hairlike cilia that normally keep foreign matter clear of the lungs. Other animal research has identified a number of suspected carcinogens in cigarette smoke. At the House hearings last week, U.S. Surgeon General William Stewart repeated his conviction: "I think we have established cause and effect in lung cancer. I don't think there is any question about it."

Scientists have produced evidence that suggests links between cigarette smoking and a variety of other cancers—of the lip, larynx, esophagus and bladder—as well as ailments as varied as peptic ulcers and psoriasis. The U.S. Public Health Service reports that nonsmokers on the average live four years longer than two-pack-a-day smokers, and eight years longer than four-pack smokers. Small wonder that last month, when the Tobacco Institute sent out a press release disputing the cigarette opposition, so few newspapers printed the story that the industry had to buy space to run the release in full-page newspaper ads.

Tobacco men raise an economic argument in their defense, correctly pointing out that their industry is a large source of taxes, exports and jobs. Congressmen from tobacco states warn that any actions damaging the industry would force Negro field hands out of jobs and cause them to move North, further swelling the ghettos and relief rolls. The economic problem is real enough, and manufacturers are dealing with it partly by continuing the diversification drive that has brought them into such areas as liquor and clothing, soft drinks and pet food. Reflecting the trend, R.J. Reynolds and American plan to drop "Tobacco" from their corporate names.

Yet the fears of deserted farms, silent fac-

tories and mass migrations of workers are exaggerated. Nobody in Congress expects or even calls for an outright ban on the sale of cigarettes; the painful memories of Prohibition are still too clear for anything like that. The current debate focuses not on sales but on advertising and promotion.

What would be the effects of an advertising blackout? Complete or partial bans on cigarette ads are in effect in Britain, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland, Rumania, Poland, Russia and Bulgaria—but people continue to smoke. In Britain, the Labor government struck cigarette advertising from TV in 1966, from magazines and newspapers in 1967. Last year, as cigarette sales stubbornly reached new highs, the government abolished games, coupons and other forms of promotion. Britons persist in smoking cigarettes in record numbers and, as usual right down to their fingertips.

In the U.S., a complete ad ban would wipe out many new brands struggling to reach profitability. On the other hand, an FCC ban on broadcast advertising would save the manufacturers the \$225 million or so a year—about three-quarters of their total ad budgets—that they spend on TV and radio. They would invest that money in many ways—in other advertising media, in such promotions as games and coupons, in acquisitions, and in raising their already generous dividends. Those possibilities have aroused new investor interest in the long-depressed tobacco stocks, and many of them have enjoyed a modest rally over the past few months.

The most immediate effects would certainly be felt by the three major networks and by the nation's independent TV and radio stations. In anticipation of some sort of restriction, CBS has already set up its 1969 budget without including the \$59 million—11% of total revenues—that it took in from cigarette commercials last year. President Frank Stanton expects that CBS would eventually find other advertisers to take up the slack, but a blackout would certainly hurt other broadcasters. If the British model held true, tobacco ads might eventually be banned from magazines, which depend on them for about 3½% of their income, and from newspapers (1½%).

A WORRISOME PRECEDENT

Even cigarette critics concede that there is no precedent for restricting the marketing of any legal product. The possibility of such a restriction raises sensitive questions about the future of other manufacturers, including gun makers and dairymen (some of whose products are a prime source of cholesterol). Many Congressmen are worried about setting an example that might be a form of censorship, but these same men would be in favor of stricter warning labels, not only on cigarette packages but also in ads. At last week's congressional hearings, Surgeon General Stewart said that he favors more explicit and more broadly applied warning labels instead of a flat ban on broadcast advertising. Even FCC Chairman Rosel Hyde somewhat softened his position and told the committee that he would be willing to forgo the ban if Congress ordered health warnings "in every bit of advertising, in print or radio or television." Of course, that would rule out the need for a ban. As Philip Morris' Cullman indicated, few if any manufacturers would be willing to spend money to advertise that cigarettes may cause "cancer" and "death."

The dilemma that cigarettes pose for society has reached its current state partly because many crusaders are pursuing an oblique and unsatisfactory approach to the problem. A ban on broadcast advertising makes little sense so long as cigarettes remain legal. Such a ban would mean that new and perhaps "safer" brands would be difficult to market.

It can be argued that the present problem would not be so acute if the industry practiced more self-policing back in the 1950s, when the health question began to be raised in earnest. In fact, since the early health

scars, cigarette tar and nicotine content has declined by about 40%, according to the Public Health Service, through the use of filters and milder tobaccos. Research goes on, despite some powerful obstacles. Not the least of them is that "advances" in filter design often make cigarettes so tasteless or tough on the draw that no one will buy them. Such has been the fate of the once-ballyhooed Strickman filter, which is now marketed in Canada and is selling poorly. Overall, however, the industry could have spent much more on developing safer tobaccos, better filters and other means of reducing the dangers of smoking—and it can still do so today.

A wiser alternative might be for Government to take over financing of research, possibly by increasing taxes on cigarettes, and intensify its campaign to educate people on the hazards of smoking. Another constructive step would be for Congress to order that the tar and nicotine content must be listed on all packs and in ads. If the dangers of cigarettes are only half as serious as most medical experts believe, the nation should settle for nothing less than a comprehensive federal drive to find causes and cures.

Government regulation of cigarettes will continue to increase. Philip Elman, one of the Federal Trade Commission's five members, argues that the Government has to take unusual actions because cigarettes pose a unique problem. "Cigarettes cannot be compared with such products as automobiles, butter or candy," he says. "Cigarette smoking is, without question, the greatest single public health problem this nation has ever faced." That may be an extreme view. But there is no denying that so long as men smoke—and that will probably be for a very long time—there will be no simple solution.

[From Newsweek magazine, Apr. 28, 1969]

CAUTION: THIS HEARING IS HAZARDOUS

In cavernous Room 2123 of the Rayburn Office Building one day last week, the air was already blue with spectator tobacco smoke when members of the House Commerce Committee took their seats. "Maybe," murmured one member, "we should begin by banning cigarette smoking here."

The occasion was the start of hearings on the 1965 Federal law that put the present nine-word cautionary warning on all cigarette packages: "Caution: Cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health." That same law barred any Federal or state agency from interfering in any way with cigarette advertising—at the time a clear victory for the \$9.9 billion tobacco industry.

But the law is due to expire June 30, and the Federal Communications Commission already has served notice that if Congress does not act, it wants to step in and ban all cigarette advertising from radio and television—a stroke that would cost broadcasters \$224 million a year. At the same time, the Federal Trade Commission has said it wants to replace the present relatively mild warning on packages with these chilling words: "Cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer and other diseases."

As the hearings opened, it seemed that very little had changed since the U.S. Surgeon General's report of 1964 linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer. As always, tobacco-state congressmen came out swinging.

"Do we want the FCC to be able to prohibit the advertising of milk, eggs, butter and ice cream on TV?" cried North Carolina Democrat L. H. Fountain.

Kentucky's Tim Lee Carter, who is a doctor, challenged Surgeon General William H. Stewart, one of the first government witnesses: "Show me just one case of cancer produced by smoke inhalation."

VITAL STATS

For his part, Stewart made it plain that he was not so much concerned with banning cigarettes or cigarette advertising as with

getting the full truth to consumers. "Cigarette advertising," he said, "should give the consumer a complete story, including the health danger." Dr. Luther Terry, who was Surgeon General at the time of the 1964 report, cited anew the familiar statistics showing that cigarette smoking can increase the death rate from heart disease, bronchitis and emphysema by twenty times and boost the death rate from lung cancer by as much as 23 times.

Yet this year there is a difference. Never before have the FCC and FTC taken such a strong stand against cigarette smoking. Despite the views of the tobacco-state members of the Commerce Committee, there is a rising tide of anti-smoking sentiment on Capitol Hill, notably in the Senate. Above all, anti-smoking groups such as the American Cancer Society have become far more vocal—and visible—since the FCC invoked its "fairness doctrine" granting them air time in the summer of 1967. In one recent sixteen-month period the ACS alone distributed 8,900 anti-smoking commercials, compared with only about 1,000 in the preceding 40 months. One of the best known: "Have you ever thought," asks the announcer, "of what happens when you smoke a cigarette?" Pause. "We have." Silently, up flashes "American Cancer Society."

KICKING IT

The campaign appears to be paying off. In 1968, over-all U.S. cigarette consumption dipped by 1.3 billion from the previous year (chart, page 86), the first drop since the short-lived decline that followed the Surgeon General's report in 1964. In all, the Cancer Society estimates that some 21 million Americans have quit smoking—a group that includes 100,000 physicians.

Tobacco interests argue that the continued success of such pressure can lead only to disaster for a wide segment of the national economy. Cigarettes account for \$8.9 billion, or about 90 per cent, of total tobacco sales. Each year the industry contributes some \$2.1 billion to the Federal government in taxes, \$2 billion to state governments and \$62 million to municipalities. There are 625,000 tobacco-growing families in the U.S., principally in six states, and 73,000 production employees who earned about \$360 million last year. Then there are the outside beneficiaries—the advertising agencies, broadcasters and print media who share some \$265 million in tobacco advertising. Fully 7 per cent of all national television revenue—about \$204 million—comes from tobacco advertising.

While still stoutly defending their product, the cigarette makers have long since branched into a wide range of other activities. R.J. Reynolds, the world's largest tobacco company and maker of almost a third of the cigarettes consumed in the U.S., is moving to acquire McLean Industries, Inc., a large transportation company. The deal would double the company's business in non-tobacco lines (already including Hawaiian Punch and Chun King Foods) to about 20 per cent of sales of \$2.2 billion—enough, Reynolds thinks, to justify its pending name change to R.J. Reynolds Industries, Inc. All this diversification, admits chairman Alexander H. Galloway, 61, is to "guard against the day we may be forced to phase out of the cigarette business."

LOOK AWAY

Philip Morris, Inc., despite its success with Marlboro, Benson & Hedges and Virginia Slims, is branching out too. It already owns the American Safety Razor Co., Burma-Vita Co., a maker of shaving cream, and Clark Bros. Chewing Gum Co. Last year, it went into the candy business when it became the U.S. distributor for Rowntree & Co., an English firm. Lorillard Corp. (Old Gold), now a part of Loew's Theaters, Inc., derives about 14 per cent of its revenue of \$600 million from non-tobacco products. Even one of the oldest tobacco companies in the U.S., the American Tobacco Co., whose Lucky Strike

brand came from the gold-rush days of the 1850s, has gone the diversification route. For decades, American proudly told the world that "tobacco is our middle name." Now it owns the James B. Beam Distilling Co., Duffy-Mott Co. and Bell Brand Foods and in February changed its name to American Brands, Inc.

The government proposal to ban cigarette advertising from radio and television has raised a good deal of controversy on and off Capitol Hill. There are those who argue that such a ban would violate free speech and would quickly be struck down by the Supreme Court. Others raise the point that if a product is legally salable, it should be legal to advertise it. One who feels this way is California Congressman Lionel Van Deerlin, a member of the Commerce Committee who is so opposed to smoking that he wants to put health warnings right on the front of the pack. Yet Van Deerlin also believes that "manufacturers have every right" to put their advertising on the air. Some opponents of cigarette smoking have thoughtfully pointed out that a ban on cigarette advertising would also eliminate the anti-smoking commercials.

In view of legal and other problems, most observers think the Federal regulatory agencies would really rather see Congress set the rules. The agencies insist that the hazards posed by smoking are unique and that they feel obligated to regulate cigarette ads in the public interest. But as FCC Commissioner Rosel Hyde acknowledged when he testified before the Commerce Committee last week, legislation on advertising "would be a better course than our rule-making." Perhaps with this in mind, Hyde indicated he would be willing to see stiffer health warnings in advertising instead of an outright ban. His reasoning: if cigarette makers are forced by Congress to mention disease or death on the air, they would stop advertising anyway.

WHY ME?

The tobacco industry will get its innings this week when 43 witnesses, led by Joseph F. Cullman III, chairman of the executive committee of the Tobacco Institute, the industry's chief lobby, descend on Room 2123. Cullman, who is also chairman and chief executive officer of Philip Morris, thinks that even the present cautionary label is too punitive and asks why other products harmful to health aren't being given as rough a time as tobacco. As he told Newsweek's Stephan Leshner last week: "It's a hazardous society we live in—and cigarettes are far down on the list of hazards. I'm on the board of Ford, but I think driving an auto is far more hazardous than smoking. So is flying a plane, or using certain drugs indiscriminately."

The theme of the industry's arguments is expected to be basically the same one it has used in the past. It is that tobacco has been impeached and indicted but not yet convicted in fact, and that the case against cigarette smoking is based on statistical associations rather than scientific fact.

To this they will bring some refinements, largely in the form of questions that even anti-smoking people admit are embarrassing because they have no answers. Why, for example, if smoking causes disease, has no ingredient in smoke been identified as the causative factor? Why in countries such as England is lung cancer double the U.S. rate, even though per capita smoking is less? Oddly, Surgeon General Stewart's own statements provide the industry with ammunition. A few weeks ago, he told another Congressional committee that "We know that some smokers get lung cancer, and we know that many heavy smokers never get lung cancer."

Still, when all the Congressional pulling and tugging is over, the anti-smoking forces are expected to come out ahead. Utah's Frank Moss is borrowing Southern tactics and has vowed to filibuster any weak bill to death when it reaches the Senate, and he is con-

fidant of substantial support from colleagues to make a filibuster work. As the matter stood last week, representatives in Congress were faced with four choices:

They could extend the 1965 Federal act as is, continuing the mild pack warning and barring regulatory agencies from acting against the industry. For tobacco, this would be an upset victory, and it is considered unlikely.

They could pass tougher health warnings for packs and ads, and continue the clampdown on regulatory action.

They could pass tougher warnings and allow the FCC and FTC to end the broadcasting of ads.

They could do nothing, allowing the act to expire and freeing the agencies to impose restrictions.

Washington pulse-takers say any one of the last three options stands a good chance, barring an unexpected deal whereby the companies agree to drop ads voluntarily from the airwaves and strengthen pack warnings on their own. Any one of them would spell bad news for the industry—in the form of drastic cutbacks in television advertising and, depending on the toughness of the warnings, even in cutbacks in print media too.

Yet surprisingly, the big tobacco companies don't appear too shaken at the possibility. Not spending all that money for ads would be something of a blessing in itself. Many of the millions spent are "defensive"—i.e., they don't win new customers but merely keep competitors from gaining. Those same millions could be diverted to more profitable products. An out-and-out ban on TV advertising, says Cullman of Philip Morris, "would not prevent us from launching new brands or selling established brands." Tobacco men also are heartened by the experience in Great Britain, where sales actually rose after TV cigarette ads were banned in 1965.

ACE IN THE HOLE

There also is the industry's ace—booming foreign markets. Exports alone accounted for some 26 billion cigarettes last year—an enterprise ironically supported through subsidies by the selfsame Federal government that is harassing the industry at home. But the big potential is in establishing plants overseas, obtaining foreign affiliates and subsidiaries and developing foreign licensing agreements. Philip Morris, with plants in India, New Zealand and Venezuela, already is a leader abroad; so is Loew's Lorillard. Loew's Bob Tisch enthused last week: "There's a terrific opportunity for expansion in foreign markets. I'm in Puerto Rico right now, and I'm falling all over people from Reynolds and other companies." Already, Lorillard is cranking up in Luxembourg, Hong Kong and South Africa.

Madison Avenue's uptight ad agencies are less casual over the prospect of losing millions in billings, and they seem certain that TV ads definitely will be banned from U.S. airwaves. "It's going to happen," says Barton A. Cummings, chairman and chief executive of Compton Advertising, Inc. (which formerly had the L&M Filters account). "You can call it outrageous discrimination. If today there is discrimination against cigarettes, what next?" To Cummings, the real impact on agencies will depend on how much tobacco budgets are reduced. A slight cutback could be weathered, but slashes of 20 to 25 percent "probably would require a reduction of staffs."

Meanwhile, admen are keeping an eye on the National Association of Broadcasters, which is thinking about forestalling Federal action by applying its airwave code (which already bans liquor ads) to cigarettes. But the clampdown wouldn't eliminate tobacco ads altogether. One code revision suggested by Bill Michaels, president of Storer Broadcasting Co., would ban physical smoking in ads, prohibit ads in or adjacent to children's programs, and eliminate all cigarette adver-

tising between 4 p.m. and 9 p.m., with the exception of those in newscasts.

WHAT TO DO?

Such a plan, says Michaels, could keep broadcasters from "losing the whole cigarette wad." But the industry generally seems pessimistic. There were reports last week that major networks were toying with sample operating budgets that exclude cigarette ad revenues. Some local stations, including two owned by the Washington Post Co. and two by Bonneville International Corp. in Utah, a Mormon chain, already have announced plans to drop tobacco advertising after current contracts run out. But Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS feels that it's too early for the networks to make decisive moves. "What CBS will do," he says, "depends on when and if a ban comes."

All the talk now could be academic. While the controversy rages, states are threatening to tax cigarettes out of existence. Says Philip Morris' Cullman: "Those taxes will be as much an inhibitor to people buying cigarettes as anything." In New York City, cigarettes already cost 55 cents a pack from a machine, 26 cents of it in taxes, and the New York Legislature is thinking about hiking its bite another 5 cents.

Proposals to increase tobacco taxes have passed in four current legislative sessions—and remain pending in twenty other states. Surprisingly, North Carolina, producer of more than half of the nation's cigarettes, is one of them. The plunge was taken by young (39) Gov. Robert W. Scott, son of a former governor, and the tax is given a good chance of passing, thus stripping North Carolina of its status as the lone tobacco tax holdout among the 50 states.

It is not so academic to the people who work in the industry. There, the pinch is not something to conjecture about; it is real. American Tobacco has had production employees on a four-day week for eight weeks. Lorillard admits that it has laid off part of its work force. Reynolds has maintained full shifts, but employees like 24-year-old James Tedder are still worried. "They may be right about this health thing," he says. "But I don't know what I'd do if people stopped smoking." Finally, the turmoil reaches back to where it all started with the Indians before there was even an America—the grower. Says Ben B. Everett Jr. of tiny Palmyra, N.C., who farms 45 acres of tobacco: "We've got to fight this anti-tobacco thing. My back is to the wall. I have only one way to go—up. If I go down, I'm out."

Mr. MOSS. Further, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post appears a small article indicating that the Boston Globe has today announced that it will cease the publication of cigarette advertising when its present contracts expire.

This is one of the early movements that are being made in the field of newspaper advertising, and it conforms with the trend that is going on now in many of the outlets of television and radio. Three large corporations already have announced that they will no longer accept cigarette advertising for television and radio. This is the first instance of which I am aware in which a newspaper has made this public announcement.

I ask unanimous consent that this small news item be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEWSPAPER ENDS CIGARETTE ADS

BOSTON, April 30.—The Boston Globe said today it will cease publication of cigarette advertising when its present contracts expire.

The action was taken because "accumulated medical evidence has indicated that cigarette smoking is hazardous to health," the paper said.

ADMIRALS AND GENERALS SEEK TO SHIFT BLAME FOR VIETNAM TRAGEDY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there is no indication that the ugly civil war in Vietnam is nearing an end. However, while the fighting and killing and maiming continues, it is apparent that some of those responsible for our involvement in that South Vietnam civil war have begun the process of exonerating themselves and shifting blame to others for our failure to beat the Vietcong into submission.

Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, former commander of our naval forces in the Pacific, has written an article in Reader's Digest entitled "We Could Have Won the War in Vietnam Long Ago." In this insidious article the admiral states that our airpower could have won the war in Vietnam by destroying the North Vietnamese economy. He cites former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara as the principle villain for our failing to do so. Of course, this loudmouthed admiral knows full well that it was President Johnson who made the decisions on the air war in Vietnam, but the generals and admirals are still resentful of the fact that Robert S. McNamara was the first Secretary of Defense in recent American history to assert civilian supremacy over the military in the Pentagon. Evidently, this admiral, U. S. Grant Sharp, is so ignorant of the wonderful history and tradition of our Nation during a period of nearly 200 years that he does not know that those patriots including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison who assembled in Philadelphia and drafted the Constitution provided that in our United States of America civilian authority must always be supreme over the military and that a civilian, our President, is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

Admiral Sharp disregards completely the fact that we have hurled a greater tonnage of bombs on North Vietnam than were dropped by the United States and its allies on Germany, Austria, and Italy during World War II. It is estimated that our napalm and other bombs have incinerated at least 200,000 Vietnamese civilians, mostly women, children and old men. In addition, approximately 300,000 Vietcong soldiers and civilians, including women and children, have been horribly burned or crippled for life by tons of napalm and other bombs hurled from our B-52's and other naval and Air Force planes.

This is the same Admiral Sharp who as far back as 1965 predicted that the tide was turning and we and our South Vietnamese allies, so-called were "no longer losing the war." He claims that had we bombed railroad yards and power stations in Hanoi and the docks in Haiphong "we could have quickly broken North Vietnam's resistance." He fails to mention that had we done so we would have killed hundreds of thousands of civilians—children, women, and men, including no doubt some officers and crew-

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

With the usual shortsighted viewpoint of the generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and most of our admirals and generals, Admiral Sharp completely disregards the tragic mistakes and miscalculations which led to our involvement and escalation of the war in Vietnam. It seems that he is completely oblivious of the larger political and diplomatic questions involved.

Admiral Sharp's reasoning is not only a mere misconception and a distortion of history, but appears to be the beginning of an attempt by military and naval leaders to exonerate themselves for our failure in Vietnam and to place the blame on civilian leadership. He refuses to consider the fact, or even the possibility, that we should never have become involved in sending many thousands of our fighting men to Vietnam in the first place or that once there events became out of control.

Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post it was reported that retired Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall said yesterday that 40 percent of our combat losses in Vietnam were the result of foolishness, impatience and heroics by U.S. troops and he singled out "lieutenants, captains, and platoon sergeants" as the weakest cog in the American war machine in Vietnam. In an interview in connection with the publication of his new book, the retired general said that last spring Gen. William C. Westmoreland, then commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam and now Army Chief of Staff, had asked him to make an assessment of American troops in the war zone to find out what our mistakes were. This is the same General Westmoreland who in October 1965 said: "We are winning the war in Vietnam."

Now it appears that not only are some generals and admirals attempting to place complete blame for the Vietnam fiasco on civilian leaders, but also to shift responsibility for their own ineptness and failures and manifest lack of intelligent leadership to lower ranking commissioned officers and even to noncommissioned officers. Is history to be written to report that General Westmoreland and his predecessors in command in Viet-

nam were not responsible for their failure to defeat the Vietcong, but instead it was the fault of the lower ranking officers, both commissioned and noncommissioned doing the actual fighting and dying? While undoubtedly there were mistakes in the combat areas as there are in any war, it was the responsibility of our generals to correct them and prevent similar ones from occurring. That is one of the first responsibilities of military leadership. Are American youngsters to be told that it was the captains, lieutenants, and sergeants who failed to defeat the Vietcong.

This shameful attempt to degrade the efforts of GI's and their company and platoon officers who actually did, and are doing, the fighting in South Vietnam is a dastardly insult to the more than 34,000 young Americans who were killed in combat in Vietnam and to the more than 200,000 other American youngsters who were wounded in combat or afflicted with dread jungle diseases such as bubonic plague, hepatitis, and malaria fever from which many of them will suffer for the rest of their lives.

Mr. President, the article by Admiral Sharp and General Westmoreland's oblique attempt to shift the blame for the bungling of our generals to civilian leaders and lower ranking officers and even to noncommissioned officers is reminiscent of the attempt during the late 1940's to place the blame for China's fall to the Communists on a few officials in our State Department—dedicated, intelligent men of high principles and dedication. Most of these "old China hands" were made scapegoats and hounded out of the State Department during the "Joe McCarthy era" which we would now like to forget. As a result the Nation lost the benefit of their experience and advice during a critical period in history. Our involvement in the civil war in South Vietnam and the failure of much of our policy in Southeast Asia is due in part to the fact that we did not have enough competent Asian experts in the State Department during the 1950's. Are we now to relive that era and its mistakes and tragic consequences as a result of our military and diplomatic failures in Vietnam?

Mr. President, it is clear no one person, civilian or military, is responsible for the tragedy in Vietnam. All those who participated in the decisionmaking processes of government during our escalation and expansion of this civil war into an American air and ground war from the President, the Secretary of State, the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff on down bear heavy responsibility. All who stood idly by and did not speak out as we became ever more mired down in the Vietnam quagmire also bear some responsibility.

Mr. President, Vietnam is a national tragedy of immense proportions. Let us hope that the war will soon come to an end, and then let us as a united people begin to correct the evils which it has perpetrated and prolonged in our society. Let us then begin to rebuild our society and to restore confidence in America. Perhaps most important, let us reject and condemn those who now seek to shift the guilt for the war and for its conduct from themselves to others.

TAX-DODGE FARMING

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was pleased to learn last week that the administration considers the problem of tax-dodge farming one "that requires changes in tax treatment." Considering the time problem which Treasury's new representatives admittedly had getting ready for the hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means on April 22, I consider the product of their labor most praiseworthy. Any difficulty that I may have with Treasury's current proposal is strictly of a technical nature and I want to make that perfectly clear now before I get into an analysis of that proposal.

First, Treasury suggests that all taxpayers who incur total ordinary farm deduction in excess of total ordinary farm income would be required to add all of such excess—in the case of a corporation—or the excess above \$5,000 a year—in the case of an individual—to an excess deductions account. That account would be reduced by net farm income in any subsequent year. Gain realized on a disposition of property used in farming that would otherwise be capital gain would be treated as ordinary income to the extent of the amount in the excess deductions account in the year of sale.

Basically, the EDA account approach proposed last week is the same as that considered by the House Ways and Means Committee back in 1963—"President's Tax Message," hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, part I, pages 144-146, February 6, 1963.

However, one major difference between the 1963 proposal and the one offered last week requires comment. In 1963, the requirement to keep an EDA account was only to apply to the extent that farm deductions were used to offset high-bracket nonfarm income. The proposal suggested last week would apply to anyone with a farm loss regardless of whether or not he had any nonfarm income. In other words, a legitimate farmer could now find himself penalized for suffering a casualty loss in a given year. I am certain that the Treasury Department had no intention of having its proposal apply to anyone other than the tax-dodge farmer. The fact that last week's proposal is not limited to gains attributable to farm deductions previously used to offset high-bracket nonfarm income is one of those things that can happen when you are under time pressures and trying to come up with an alternative that reads differently from anything already under consideration.

The use of an EDA account was one of the methods I considered when back in 1967 I began looking into ways to remedy the tax-dodge farming situation. However after reviewing the testimony taken by the House Committee on Ways and Means in 1963, I began to search around for a more effective way to get at this problem without hurting the legitimate farmer. For example, back in 1963 the National Livestock Tax Committee made this comment about the EDA approach:

We cannot say whether it would work or would not, but it is the most modest approach that has come to our attention.

Well, when we read that sort of grudging praise made by an organization that

has been fighting tax reform in this area every step of the way, it makes us sit back and take a second look at what we are trying to do. After a great deal of technical discussion with experts, I determined that the most effective way to get at this problem without hurting the legitimate farmer would be to limit the amount of artificially created farm losses each year that could be used as an offset against nonfarm income. The problem with the EDA approach is that it allows the tax-dodge farmer to defer any recognized capital gains until he is ready to sell and you can rest assured no sale will take place until he has milked his excess deductions dry. Certainly last week's proposal will not remove any of the incentive from existing clients of cattle management firms such as Oppenheimer Industries.

Another reason for approaching this problem on an annual basis is that by doing so you can take into account the nature of the deduction that generates a loss in any given year. For example, under the provisions of S. 500, certain exceptions are made for deductions that are in general deductions which would be allowed to anyone holding property without regard to whether it was being used in farming or because it is the type of deduction that is clearly beyond the control of the taxpayer.

That is why S. 500 in no event prevents the deduction of farm losses to the extent they relate to taxes, interest, the abandonment or theft of farm property, or losses of farm property arising from fire, storm, or other casualty, losses, and expenses directly attributable to drought, and recognized losses from the sales, exchanges, and involuntary conversions of farm property. Under my bill, if the total of these deductions is higher than \$15,000, then the higher figure may be used without any reduction because of nonfarm income above \$15,000. In other words, the dollar limitation contained in S. 500 is directed solely at the type of deductions that are artificially created through the abuse of the special farm accounting rules designed for farmers.

The Treasury's new representatives obviously grasped the fact that the artificially created deductions are the very core of the problem. I say that because I notice that last week's proposal exempts a taxpayer from keeping an EDA if "he used accounting methods which are generally applicable to businesses other than farming."

My whole point is that by limiting deductions each year the tax-dodge farmer can be caught with his hand in the cookie jar. Is it not better than letting him put us in the position of having to refill an empty jar?

COMMEMORATION OF LANDING OF THE VIRGINIA COMPANY AT CAPE HENRY, VA., IN 1607

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on April 28 many Virginians gathered on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean to commemorate the landing of the Virginia Company at Cape Henry, Va., 362 years ago. This began the establishment of the first permanent English settlement at James-

town, which ultimately became the beginnings of this great Nation. My colleague from Virginia, Representative THOMAS N. DOWNING, addressed those assembled at the cross at Cape Henry.

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

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

REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING AT THE LANDING DAY CEREMONY, CAPE HENRY MEMORIAL, APRIL 27, 1969

As we gather this day to commemorate the landing at Cape Henry, the familiar words of an old English carol come inescapably to mind: "I saw three ships come sailing in."

Barely over a century after the three small ships of Christopher Columbus came sailing across the Atlantic, opening a new world and firing the imagination of Europe, the three small ships of the Virginia Company hove into view along this shore. They soon established the first permanent English settlement in this same new world at Jamestown.

Seeking to create a great English nation beyond the seas, they truly builded better than they knew, and laid a lasting foundation for the growth of American civilization.

Standing before this cross, silent memorial to their faith and to the hardships they endured, let us recall briefly the circumstances of that momentous journey by those three small sailing ships 362 years ago this very month.

We cannot fully appreciate the story of colonization from its larger setting—the surging spirit of nationalism, the commercial expansion, the lure of discovery, characteristic of the Elizabethan age. The men who came to Virginia were, let us remember, of the generation of Shakespeare; and the mighty victory over the Spanish Armada was fresh in their minds. It seems appropriate indeed that they should be the initiators of one of history's greatest dramas—the transplanting of the old world in the new and the birth of a great new nation.

The Jamestown epic begins across the sea in London with the chartering by James I of the Virginia Company in 1606. Despite the failure of previous colonies, the time and occasion were propitious for those who could see the remarkable success of the East India Company and similar joint-stock ventures. The so-called London Company was given the domain which is now Virginia; the Plymouth Company in the north was destined to meet with failure.

In December of 1606 a full-scale colonizing expedition set forth from London in three small ships (whose reproductions at the Festival Park here are familiar to many)—the "Susan Constant," the "Godspeed," and the "Discovery"—carrying 144 persons and a small cargo of supplies. After many months at sea, the colonists—now reduced to 105—landed on these shores, then at Hampton where they were welcomed by the Kecoughtan Indians. After a feast with the Indians they sailed up the broad river they named for their king and selected a landing site on a wooded peninsula some 30 miles from the sea, naming it Jamestown. All this happened some 13 years before the landing of the "Mayflower" pilgrims at Plymouth.

The story of those early days is known to every schoolchild, written as it is into the very foundation of our American heritage.

The new colony began with bright hopes. "Heaven and earth never agreed better to frame a place for man's habitation," wrote one observer, mindful of the good soil, abundant timber, and plentiful game. Who could have foreseen the suffering and hardship ahead, suffering and hardship by which those early settlers were tested and tempered as steel.

Death and disease were familiar visitors, and conflict—both within and beyond the settlement itself—wore down the endurance of the settlers. During the winter of 1607–1608 the ravages of sickness and the intermittent fighting with the Indians reduced the colony to 38. Faced with imminent extinction, the survivors were rallied by Captain John Smith, under whose rigid discipline a blockhouse fort was built, along with many cabins and a church, and a well dug. He also forced the settlers to plant crops (notably corn) and to raise livestock and chickens in place of that craze for gold which had blinded them to a realistic appraisal of their needs. But dissensions multiplied, and in 1609, injured by an explosion and discouraged, Smith returned to England.

The ensuing winter of 1609–1610 was the terrible "starving time" during which the beleaguered colonists first ate their horses and dogs, and then turned to rodents and snakes. Within six months' time, 90% of the colony died, reducing the population from about 500 to 60.

In May of 1610—three years after the first landing—relief ships, appalled by the condition of the colony, turned back for England. At this dramatic moment the colony was again saved by an unexpected and unforeseen turn of events: the sudden arrival of the Governor-elect, Lord Delaware, whose ship entered the river's mouth just as the others were ready to put to sea.

Stern but efficient, Lord Delaware restored both the physical life of the settlement and the morale of the settlers. Not hesitating to impose martial law to control dissension. The colony survived—and gradually recovered, with a slow but rising tide of prosperity.

As early as 1612, John Rolfe had introduced West Indian tobacco, thus providing a firm and expanding economic base. It was this same John Rolfe who in 1614 married Pocahontas, daughter of the Indian chief, Powhatan, thus ensuring a time of peace with the Indians.

By 1618, the company decreed the end of martial rule, and in 1619 the first representative Assembly gathered in the Jamestown church. This was the beginning of representative government in the western world, the forerunner of the Congress of the United States. Our Virginia General Assembly which celebrates its 350th anniversary this year is the direct continuance of this first meeting at Jamestown.

As we today commemorate the events of 1607, we look—and rightly—for the continuing significance of these events in our Nation and in our world. I suggest that we shall find it in that spirit of enterprising adventure which inspired and sustained the men of the "Susan Constant," the "Godspeed," and the "Discovery." For, as much as they were adventurers. They were also builders.

In seeking permanent settlement in the new world, in the face of adversity, they bequeathed to us the American heritage of liberty under law, expressed in four great elements: (1) the English language, that rich and flexible vehicle of human communication whose establishment in this continent the German Chancellor Bismarck regarded as among the most important political circumstances of history; (2) the English common law, with its powerful emphasis on the rights of free men; (3) representative institutions for the free expression of thought and action; and (4) the English Bible, that remarkable instrument of the religious life so deeply rooted in the values cherished by the Jamestown settlers.

Think, then, for a moment, how much invisible cargo was borne to the new world by these three little ships over three centuries ago. The philosopher Whitehead has written that societies perish whenever the spirit of adventure decays. It is this spirit of high adventure and enterprise which is perhaps the heart of the legacy of those settlers to us

and which has to greater or lesser degree touched all of our institutions.

Standing before this cross which marks the earliest landing of the Jamestown settlers, we are mindful of the price paid by those who have given us the heritage of liberty and law, that precious balance between anarchy and tyranny. In the face of all the problems which confront and challenge our Nation today, problems marked by complexity and bitterness, we look to that hope and faith demonstrated in 1607 and carried into our Nation and into the changing world in such deeply felt convictions as the dignity of productive labor, the right of free men to govern themselves, and the shared expectation of greater abundance in our quest for higher standards of living.

With such a heritage, the lamp lighted by those brave settlers will never fail. In the words of an ancient prayer: "As God was with our fathers, so may he be with us."

JEFFERSON MEDAL AWARD

Mr. BIBLE, Mr. President, on April 24, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) was presented with the 1969 Jefferson Medal Award of the New Jersey Patent Law Association. This medal is named in honor of Thomas Jefferson, who served as Secretary of State at a time when one of the duties of that office was to examine patent applications. It is bestowed for outstanding contributions in the patent, trademark, and copyright field.

The award of this medal to Senator McCLELLAN is most appropriate because of his contributions over the past 8 years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights. It should be noted that Senator McCLELLAN is the first legislator to receive the award.

The importance of patents to the vitality of small business has been made clear over the years. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate the outstanding honor which has been paid one of its Members.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator McCLELLAN's remarks at the time of acceptance of the award.

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

THE PATENT SYSTEM: STABILITY OR STAGNATION?

(Remarks of Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, delivered on the occasion of the presentation of the Jefferson Medal Award, New Jersey Patent Law Association, Newark, N.J., Apr. 24, 1969)

I am highly gratified and honored to be the recipient of the Thomas Jefferson Medal. My appreciation for this recognition is indeed deepened and enhanced in the knowledge that I am the first Member of Congress to receive this distinguished award.

In 1961 the Chairmanship of the Senate Patents Subcommittee became vacant at a time when I was the most senior member of the parent Judiciary Committee who did not have a subcommittee chairmanship. When I accepted this assignment, I assumed that it would not place too many demands on my time or involve me in serious controversy. Events, however, have developed somewhat differently. The Subcommittee has not sought issues but in the performance of our legislative responsibilities, we have been confronted with many complex

subjects—some of which have engendered considerable emotion.

Thomas Jefferson, several years after leaving the White House, wrote to a friend that:

"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind, as that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed . . . institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

In this age, the expectation of change is greater than the expectation of continuity. Ideals that have prevailed and institutions that have endured for centuries are being uprooted, repudiated, and challenged. Many fundamental and traditional values are held in disdain. Large segments of our youth and some militant groups question the relevance of certain basic components of our civilization. Our campuses, our centers of learning, and our city streets are converted into battlegrounds while those in authority abdicate their responsibility to preserve order and capitulate to force, threats, and intimidation. Lewdness and obscenity are today circulated and commercialized with judicial sanctions and impunity. And, finally, even our churches—the historic defender of enduring norms—are torn and divided by discord and doubt.

Attending this challenge to our institutions and values—and no doubt a strong contributing cause—is the rapid advance of technology. Technology has greatly enriched our society. An American today has more options in work, investments, and the pursuit of happiness than ever before. But, the tremendous progress we have made is accompanied by numerous complex and unanticipated problems.

The impact of technological growth has not spared the Patent System. The unparalleled explosion of scientific knowledge, the intricacy of modern inventions, and the accelerated development of most regions of the world have significantly added to the burdens of our Patent System. As a consequence, both the Executive and Legislative Branches have undertaken comprehensive studies of the systems operations. The report of the President's Commission on the Patent System and the studies of our Subcommittee reached similar conclusions. There was agreement that patents continue to play a dynamic role in promoting the economic and scientific progress of the nation. Both studies expressed concern about certain problems, such as the protracted delays in the processing of patent applications, the quality of issued patents, and the expense of patent litigation. I was rather appalled to learn recently that every one of the 16 patents litigated during the past two years in the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, which includes Arkansas, was declared invalid.

The President's Commission made 35 recommendations, most of which would require legislative implementation. The test that I have applied in studying these recommendations has been whether a proposed change would render the Patent System more efficient. Innovation is not necessarily synonymous with reform. A complex body of laws, such as the Patent Code, should not be tinkered with unless it is necessary, and unless the implications of a contemplated change are fully understood.

While stability in our Patent System is highly desirable, stagnation will be the result if prudent and timely adjustments are not made. In amending present law and making changes, it should be our goal to devise a Patent System which is adequate not merely for the 1970's, but one which will also serve our needs in the 21st Century. There is no magic formula or single remedy which will provide a revitalized Patent System. But, rather, a series of interrelated actions are required. In my view, they are:

First, there must be improved organization and more effective use of the limited manpower and funds of the Patent Office. I be-

Have significant progress in this direction has been made in recent years. President Nixon has emphasized his desire to improve the organization of the Federal Government and to increase its efficiency. The Patent Office, within the limitations imposed by statutory law, should endeavor to allocate more of its resources and a greater portion of the time of its examiners to significant patent applications.

As Chairman of an Appropriation Subcommittee, I have the initial responsibility in the Senate for the appropriations of the Department of Commerce. Because of more urgent military and social needs, I cannot offer any encouragement of any substantial increase in appropriated funds for the Patent Office in the foreseeable future. Therefore, I have already requested Secretary of Commerce Stans to furnish the Subcommittee with the Department's recommendations for an improved method of recovering the costs of the patent operation. Another increase in patent fees may be required.

Second, there should be an expanded program to provide the examiner with as much mechanical assistance as possible. As far back as 1955, the Senate Committee on Appropriations directed the Department of Commerce to "make an aggressive and thorough investigation as to the possibility of mechanizing the searching operations." While major obstacles presently retard the use of mechanized searching in most classes of the arts, careful exploration of all promising techniques is warranted.

Third, the concept of "Fortress America" is no more valid in patent matters than in national security. We cannot have and keep a sound Patent System if it ignores international trends and developments in the domestic legislation of other major industrialized nations. Several years ago, during the observance of the 175th Anniversary of the American Patent System, in a public address, I recommended that the Executive Branch proceed with efforts to promote international cooperation in patent matters. I believe we are already seeing tangible gains from such undertakings.

I welcome the Convention to Establish the World Intellectual Property Organization to promote international respect for industrial and intellectual property. I have recommended to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it act favorably on the ratification of the Convention. I have supported the efforts of the past and current Administrations to devise a Patent Cooperation Treaty. I believe a meaningful treaty can be prepared which will not require major alterations in our domestic patent law. I endorse the recommendation of the Department of State to hold a diplomatic conference to draft such a treaty. My colleague from Arkansas, Senator Fulbright, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has recently introduced a joint resolution to authorize appropriations for that purpose.

Fourth, there should be appropriate changes in the patent statute. I believe that the record of the extensive Subcommittee hearings, together with the Executive and Congressional studies, have amply documented the case for a significant revision in the patent law. While I could not support all of the provisions contained in the Patent Reform Act of the 90th Congress, the general objectives of that legislation were sound. However, in an effort to present a bill which would receive more general support, I introduced on February 28th of this year S. 1246 which makes desirable but rather modest changes in the Patent Code.

In my judgment, a more ambitious revision would have been justified. But, this bill leaves for another day further consideration of more sweeping procedural reforms. I hope by that time there will be more understanding that they are also in the best interests of the Patent System—and of the patent bar.

Our Subcommittee, I think, has demonstrated that it is prepared to act on patent revision legislation. It is necessary now for the Administration—and especially the new team in the Commerce Department and the Patent Office—to indicate their commitment to this effort.

I have spoken of stability and stagnation in the Patent System. In appraising our institutions of government, we must reject those despairing and dismal voices that contend that the accumulated wisdom of the past is not relevant to the solution of the problems of this age. But no less unsound are those who fear progress and who blindly refuse to recognize that time marches on and that human institutions must be revitalized.

A society to survive must receive—and in fact must demand—general acceptance of its transcendent values. The enemies of our country—both the foreign and domestic variety—seek first to weaken our social order and to undermine faith in our goals. Our need is not to invent new values but rather to implement those in which we believe and reflect them in our institutions. If we will only preserve our traditions and undertake, as needed, the renewal of our institutions, then we will pass on to those who succeed us a rich and viable heritage unsurpassed or unparalleled in the history of civilization.

THE FIRST 100 DAYS OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Appraisal of Nixon Administration," prepared by the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER).

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

APPRAISAL OF NIXON ADMINISTRATION (Statement by SENATOR TOWER)

President Nixon this week passed the 100-day mark of his administration. Earlier he declared that he now has the reigns of government firmly in hand.

The President has correctly taken the view that it is more important to gauge the effects of his administration after a year or longer in office. But there seems to be a habit in this country of making a preliminary evaluation at the end of a president's first 100 days in office.

In reviewing the first few months of the Nixon administration, it is important to look at some of the things which Mr. Nixon has not done as well as his more positive achievements.

As my colleague and Senate Republican leader, Everett Dirksen, noted recently, "the lack of drama has been part of the achievement" of the early days of the Nixon administration.

It is my opinion that the majority of those who voted for Mr. Nixon last fall, looked forward to an attitude of calm in the White House. They wanted the decision-making process to be more thorough, more carefully considered. They wanted many of the new imaginative programs which had been started in recent years, to be re-studied and re-structured so as to reduce waste and increase effectiveness.

The attitude of calm and deliberate decision-making has already shown itself to be a hallmark of the Nixon administration. I both expect and hope that it will continue to be.

Now let me turn to specific actions—and some non-actions—which the Nixon administration has taken during its first few months of operation.

First, Mr. Nixon has not widened the war in Vietnam. His administration has worked steadily both in Paris and in South Vietnam to secure an honorable peace. We do not yet know how effective these efforts will be, but the Nixon administration is giving the bombing halt announced by President Johnson every opportunity to be productive. At the same time, the Nixon administration is fostering considerable improvement in the combat capability of the army of the government of South Vietnam. My recent visit to South Vietnam made it clear to me that the combat capability of the ARVN troops is indeed showing substantial improvement. Now we must exhibit patience while maintaining a firm position to see whether the North Vietnamese are actually ready to negotiate a lasting peace.

The second most important battle in which the Nixon administration is engaged is the one against inflation. In this area Mr. Nixon has taken several positive steps. He has reduced the fiscal 1970 budget request by \$4 billion. He is urging extension of the 10 percent federal income tax surcharge to January 1, to be followed by a surtax of only 5 percent. And he has offered a tax reform package which includes the proposed abolition of the 7 percent investment tax credit. I am uncertain at this time whether abolition of the 7 percent investment tax credit would be the best course. But I know that we must take steps to combat the rising cost of living and I commend President Nixon for taking positive steps.

Recently President Nixon faced his first sudden international crisis when North Korean aircraft shot down one of our EC-121 intelligence planes while over international waters. This was an unprovoked attack and may have been calculated to test the new administration. To President Nixon's credit, his reaction was one of firmness coupled with restraint. He avoided any knee-jerk reaction which might have proved detrimental in the long run. Yet he made it clear to the North Koreans that they could not make a second similar attack with impunity.

Early in his administration, President Nixon made an 8-day European tour to assure our friends there that European views would be fully and fairly considered by this nation in activities of vital European interest. Before that tour, many Europeans had begun to fear that United States world policy was being formed with little regard for our European allies. Mr. Nixon's tour reversed that feeling and in the process strengthened the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Nixon administration has now begun to send its legislative proposals to Congress. First, the President appropriately took the time necessary to formulate sound proposals.

Among these proposals are: increased efforts against organized crime; promotion of postal officials on the basis of merit rather than politics; a restructured program for aid to the cities; the safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system designed to protect our nuclear deterrent capability, and a proportional electoral reform program.

Overall, it seems to me that President Nixon has brought to the White House a new attitude—an attitude of responsibility—which is being welcomed by the majority of Americans. The President is not offering panacea programs. He is offering sound and capable leadership.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS SUPPORTS NEW CHINA POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on April 27, the League of Women Voters issued a major policy statement calling on the United States to improve relations with Communist China. The statement was released in advance of the meeting this week in Washington of the League's National Council, and was discussed in de-

tail in a statement by Mrs. David G. Bradley, chairman of the League's Foreign Policy Committee, at a meeting of the committee on Tuesday, April 29.

In addition to specific proposals relating to encouragement of travel, trade, and cultural exchange with China, the league also asks the United States to seek diplomatic relations with the Peking regime, and to withdraw our opposition to representation of Communist China in the United Nations.

The league's recommendations are especially significant because they represent a growing consensus across the Nation that it is time for a change in our China policy. The recommendations are also important because they recognize that it is the United States who should take the initiative in seeking to improve relations with China, and that we should not wait for some "change of attitude" by the Peking regime.

Three times in the last 30 years, we have sent American boys to die in land wars in Asia. Our policies there have cost us tens of thousands of lives and billions of dollars. One of the most frequent questions I get when speaking in different parts of the country is, will we be sending American boys to die again in Asia? Or, is our policy in the Far East going to change?

Clearly, our policy should change, and I fully support the recommendations of the League of Women Voters. Last month in New York City, in a speech to a conference sponsored by the National Committee on United States-China Relations, I had the opportunity to express my views on the urgent need for new initiatives in our China policy. For far too long, we have sought to isolate China, to impose a policy of diplomatic, political, economic, and cultural quarantine on the world's oldest civilization and the world's most populous nation, a nation of 750 million citizens and likely to exceed 1 billion by the 1980's.

Our current China policy is futile. We must begin to move now toward a new policy that seeks to bring China into the world community. Only through such action can we realistically hope to insure future peace for the world.

As the League of Women Voters' recommendations make clear that the United States can take a number of steps at once to improve our relations with China. It is worth emphasizing that nothing in these recommendations—and nothing I and others who share my beliefs have proposed—would in any way impair our own national security or our ability to respond firmly and forcefully to Chinese aggression anywhere in the world. What is clear, however, is that, if nothing changes, we in the United States will continue to live in the shadow of fear and arms and war. We owe ourselves a better hope for the future.

Mr. President, because of the significance of the recommendations by the League of Women Voters on our China policy, I ask unanimous consent that the league's press release announcing the recommendations be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Bradley's statement explaining the league's position be printed in the RECORD.

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

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES ASKS UNITED STATES TO NORMALIZE RELATIONS WITH MAINLAND CHINA

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 27.—The League of Women Voters of the U.S. today called on the American government to take the initiative to normalize relations with Mainland China.

The League called for specific policy changes such as the establishment of cultural, trade, and diplomatic relations with Peking.

The League also recommended that the United States no longer oppose representation of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations.

The League's policy statement reads in full:

"The League of Women Voters advocates U.S. initiatives which would facilitate participation by the People's Republic of China in the world community and relax tensions between the United States and Mainland China. Policies should be established which would encourage normalization of U.S. relations with the Chinese mainland, including travel, cultural exchange, and unrestricted trade in non-strategic goods. The United States should withdraw its opposition to representation of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations. The United States should move toward establishing diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China."

The League's policy position on U.S.-China relations climaxes a three-year study by the nonpartisan, 157,000 member organization. In announcing the position, Mrs. Bruce B. Benson, of Amherst, Massachusetts, National League president, emphasized that reports from local Leagues in every part of the country overwhelmingly indicated agreement that "present U.S. policies of isolation and containment of China are invalid."

At its 1966 convention, the League adopted U.S.-China relations as a major part of its foreign policy program. Since then, members of the 1,202 local Leagues throughout the country have been involved in extensive study and discussion as well as conferences with China experts from universities, government, and the press.

Leagues used as background material both non-League and League material. Over 100,000 copies of the League's 50-page booklet, "The China Puzzle", have been sold.

Mrs. David G. Bradley, of Durham, North Carolina, Chairman of the League Foreign Policy Committee, in commenting on the China position stressed that "the League is now in a position to urge changes in basic U.S. policies which have cut this nation off from communication or cooperation with the People's Republic. We want a U.S. policy designed to invite a peaceful response from the People's Republic, welcoming her participation in the family of nations."

Members of the national Foreign Policy Committee are Mrs. William M. Christopherson of Louisville, Kentucky; Mrs. Ezra Levin of Champaign, Illinois; Mrs. Alexander M. White, Jr., of New York City; and Mrs. John Kenderline of Holtwood, Pennsylvania.

The China position will be discussed by League leaders from 50 states during the week-long meeting of the League's National Council, which convenes here tomorrow morning.

At the Tuesday afternoon foreign policy session, April 29, the Council will discuss ways to bring about changes in U.S. policy on the basis of the China position.

All meetings of the National Council, Monday, April 28 through Friday, May 2, at the Mayflower Hotel, are open to the press.

Mrs. David G. Bradley, Foreign Policy Committee Chairman, and all other members of the committee will be available for questions

and interviews on the China position during the Council meeting.

STATEMENT OF MRS. DAVID G. BRADLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE FOREIGN POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, APRIL 29, 1969

The League of Women Voters has persistently searched for policy formulations and governmental programs which can reduce the risk of war and assure non-violent resolution of conflict between nations. This is the common theme of our foreign policy positions, and this concern has guided the League's review of U.S. policy toward the People's Republic of China. An overwhelming number of nearly 1000 Leagues reporting to date hold that the United States should take "initiatives which would facilitate participation by the People's Republic of China in the world community and relax tensions between the United States and mainland China." The key words used over and over again are communication, coexistence, cooperation. The Leagues want a U.S. policy designed to invite a peaceful response from the People's Republic, welcoming her participation in the family of nations.

One of the most striking impressions which remains after reading through the consensus reports is the sense of agreement on this basic philosophy which prevails in the League in every section of the country. Support for existing policies is negligible, confined to a small number of Leagues.

In 1966 when the convention adopted the China study it identified U.S. relations with mainland China as being of critical importance. Now, in 1969, this organization has taken a long look at political reality and the consensus which has emerged defines essential specific policy changes. Furthermore, the Leagues recognize the complexities of the China puzzle. They are aware of the effect of the war in Vietnam on the possibility of immediate action. They see the necessity for careful international diplomacy in seeking a resolution to the Taiwan problem. They acknowledge the difficulties inherent in the tangled relationships between Washington, Moscow and Peking. They know that the passage of time will be necessary to some forms of progress. They accept the need for political astuteness and proper timing.

In spite of the fact that there were no queries on specific policies in the consensus questions, the Leagues spontaneously chose six basic areas in which to recommend new approaches.

In advocating policies "which would encourage normalization of U.S. relations with the Chinese mainland" the League holds that U.S. policies toward China should be the same as those for any country, regardless of ideological or political differences. The first step should be to open the channels for trade in non-strategic goods. This country should also seek opportunities for travel for American and Chinese citizens in both countries. We should furthermore seek contacts through cultural exchange, including international meetings ranging from scientific confabs to disarmament conferences. Such moves would build a favorable climate for further diplomatic initiatives. And the League wants the government to take the initiative.

Beyond trade, travel and cultural exchange, League members urge that this country should "withdraw its opposition to representation of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations." They admit the difficulties: the possibility of a need for change in the U.N. itself, perhaps in the Security Council; the sensitivity of both mainland China and Taiwan to the question; the international aspects of the problem.

Each League sees it a little differently and we have no blueprint to offer on Taiwan. However, this approach may prove to be a realistic one. Solutions to political problems

seldom fit preconceived patterns. If the United States does cease opposing representation for mainland China, the door might be opened for the United Nations to find a resolution of the problem of Taiwan's future status in the United Nations.

Finally, we should "move toward establishing diplomatic relations." Some want to do it at once, some as soon as practicable. Some emphasize de facto recognition now. But the overall agreement is clear—the People's Republic is the legitimate government of the mainland and the United States should move in the direction of recognizing that government.

The League is now in a position to urge changes in basic U.S. policies which have cut this nation off from communication or cooperation with the People's Republic. We have stated our objectives and determined specific policy directions. In the future we can measure policy proposals against the objectives and take action.

I have chosen to close, rather than to open, with a reading of the Statement of Position itself. I think it is something we can be proud of.

"The League of Women Voters advocates U.S. initiatives which would facilitate participation by the People's Republic of China in the world community and relax tensions between the United States and mainland China. Policies should be established which would encourage normalization of U.S. relations with the Chinese mainland, including travel, cultural exchange, and unrestricted trade in nonstrategic goods. The United States should withdraw its opposition to representation of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations. The United States should move toward establishing diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China."

BOYS TOWN, NEBR., WELCOMES HOME AN ALUMNUS, COMDR. PETE BUCHER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to be present at one of the most moving events of my life, the welcome home given by the young men of Boys Town, Nebr., to one of that famed institution's alumni, Comdr. Lloyd "Pete" Bucher, skipper of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

For Commander Bucher it was a sentimental journey, returning to the school where he learned love, comradeship and devotion to country, where he played on the football team and where he attained manhood.

For those of us privileged to be present on that evening, it was an emotional experience seldom matched.

The welcoming address was presented by the director of Boys Town, the Right Reverend Monsignor Nicholas H. Wegner. My colleague from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) expressed his admiration of Commander Bucher and his crew. Representative CUNNINGHAM, of Omaha, who has introduced a bill authorizing the award of the Medal of Honor to Commander Bucher, and Representative WILLIAM SCHERLE, of Iowa, were also on hand to salute the *Pueblo* skipper, as was our Governor, Hon. Norbert Tiemann.

It was my special privilege to offer remarks commenting on the bravery and suffering of the men on the *Pueblo*.

Of course, the highlight of the evening was Commander Bucher's own response to the applause of 1,100 persons at the dinner.

It was with regret that I observed that none of the speakers had prepared texts.

But to my delight, I have now been able to obtain a tape recording of the remarks of that remarkable evening. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR NICHOLAS H. WEGNER

Pete, this is a night that God only could have made possible. You're welcome, and thrice welcome. I doubt very much that any group of people could give you a greater welcome than those here tonight, and I don't care where you could go. Welcome to you, to your fine wife, Rose, and to your two boys, Michael and Mark.

To me there is kind of an allegory, you might say, from the story of the Prodigal Son. Not that you went out in distant part for a good time for yourself, Pete; on the contrary you suffered. And you came back home. Your Father and your many, many friends were waiting for you. They were looking over the hill and when the news reached us that you finally gained your freedom, at that very moment we were prepared to extend a welcome to you at Boys Town such as has never been extended to anyone before; and I doubt that there will be another occasion like this.

When I first saw you in the naval base in San Diego, after your return from Korea and a Communistic prison where you suffered so much, I had some doubts in my mind that you would make it. Thank God you heard our prayers and the prayers of many, many of your friends throughout the world. Thank God that you are here tonight, totally well, that you're again among your friends and your fellow alumni, and so many of them are here, as well as the youngsters of Boys Town. We did everything possible this evening to bring out the fatted calf; I'm certain you deserve that. For you and for Rose and your two boys this day will ever stand as a most memorable one; and it will be a particularly memorable one for us at Boys Town.

I think back to May 13, 1967, when I stood at your side on the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. Tears came to my eyes as you were given the command of that ship. I was so proud of you and your family that I couldn't hold back the tears. Little did I think that during these intervening months you would have to undergo the punishments, the cruelties, the harassments, from those who took you prisoner which they had no right to do.

You're a courageous man, a man of character, a man of duty. Much of that, thank God, was impregnated in your heart while you were a student at Boys Town. We'll always be proud of you and your name will go down in the annals of Boys Town as one of its greatest citizens after Father Flanagan, the founder.

I also want to mention at this time that your good wife, Rose, and your two boys, suffered almost as much as you did because of your absence from them. Please God, again I say, that you are here with us tonight. You will always be a hero in the eyes of these young men, and in fact in the eyes of the entire nation that you deserve every honor this nation can confer upon you.

Oh yes, there are some that might disagree with this statement, there are some in this country who defile their citizenship; thank God there are so few. But as you upheld the honor of the United States every move you made from the day you took over the USS *Pueblo*. You didn't sail it very long. It looked as though the fates—the malfates were against you. We tried by every means possible to get in contact with you. I think I was the first one to receive a letter from you, dated March 23rd, which was mailed out of New York City March 26, evidently brought there by courier

of the United Nations. And, a month later, I received the same letter in which you made quite a number of mistakes and your Communist overlords didn't catch them; they were too dumb to see them. This letter was mailed out of Paris, Orly Field, just a month later. In fact on the eve of this day, the 25th, 1968 that I received this letter on the 26th of April.

So Pete, we the citizens of Boys Town, we the citizens of the world, greet you as a real Roman hero. We hope that God may give you and your family many, many years of happiness and joy because you certainly deserve it, and I hope that you will come back to Boys Town whenever you can. You always know that you are welcome. You appreciate liberty to the Nth degree, and we shall all appreciate it.

Remember what Daniel Webster said? "God grants liberty unto those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it." This you have done and you did it every day for a period of 11 months. You never jellied out. You know that your country was your object and by the blessings of God. Daniel Webster says, "May that country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror but of wisdom of peace and of liberty upon which the world may gaze with admiration forever."

Pete, we gaze upon you with untold admiration, upon Rose and your two boys. You will ever be held in the hearts and in the minds of your countrymen. This nation has withstood many storms and is undergoing new storms today. And you certainly showed that bravery which is necessary in every storm. May you continue to manifest that strength and bravery and courage so that, we, your friends, may enjoy the liberty which God gave us and which we can only continue to enjoy because of men like you.

Pete, God bless you, your good wife and your two sons, and God bless every one here with us this evening. Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA

Boys Town has witnessed and experienced many eventful, notable occasions. The events of yesterday and today, I'm sure, are among the finest and the most stirring of any of those occasions. These are days when all can again honor and commend this fine community of Boys Town for its mission, its dedication and its spirit. It is in order that we do so because it has proved once again its capability for bringing out the finest in its men, and the man we honor this evening is one of the most exemplary.

My colleagues and I, in the Senate and the House, come here tonight from the first session of the 91st Congress. From its very beginning, as well as during the months of 1968, there has been much discussion about the seizure of the *Pueblo* and all of the events that followed.

You know, Congress has its foibles and its shortcomings. Sometimes it acts too slowly, sometimes it acts too quickly and it has made mistakes; it's going to make some more, because it's made of human beings, you see. But on the whole, it is a wondrous institution, working towards the goals and the destiny of a self-governed nation.

The Congress is composed of men and women whose opinions and thinking pretty well coincide with national events and with national thinking. These men and women are possessed of compassion and of responsibility. And they are possessed of a capacity for reflecting and expressing the will and the conscience of the American people. And it does this by a composite judgment of 535 members, and that judgment in the main serves the Republic's best interest over the long pull.

It is my belief, ladies and gentlemen, that Congress, insofar as it may have any role concerning the event which brings us together here tonight will act deliberately, justly and wisely, and in support of our dis-

tinguished, honored guest and his gallant crew.

We have heard much about rules lately, and I imagine we're going to hear more in the weeks and perhaps the months ahead. Congress knows a good deal about rules. That's its business, you know, to review the present rules and to determine whether they could be repealed, or amended, or replaced with different rules. Often Congress is called upon to review rules which are of long years' standing. Now and then, it decides to discard the old rule—not because it's old, but because it is worn out and outdated, because there has been a change in conditions and circumstances and in human values and human standards.

It is not unusual to find in government that some rules are a product of a different century, a different culture, a different age and technology, and made to serve different national purposes than those which exist today. Congress has also known instances when nation's officials are charged with certain duties and obligations without being furnished sufficient or proper equipment or support. Sometimes, when a mission fails, an effort is made to blame the one immediately in charge, to the exclusion of officials or agencies who were responsible for the shortages or the defects of equipment, of tools or of support.

These observations about Congress which I have accumulated with a personal experience of the past 15 or more years, I express for the purpose of laying foundation for these additional declarations: I want to assure you that members of Congress know bravery and valor when they see them, and they admire and respect bravery and valor. They recognize courage and stamina which showed throughout the severe and sustained physical and mental abuse inflicted on Commander Bucher and to the crew of the Pueblo.

Congress knows the injustice and the inherent unfairness in applying the same requirements and results of judgment and decision and action under all conditions alike. It is one thing to be confronted with a sudden, unexpected and drastic emergency and crisis far out afield, and in a hostile environment. That's one thing. It's another thing to analyze and pronounce judgment on such a crisis from the quiet and the comfort and the security and the opportunity for leisurely reflection within a congressional committee room, or the offices of the Pentagon, or even the White House.

The same decision and action cannot and should not be expected from these two vastly differing situations. The courage and the stamina of Commander Bucher and his crew have earned them our honor and gratitude.

It is neither punishment nor reprimand that is in order, but rather justice and fair treatment.

Proceedings of official nature are still in progress. They are under study. It will be some time before they reach a final stage, but I respectfully submit that as far as the American public is concerned, the verdict has already been returned. It is a verdict of commendation and tribute and honor for a courageous and honorable sailor and his intrepid shipmates.

That verdict has strong support in public opinion and Monsignor Wegner, considering the short few days that you have had to organize this splendid welcome, I think that's as convincing a piece of evidence of the strong support of public opinion for the Commander as you will find any place in America.

In regard to Commander Bucher's attributes as a real leader, that verdict will be further sustained by his loyal crew, and they have said so, many times and earnestly.

America has witnessed many occasions of paying tribute to heroes in bygone years. It has paid honor to many persons of great stature. But they are not only of the past,

these men of great stature. We are assembled here this evening in the presence of a patriot and a gallant man and a tall man, a very, very tall man. Commander, my message to you and to your family is: We salute you and we are with you!

REMARKS OF SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS

I shall not take time to make a speech. There are two things that I want to say. I'm sure I speak for everyone here, and many who are not here, when I express the gratitude of us all, that Commander Bucher and his crew arrived back home safely.

And the second thing that I want to say is that, Commander Bucher, I'm here because of my great admiration for you and we want to be with you always.

REMARKS OF GOV. NORBERT TIEMANN

All the free world joins this nation and Nebraska tonight to honor one of the most gallant men this country has ever produced, Commander Bucher. I had the privilege of doing something that not even the Congress can do and so far the U.S. Navy has failed to do and that is to make the Commander an Admiral.

Commander, to you and your tremendous crew we pay homage tonight. And I think we also pay equal homage and honor to Mrs. Bucher and these two fine young gentlemen who I hope some day will be citizens of Nebraska.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM SCHERLE

Last night I had a very, very high honor. I was invited to the homecoming in Greenbelt, Maryland, for Staff Sergeant Robert J. Chicca, one of the Marines who was aboard the Pueblo and who was wounded during the incident. During the ceremonies, young Bob got up and he said, "Mr. Scherle, when you get back to Nebraska, you tell Commander Bucher that I had the opportunity to sail under one of the finest skippers in the entire U.S. Navy!"

I concur 100 percent. I would also like to tell you this evening that the best lobbyist in Congress is another Congressman. So I can assure you tonight with four of us up here, we're going to do a lot of lobbying when we get back to the halls in Washington, D.C. Thank you very much for a very high honor and I'm very humble and very pleased to be a part of the homecoming for your native son.

REMARKS OF COMDR. LLOYD M. BUCHER

I have so many things, so many thousands of things I'd like to say, that I'm going to try to say them in as few words as possible.

The generous accolades that have been paid me this evening, I cannot possibly live up to unless they were to hang me on a cross. And only one man in the history of the world, a God-made man, Jesus Christ, deserves the honors that you bestowed on me here this evening. I appreciate it so very much, I can't tell you how much.

I would like, on behalf of my crew and myself, to tell each and every one of you that the millions and millions of prayers that were said in our behalf sustained us through the hell that we had in North Korea. And we do so appreciate those prayers.

And while I'm speaking of my crew, I would like to say that my crew represented a cross-section of the United States of America. I believe that there were men from 31 states on board my ship and they were highly intelligent, true representatives of the United States of America, from the best that this country could hope for in sailors to man a ship that this country seems to need. These men—and every one of them are now men, although some of them were certainly boys when they started out—gave me every possible support that I could have wished for or hoped for. I had ample opportunity while I sat there in the prison cell in North Korea

to reflect on many things, and there is one thing that I was reminded of. And in sort of a backhand way, I would like to tell you a friendly, funny little story that I would have wished would have been our plight, as opposed to the plight of the fellows.

There was once upon a time, a little red-headed boy who had a little yellow dog and he was walking that little yellow dog down the street. Directly around the corner of the block came a rather distinguished looking gentleman with a brace of Great Danes on one hand and in the other a brace of Doberman Pinschers. He yelled at the little kid and said, "Hey, kid, get that little yellow dog out of here! My animals will tear him apart!"

Well, the kid kept coming, there was a confrontation, there was fur and teeth and tails and all sorts of things flying around and, directly, the only thing left standing was the little yellow dog and his two adversaries. The guy said, "Son, that's the wildest animal I've ever seen! Where did you get that thing? I've never seen a dog like that."

And the kid said, "Well, until I cut off his tail and painted him yellow, he was an alligator."

I felt very much like that little yellow dog out there that day, except that we didn't have an alligator's teeth. There was nothing that I would have liked better than to put every one of those North Korean ships in the bottom of the ocean. There's nothing that I think that they deserve more.

My life, my history, my biography is hardly a secret to anyone here in this room. It has been recounted by the local and national news media and by and large, they have told an accurate story. But sometimes what they haven't told are the things that really make me proud to be an American, proud to be a friend of each of you, proud to serve this country of ours.

Those things are this love of God and country, and Boys Town, instilled in me with the great love found in the heart of Father Flanagan, and in the bosom of Monsignor Wegner. These two men represent the finest in citizenship. They have taken many of us, many boys who were not so fortunate in many ways and made them among the most fortunate in the world. We have here at Boys Town that love, that comradeship, that devotion to our country, the honor of our flag, the high regard for the heritage which has made this country the greatest the world has ever known. We have real reason to respect all of those things. We know that with the tremendous support of the citizens of the United States, the love that abounds in the hearts of the teachers, the counselors here in Boys Town, the faculty and the Monsignor himself, will never be a frustrated love, because it takes money as well as effort to accomplish things.

This is the system under which we live, this great, tremendous, capitalistic system, this republic which was founded by some of the greatest human beings who ever graced the face of the earth. We're privileged tonight to have with us several members of the American Congress who have distinguished themselves in their service to the public, their service to these United States. We have other gentlemen here who are also in the service of their country, in the military and in civilian service. Each and every one of us who works in the government works to carry out the policies of the Administration and to perpetuate all of the great thoughts that are incorporated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America.

I have a message for the junior-senior class of Boys Town, and that message is this: When you leave Boys Town, you'll be going out into a world that is full of trouble, that is full of dissension. There is nothing wrong with dissension. Dissension is the way we improve our lot, the American way, the way America has developed into the great nation that it has. But destruction does not be-

long along with dissension. Construction belongs with dissension. All the destruction and the many people who are attempting to destroy the very foundations on which this country was built do not offer a thing on the positive side. They give us nothing but a lot of trouble. They disobey the laws, they do not support the communities. Instead, they tear down. I ask that each of you build in your mind and your heart, such a great love for your country and an honor for your traditions and heritage which you will, at every step of the way, whether assenting or dissenting, be constructive in whatever you do.

And to those who are already adults, through your demonstrated love of your country, the children will look to you for guidance in the things that we all believe in, the hope for freedom, complete freedom within the law, rightful dissent, constructive criticism, the democratic way of life based on a republic of states.

To too many people, I think, patriotism is passe. Patriotism is not passe if it burns deep within your heart and in your mind and in your prayers. This country cannot stand, unless it has everyone's undying, devoted attention and through that example, the children who look to you will carry on, will have with them the freedoms that we now enjoy. If we do less, we could lose those freedoms for those generations yet unborn, and it will be a fact that history will record, if, in fact, history books are even permitted.

To leave the more serious side of my rambling talk here this evening, I would also like to pay my deepest respects to my wife, Rose. She represents to me everything I thought a Navy wife should be. I spent most of my Navy career in the Submarine Service. We expect a lot of our wives when we're deployed and she grew up in that training program. She attempted and succeeded, I think, in keeping together, consoling and giving comfort and encouragement to the families, wives and children of my crew members. I think that she represented not all that could be expected of a Navy wife, but all that could be expected of a citizen of the United States. And I can only say that I love her very deeply.

To get back to what I am and what I represent, I am a U.S. Naval officer. I remained in the U.S. Navy and sought a career as a Naval Officer because I have always sought responsibility and I feel, and very strongly, that with responsibility goes accountability. I have attempted to render a complete account of my actions as commanding officer of the USS Pueblo to the American public through the court of inquiry conducted by the U.S. Navy.

Rendering accountability was instilled in me through the good offices and the many kicks in the butt by coach Skip Palrang. I can't say that all those kicks really hurt, because I deserved most of them and those that you deserve never hurt. The love and the faith in God, and the faith in my fellow Americans were instilled in me by my instructors, by Father Flanagan and by my very dear friend, Monsignor Wegner.

I wish to leave with you this evening the thought that there is one thing in these trying times that we must do and that is to search deep within ourselves for the right answers to the many problems that face us, and then energetically proceed with constructive programs to effect the repairs, the changes that are needed. From the depth of my soul and the bottom of my heart, I thank each and every one of you for honoring me this evening. It has been the most glorious day of my life. I wish I could reach out and touch you all. That would be a physical impossibility. My hands are already broken, and without going any further, thank you all and God bless you.

CXV—689—Part 8

REPEAL OF TITLE II OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Mike Masaoka, Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League, endorsing the principles of S. 1872, a bill I recently introduced to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Daily I receive hundreds of letters; however, I was deeply impressed by this moving and eloquent statement in support of S. 1872. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Mr. Masaoka letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 23, 1969.

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE,
U.S. Senator from Hawaii, Old Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR INOUE: On behalf of the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), the only national organization of Americans of Japanese ancestry in the United States with chapters and members in 32 states, may we commend you and your 20 cosponsors for introducing last Friday, April 18, 1969, S. 1872, a bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, which is Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

As you so eloquently explained in introducing this legislation, Title II, which was described by the then Chairman of the Judiciary Committee Pat McCarran as a "concentration camp measure, pure and simple" during floor consideration of this provision almost 20 years ago, "violates a number of our established freedoms and constitutional rights. The procedures detailed in the Act are at odds with our established judicial procedures."

Your introductory remarks to the Senate also emphasized the urgency of repealing this statute, by referring to the May 1968 Report of the House Un-American Activities Committee that included a recommendation "for the possible use of these detention camps for certain black nationalists and Communists." You observed too that "Many dissidents in our society fear use of Title II. It stands as a barrier of trust between some people and our Government."

To refute the argument that Title II would not be put into operation in the United States, you recalled the World War II evacuation and detention of some 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry from their West Coast homes and associations, without trial or hearing, at a time when all of our courts were functioning, simply because a Commanding General suspected that there might be some among the evacuees who might engage in sabotage and espionage.

The records, as you know, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Army and Navy Intelligence indicate that there was not a single instance of espionage or sabotage by a resident of Japanese ancestry before, during, and after World War II, in spite of the fact that resident aliens, though lawfully admitted for permanent residence, could not become naturalized citizens because of the racial prohibitions of our national laws of that time.

JACL'S CONCERN

In any event, it is because of our wartime experience that Japanese Americans in general and the JACL in particular feel so strongly about Title II. After all, we of Japanese ancestry are the only Americans in recent times to be arbitrarily deprived of their freedom and of their property and detained in what have euphemistically been described as war relocation centers.

JACL is determined that no other American, or group of Americans, will ever again be subject to detention solely on the grounds of suspected loyalty, that any citizen or group of citizens may be interned on the presumption of the probability of committing certain proscribed acts, that the constitutional guarantees of due process may be denied on the pretext of a proclaimed "internal security emergency".

The treatment of Japanese Americans in World War II was not authorized by specific statute. Nevertheless, in a time of hate and hysteria against a wartime enemy, it was carried out by the Commanding General of the Western Defense Command as a "military necessity" since he could not determine the individual loyalty or disloyalty of those of Japanese ancestry on the Pacific Coast and since there was the probability that some might engage in subversive activities.

Subsequently, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld this evacuation as a valid exercise of the war powers. And, in the words of then Justice Jackson, "The principle (of wartime exclusion and evacuation) then lies about like a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need."

Social scientist Morton Grodzins, writing in the University of Chicago Press documentary "Americans Betrayed" in 1949, concluded that "Japanese Americans were the immediate victims of the evacuation. But the larger consequences are carried by the American people as a whole. Their legacy is the lasting one of precedent and constitutional sanctity for a policy of mass incarceration under military auspices. This is the most important result of the process by which the evacuation decision was made. That process betrayed all Americans."

Two years earlier, in 1947, the President's Committee on Civil Rights, declared that "The most striking mass interference since slavery with the right to physical freedom was the evacuation and exclusion of persons of Japanese descent from the West Coast during the past war . . . The ground given for the evacuation was that the military security of the nation demanded the exclusion of potentially disloyal people from the West Coast . . . we are disturbed by the implications of this episode so far as the future of American civil rights is concerned. Fundamental to our whole system of law is the belief that guilt is personal and not a matter of heredity or association. Yet in this instance, no specific evacuees were charged with disloyalty, espionage, or sedition. The evacuation, in short, was not a criminal proceeding involving individuals, but a sort of mass quarantine. . ."

Because JACL believes that the freedoms and liberties of all Americans have been compromised and jeopardized by this Supreme Court decision, ever since the Korematsu case was decided in the fall of 1944, JACL has been trying to find an appropriate case in which to request the nation's highest tribunal to review—and to reverse—the so-called evacuation ruling. This search continues today.

TITLE II BACKGROUND

Title II goes further than even the evacuation decision.

It provides that the President may declare an "Internal Security Emergency" in the event of (1) an invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions, (2) a declaration of war by the Congress, or (3) insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy, and authorizes the Attorney General "to apprehend and by order detain . . . each person as to whom there is a reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or of sabotage."

As you noted in introducing S. 1872, the

procedures for continued detention "is at odds with normal judicial procedures."

The accused is not entitled to a trial by a jury, but to administrative hearings, with an appeal not to the courts but to another administrative review board. The detainee is presumed to be guilty, and has the onus of proving his innocence against the Government's suspicion that he may engage in, or conspire to engage in, espionage and sabotage. The Government is not required to reveal its informants, if such disclosure may endanger the national safety or security. Compared to the rights guaranteed the most vicious of criminals, the hearings for detainees before appointed examiners of the Attorney General clearly violate due process.

Accordingly, when Title II was proposed, first as a compromise-substitute and then subsequently as an amendment, to the Internal Security bills then under Senate consideration in the summer of 1950, JACL was among those who opposed it. When the Congress approved it, JACL urged the President to veto it. When the President did veto it, JACL called upon the Congress to sustain the presidential action. Unfortunately, in JACL's opinion, Congress overrode the veto and enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Those were the days when anti-communism was a fetish, when investigations of alleged Communists in Government were acclaimed, and when the Korean War threatened our Far Eastern security.

Since that day 19 years ago when the Internal Security Act became law, conditions within the United States have changed drastically, as well as have the international relations of the nation. And, until recently, it appeared that Title II had become another "dead letter", an obsolete and unenforced authorization.

NEED FOR REPEAL

Within the past two years, however, because Title II has remained on the statute books as a melancholy reminder of another era when repression and suppression was the dominant theme, rumors have been spread to the effect that concentration camps were being prepared for the militants and activists among the disillusioned and the disadvantaged.

Certain black militants have taken advantage of these rumors to foment greater unrest and even fanned the flames of revolution and destruction in urban ghettos. Certain others have used these rumors to threaten Vietnam War protesters. Still others have resorted to these rumors to escalate the confrontations and violence on campuses.

Many of these rumors were given credence and validity when the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued its report on "Guerrilla Warfare Advocates in the United States" on May 6, 1968. Then Committee Chairman Edwin Willis claimed that "Mixed Communist and black nationalist elements are today planning and organizing paramilitary operations and that it is their intent to instigate additional riots, which will pave the way for a general revolutionary uprising." He argued that these militants have essentially declared war on the United States and, therefore, should lose their constitutional rights and be imprisoned in detention camps. He cited Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as the appropriate legislation which authorizes such detention. Though he subsequently tried to clarify his remarks, among those who may be most affected by the potentialities of Title II about all that is remembered are the former Chairman's initial statements concerning concentration camps in the context of today's social, educational, and economic unrest and upheaval.

Of course, there are those who insist that no President or Attorney General would ever invoke Title II, regardless of the circumstances. While JACL hopes that this will be

true, we cannot forget that, even without statutory authority, a humanitarian Franklin D. Roosevelt and a liberal Francis Biddle did, in the spring of 1942, authorize the mass evacuation and detention of some 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry from the Pacific Coast because their individual loyalty to the United States was suspect.

JACL believes that the immediate repeal of Title II is justified because it unnecessarily provokes and intimidates, and threatens and circumscribes, those who legitimately disagree with conditions as they are and desire to correct them. JACL may not necessarily agree with their analyses or alternatives, but JACL believes that the constitutional guarantees must apply to them equally as they must apply to those who would defend the status quo.

And if among those who dissent, or protest, there are those who violate the laws, including those relating to internal security during times of grave national emergencies when a foreign enemy threatens our existence and survival as a nation, JACL is confident that there are other laws that will safeguard our country and our institutions more effectively and more adequately than Title II, and without making a mockery of our traditions and heritage.

May we, therefore, in conclusion assure you and your associates that JACL will do everything possible to help in seeking the early repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Emergency Detention Act, secure in the knowledge that such a repeal will advance, and not hinder, the cause of true internal security.

Sincerely,

MIKE MASAOKA,
Washington Representative,
Japanese American Citizens League.

GAMBLING CONTROL ACT OF 1969

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Tuesday I was happy to cosponsor the introduction of the Illegal Gambling Business Control Act of 1969. This was another meaningful step in what I believe will be an unrelenting war on crime in this country.

It was also an important step in the fulfillment of a campaign promise made by President Nixon last summer. The President promised that if elected he would give the State and Federal law enforcement agencies the tools to penetrate the privileged sanctuary of organized crime. The bill, S. 2022, is such a tool.

With the proposed legislation, we strike directly at the foundation of organized crime. We hit where it hurts—its treasury. The coffers of crime overflow as the result of its "take" from illegal gambling. Estimates of the income obtained by this method range as high as \$50 billion a year. This, I might add, is up considerably from the estimates we received in 1961 when the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, on which I served as the ranking Republican, investigated gambling and organized crime. As such it further illustrates the necessity for prompt Federal action. This money comes from the public, flows into the treasury of the crime lords and in turn is used to further terrorize the general populace, thus completing its ironic cycle.

Mr. President, it would be possible to choke off these funds if the general public would refuse to gamble. The \$2 off-track horse bet and the numbers card may not seem like much. But multiplied

several times over, the small wagers become part of the illegal thousands, the millions, and the billions of dollars that become the major gambling profit.

It is difficult, however, to legislate morality; and if we cannot stop every sale of a 25-cent numbers card or every bet made with an illegal bookie, we can take the next best step and attack the receivers of these funds. This would be done under the proposed legislation.

Specifically, the bill provides a greater latitude and jurisdiction for the Federal Government in the fight against organized gambling by making it a Federal offense to engage in a large-scale business enterprise of gambling.

Second, it makes it a felony for large-scale gamblers to corrupt and bribe law-enforcement officials.

Mr. President, I realize this is not a pleasant subject, and I do not wish to leave the implication that such occurrences are commonplace. That is not true. On the other hand, it does happen, and both those offering and those receiving the bribe in an effort to conceal illegal gambling activities or other crimes must be rooted out and stopped.

Mr. President, it is a privilege to be associated with the bill, and I hope we will secure its speedy passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the Attorney General, accompanying the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration and appropriate reference is a legislative proposal entitled the "Illegal Gambling Business Control Act of 1969."

Organized crime is one of the major problems of law enforcement in America today. It feeds on money obtained from people who can ill afford it. One of the main sources of its money is illegal gambling enterprises. Organized crime thrives on corruption of law enforcement officers and local officials. In order to check the problem, we must check its causes. We must stop the flow of money to organized crime from gambling enterprises. We must stop the corruption of law enforcement officers and local officials by gamblers. In order to accomplish these goals, we need new weapons. The Federal Government must be able to do more than deny the use and facilities of interstate commerce to the day-to-day operations of illegal gamblers, as it can do under existing statutes. It must be able to go to the source of the problem, to the gambling enterprises and their corruption of officials.

The proposed legislation would give the Federal Government two new means to aid the States in combatting large-scale gambling. Title I would make it a felony for large-scale gamblers and law enforcement officers or public officials to scheme to obstruct enforcement of State and local laws against gambling through bribery of the government officials. Title II would make it a Federal offense to engage in a large-scale business enterprise of gambling.

In addition to providing these two weapons against large-scale gambling, the proposal would amend section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, to permit interception of wire or oral communications, subject to existing safeguards and procedures, in instances

where such interception may provide evidence of an offense which is punishable under this proposal.

I urge the introduction and prompt enactment of this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

Attorney General.

TRAIN WRECK AT EAST GERMANTOWN, IND.

Mr. HARTKE, Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 22, I introduced a bill which would provide for more comprehensive Federal control of railroad safety conditions. I noted at the time of introducing that bill the increasing frequency of train accidents involving hazardous cargoes and the threat that the resulting flames, explosions, and contamination by poisonous gases can pose for whole communities. As an example of this dangerous situation, I cited an accident that occurred in Dunreith, Ind., requiring the evacuation of that city for a number of days because of the fire, explosions, and contamination caused by a train wreck.

Less than 72 hours after introducing that bill, I was shocked to learn that another train carrying hazardous materials had been involved in a wreck at a location not more than 18 miles from Dunreith, Ind., near East Germantown, Ind. This accident represented the fifth major rail derailment involving hazardous materials within the past 4 months.

As a Senator from Indiana and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, I thought it incumbent upon me to join the Federal investigating team headed by Adm. L. M. Thayer, of the National Transportation Safety Board, and Mr. Mac E. Rogers, Director of the Bureau of Railroad Safety, in investigating the accident. Upon arriving at East Germantown, we found nearly all of the ingredients that had been present in the several prior accidents of this kind. All of the residents of East Germantown had been evacuated as a precautionary measure. It was my impression that such precaution was necessary to insure their protection. It would be impossible to measure precisely the danger which existed. A severe fire was still not completely under control. Acrid and noxious fumes from a punctured tank car containing a dangerous chemical compound were contaminating the air.

The unofficial initial information at the scene indicated that early that Friday morning, some 62 cars of an east-bound Penn Central train containing a total of 110 cars had been involved in a derailment resulting in an explosion which was followed in turn by a very serious fire involving some 35 to 40 freight cars. This particular train was transporting cars containing such hazardous commodities as butane, ethylene, and vinyl chloride—all of which are highly volatile and highly flammable materials. Fortunately only a few of the cars containing hazardous materials were caught up in the conflagration.

As I inspected the wreckage, it appeared that the local authorities had the

situation well in hand but I was struck by the thought of how much more horrible this could have been had more of the hazardous cargo been involved and had the accident occurred closer to a large population center. If the accident had occurred a few hundred feet up the track, lives and property might have been destroyed. Sheer good fortune is all that prevented such a calamity.

At the scene the investigators pointed out to me a broken wheel truck, which, while it may not have caused the derailment was noteworthy nevertheless. Incredibly this piece of equipment was cast in 1907. It is rather unusual, I would think, to find in operation today equipment in any mode of transportation which is over 60 years of age. I thought locomotives of that vintage could be found only in museums.

I think this points up quite clearly the need for greater Federal control over the safety of our railroads. As I noted on April 22:

Car wheels and axles which are major causative elements in many accidents are not subject to Federal regulations.

It is time for the Congress to pay greater attention to this dangerous situation and I am, therefore, planning to schedule hearings within the next few weeks on railroad safety legislation.

This accident was not as severe as others have been but under slightly different conditions it could have been much worse. I realize that the railroads have a tendency to view rail accidents as a problem which is of concern only to the railroads, particularly when as in the case of East Germantown, most of the damage is to railroad equipment. But I think most people in the United States would agree with me that these accidents are of concern to us all.

Accidents of this kind are costly to the shipper in terms of delaying the transportation of his goods. The satisfaction of a damage claim is not to the shipper's mind an entirely acceptable equivalent to the timely delivery of his goods. I can assure you that it would be next to impossible to convince the residents of East Germantown and Dunreith; Laurel, Miss.; and Crete, Nebr.; that the threat to their lives and property should not concern them.

None of the people living in East Germantown was killed in this accident, but they were prevented from enjoying the comfort and privacy of their own homes for more than a day. The fear, uncertainty, and inconvenience to these citizens cannot easily be assigned a price. And in considering the seriousness of the situation we cannot forget the dangers posed for the men who operate the Nation's trains.

Too often in the past, it has been the practice for the Congress and the administration to await a major catastrophe before taking corrective action in the safety field. I propose that in this case, the Congress should move expeditiously.

ABM SAFEGUARD: NEXT STEP IN EVOLUTION OF DEFENSE

Mr. JACKSON, Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services, under the able chairmanship of the Senator

from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), held 2 days of public hearings last week on the anti-ballistic-missile defense system. These hearings were held in connection with the yearly legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1970 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, ships, and research and development.

On April 23 the distinguished scientist, Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of Rockefeller University and president of the National Academy of Sciences, told the committee he believes the time is now appropriate to invest substantial amounts of money, ingenuity, and industrial production in a prototype ABM system of the type which President Nixon has proposed, as the next step in the evolution of our defenses.

Dr. Seitz's major professional scientific interests have been in the theory of solids and nuclear physics. He was a civilian member, National Defense Research Committee, 1941-45; consultant to the Secretary of War, 1945; director of the training program in atomic energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 1946-47; science adviser to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1959-60. He is now a member of the Defense Science Board—chairman, December 1963-March 1968—Department of Defense; member, Naval Research Advisory Committee—chairman, 1960-62—Office of Naval Research; member, Scientific Advisory Group, Office of Aerospace Research; member, Smithsonian Institution Advisory Council; member, National Selective Service Scientific Advisory Group; and member, Liaison Committee for Science and Technology, Library of Congress.

In 1968 Dr. Seitz received two awards: the Distinguished Civilian Service Award, presented by Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze; and the Herbert Hoover Medal for Distinguished Service awarded by Stanford University.

I wish to commend to the attention of this body Dr. Seitz's opening statement given before the Armed Services Committee. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY DR. FREDERICK SEITZ BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, APRIL 23, 1969

At the outset I wish to emphasize that the opinions expressed in this testimony on the matter of the antiballistic missile system are personal ones and not necessarily representative of those of any of the members of the National Academy of Sciences of which I have been President for the past seven years. In fact, as you know, the university scientific community which is strongly represented in the Academy is currently so divided on this issue that it is almost impossible to make any definitive statement in the circles in which I move which will not generate sincere emotionally heated dispute.

I should add that I first became an adviser to what is now the Department of Defense in the autumn of 1939 soon after the outbreak of World War II in Europe. Moreover, I have served on the Defense Science Board of the Department of Defense for nearly ten years and was Chairman for about four of them.

Perhaps it is not unreasonable to add that I view our national defensive posture as ex-

ceedingly important not only for the protection of our national well-being in the narrow sense but also because I feel that our country is a far more effective agent for promoting world peace if it is in a position to protect the interest of the open world of which we are part. World War II probably would not have broken out and followed the course it did had the United States not been so nearly totally disarmed in the 1930's as a result of decisions made in the 1920's to disarm unilaterally. I take it as axiomatic that in the decades ahead our national objective in relation to international affairs should be to encourage peace and stability and that we should be willing to work out formal agreements with other nations, not the least the Soviet Union, to further these goals. In fact, I think it is clear that unless we can achieve universal international agreement on the control of arms, our civilization faces very great jeopardy. As has been said so often, World War III could be an unparalleled disaster to mankind.

For reasons indicated in the following, I believe the time is now appropriate to invest substantial amounts of money, ingenuity and industrial production in a prototype ABM system of the type which President Nixon has proposed, and known as the modified Sentinel system, as the next step in the evolution of our defenses. This should be done with the use of as much imagination as we can muster in order to provide us nationally with the optimum amount of realistic information which we can obtain on the workability of such a system. Practical knowledge of the functioning of such a system is important for future defense planning. In accordance, those devising the system should have considerable leeway in the course of its erection to introduce technical innovations as circumstances along the route may dictate. This does not mean that the expenditure ceiling should be arbitrary but only that innovations should be encouraged rather than restrained when highly advisable as has been the case for most successful weapons systems.

The principal arguments given against the point of view expressed above, frequently by quite distinguished scientists and analysts, seem to be three in number. First, the system is probably unworkable in detail. Second, even if it should be workable under ideal circumstances it probably would not be effective in a surprise attack because of inadequate alertness. Finally, the development of such a system would be regarded as a new major challenge by the Soviet Union causing it to accelerate the arms race further and plunge the world into a situation even more desperate than the present one.

While highly respectful of the intelligence and rationale behind these points, I am deeply skeptical about their basic correctness.

On the first point I would only call attention to the vast evolution in the field of controlled ballistic systems which has taken place in the United States as well as in the Soviet Union as a result of dedicated attention to rocket propulsion and guidance systems and the achievement of a new level of reliability of components. It is notable, for example, that the final splashdown of the astronauts in the December circumlunar voyage was predicted at launching to within a minute or two even though the trip required nearly a week. Moreover, the location of the splashdown was also predicted with remarkable accuracy. I see no reason to believe that with similar dedication completely comparable further advances will not take place in the next dozen years and give us ever-increasing ability to track and intercept other missiles.

Taken as a whole, this field of technology is still in its infancy; the issue of what is and is not feasible will in the main be determined through both small and large scale

development with working systems as has been true in the space program. Paper analysis prior to the development of such systems is of very limited value.

Regarding the matter of alertness and whether or not any given ABM system will operate adequately in an emergency, it is clear that we are continually vulnerable to a sneak attack, as we were at Pearl Harbor. Uncompromising alertness is not first nature in a peace-respecting democratic society. On this matter several points should be made. First, I would hope it would be possible to train operational crews which would be orders of magnitude more alert than our armed forces were at Pearl Harbor, particularly if they are given the assistance of the vast variety of monitors and sensors made possible by modern science and technology. Second, I would assume that an enemy would be most inclined to attack us during a period of international tension such as during the Cuban missile crisis. In fact the raid on Pearl Harbor actually did occur at a time when our relationships with the Japanese were at crisis level. Our nation cannot again afford the type of lapse which allowed us to be caught unawares on that occasion. Third, one might ask whether the existence of a potentially reliable ABM system would increase or decrease the probability of an arbitrary strike against us. I am personally inclined to believe that it would decrease that probability because of the increased uncertainty of the success of such a perilous adventure. Finally, it should be emphasized that knowledge obtained through working practice with a system should give us experience with its strengths and weaknesses and permit us to devise ways of automating alertness within acceptable bounds.

Let me raise next the question of the reaction of the Soviet Union to our own development of an ABM system. It is my personal opinion that in view of the defensive nature of the system, the Soviet leaders would consider its evolution to be a completely reasonable and natural step. The Soviet Union has continually emphasized the defensive aspects of its own armaments and has in fact insisted that its own vast deployment of intermediate range and intercontinental ballistic missiles is basically defensive. The fact that it regards an ABM system as an automatic adjunct to the deployment of IRBM and IBM systems is amply demonstrated by the fact that, as best we can determine, it has taken substantial steps to deploy its own ABM system. There are those who suggest that the Soviet Union may actually have abandoned work on its ABM system. As I attempt to sift the evidence they present, however, I find no convincing proof that this actually is the case. It seems to be characteristic of the Soviet deployment of weapons that the process goes in large spurts. I presume the periods between spurts are used for reassessment and innovation.

More generally, I think it can safely be said that ever since the early 1920's the Soviet leadership has consistently and pragmatically devoted all the attention and wealth it could derive from its economic system to the development and production of arms with the avowed statement that their armaments are principally defensive. They have no valid reason to take issue with the development and deployment of a defensive ABM system in the United States.

In this connection, it is interesting to note there is no significant area of military research, development and production known to us in which the Soviet Union is not fully involved on its own, essentially as a matter of course. It is true that there have been periods when it appeared on the surface that they might be prepared to forgo activity in a particular area of development or deployment. However, it has always turned out that, in due course of time, after a suitable cycle of development, they have turned up

with tactically or strategically significant quantities of major weapons whether they are tanks, aircraft, surface-to-air missiles, rocket launching submarines, or aircraft carriers. In fact, in certain cases, they have weapons systems, such as the surface-to-surface missile system used to sink the Israeli destroyer *Elath*, which we do not yet have in our own inventory.

On a broader scale, I wish to emphasize that it is to our own advantage as well as that of other nations that we continue negotiations on arms control with both the Soviet Union and other nations in the period ahead hoping that we can reach a point at which understanding and formal agreement permit all nations to enter into a period of significant disarmament. In this connection it is worth noting that we have made significant strides since 1945. There was, for example, the series of agreements in the mid-1950's which led to the decision to support international cooperation in the development of the peaceful atom. Similarly there were the agreements between ourselves and the Soviet Union on cultural and scientific exchange which occurred somewhat later in that decade and which have done much to promote closer and more friendly understanding among professional groups in our two countries. The agreement to limit the testing of nuclear weapons to underground explosions in the early part of this decade, which was accepted by most but unfortunately not by all nations, was another notable advance. Finally, the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which presumably will be agreed upon by a significant number of nations in the next year or two is another hopeful step.

It should be emphasized, however, that the truly major steps along the road toward world disarmament occur at the rate of one or at most two per decade, which is about the same as the rate at which significant new technological systems of major military potential emerge. Moreover, the entire international picture is made complex by our profound lack of knowledge of the ambitions of the communist Chinese. If we were to heed the advice of those who urge that our nation enter into an extended period of essentially unilateral cessation of the development of weapons systems, we might well find ourselves coming to the conference table to discuss disarmament in another decade or so under circumstances in which we would have little to offer to restrict except out-classed or outmoded weapons. This does not seem to be a reasonable national posture to me even though I would welcome world peace and world disarmament as much as anyone I know.

You may recall that just twenty years ago there was a debate concerning hydrogen weapons similar to that underway at present in relation to ABM systems. That debate was resolved by President Truman, who decided to proceed with the development of the fusion bomb. I find it difficult to believe that the balance of national freedom maintained so precariously since 1945 would have been retained in the past twenty years if we had renounced the development of hydrogen weapons and left them to the Soviet Union, which, as we learned subsequently, began research and development on them soon after 1945, presumably well before our own debate took place.

In closing I do wish to reemphasize that I personally have high hopes that we can achieve an even more significant level of understanding with the Soviet Union. As you know, our government authorized a system of scientific exchanges of scientists with the Soviet Union in the period immediately after the first international congress on peaceful uses of the atom in 1955, leaving the administration of the US portion of the exchange program in the hands of the National Academy of Sciences. This has been quite effective in promoting a substantial amount of under-

standing even though the program has not grown as much as I personally would have liked. While there is no reason to believe that Soviet scientists have a large or even significant voice in determining the political decisions made by their government at the present time, one gains the impression from them not only that they would welcome closer and more friendly relations with us but also that they hope that in due course of time the spirit of mutual understanding will grow more broadly and deeply. Sufficient progress has been made in the last ten or fifteen years but I have hopes that we will be even closer together in another decade or so.

WORLD HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it has recently come to my attention that a new organization, made up of distinguished members of the business and professional communities, has been formed for the purpose of advancing human rights around the world.

The group, the Committee for World Human Rights, Inc., has some 32 charter members. It has developed an ambitious set of objectives which were described in a speech in New York earlier this month by its president, Joseph Kolodny. In the belief that the appearance of this organization will be of interest to Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that those remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WORLD HUMAN RIGHTS

A handful of dedicated individuals from the business fraternity have worked diligently for a considerable period to bring the Committee for World Human Rights into existence. As businessmen, we deemed it our duty and obligation to our generation to contribute to the best of our ability to the furtherance of wider knowledge and greater understanding of the concept of international concern with human rights, its meaning, its implications, and its potential capacity for generating humaneness into the daily conduct of international relations. In the last analysis, we recognize that there is nothing so important as the human spirit. We have been persuaded that this profound idea, this concept of world human rights, is imperative for the veritable survival of civilization. Thus, we have conscientiously embarked on a program of promoting and radiating a greater grasp and knowledge of the principles of worldwide concern for human rights. We are taking part in it—as we regard it as a singularly inspiring experience.

Prior to undertaking this essential assignment we conferred with the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, and, much to our delight, the Commission not only approved of but heartily encouraged our endeavors.

In brief, the Committee for World Human Rights is a voluntary group of men and women, distinguished in their business and professional fields, who have conscientiously addressed themselves to the spread of knowledge about human rights throughout the world. It stemmed from the realization that we no longer can be mere bystanders; that we must become involved in doing "something" toward a better and happier world for all people; that we must play a role in aiding in the creation of a better world.

The immediate purport of the Committee is: To bring home to people the importance of world human rights, and, to this end, to

prepare and publish a comprehensive text to serve as an authentic source of information.

Is human rights an abstract subject?

Far from being an abstract subject, human rights affect the daily lives of everyone—man, woman and child. "Human rights" mean the right of every human being to enjoy maximum liberty, with commensurate opportunity in every sphere of human endeavor—be it civil, political, economic, social or cultural.

To give reality to human rights is obviously an immensely challenging and difficult undertaking. It calls for prolonged effort. The first and primary task is that of educating, teaching, persuading mankind to believe and adhere to principles that at first may seem to conflict with certain deeply engrained habits and ways of thinking. Basically, we have to take cognizance that what is irritable and hateful to us we should not, wittingly or unwittingly, inflict on our fellowmen. It is incumbent upon each of us to set an example in viewing each other as the emissaries of mutual happiness instead of, more often than not, regarding one another as obstacles.

A powerful and effective springboard toward ultimate attainment of these objectives was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations—proclaiming universally that the rights of every man, whoever he may be, must be accorded recognition. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights also acts as an inspiration and motivation, for national and international statutes will enable those who suffer oppression to seek redress by direct recourse to the authorities of their own country or to the Court of World Opinion.

What is ahead?

The road ahead will doubtless be long, the difficulties great, the disappointments many. But, traditionally, hope and constancy can never fail those who have faith in the destiny of men.

In addition to publishing a textbook, the Committee intends to:

(a) Provide a platform for men and women in all walks of life to express their views on human rights.

(b) Encourage universities and other institutions of higher learning to render the subject of human rights an integral part of their curriculums.

(c) Motivate individuals and corporate entities to endow Chairs of International Human Rights.

(d) Exercise our influence in every comprehensive and legitimate manner in the advocacy of Human Rights.

(e) Accord world-wide distribution to the impending publication—translated in several languages.

(f) Conduct forums and seminars on the subject of World Human Rights.

(g) Furnish speakers, whose competence in articulating the subject is beyond question, for service clubs and similar organizations.

(h) Provide academic material to be used in institutions of learning.

We realize that it is perfectly possible to engage actively in a materially productive life, and, at the same time, aspire to the highest spiritual attainments.

LAW DAY U.S.A.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, today marks the 12th annual nationwide observance of Law Day U.S.A. This tradition originated in 1958, when President Eisenhower issued a proclamation establishing May 1 of each year as Law Day U.S.A.

Law Day is sponsored by the American Bar Association in cooperation with 1,500 State and local bar associations, and with the endorsement of many national orga-

nizations. Through the efforts of these and other interested groups, thousands of Law Day programs and activities are held throughout the country on or near the first of May. These include addresses, school assemblies, courthouse tours, essay contests, television and radio shows, and dramatic presentations.

The purposes of Law Day are both educational and patriotic. It is not a "lawyers day," it is an occasion for honoring the place of law in American life. For this reason, all Law Day activities have four basic purposes: First, to foster respect for law and an understanding of its essential place in American life; second, to encourage citizen support of law observance and law enforcement; third, to advance equality and justice under the law; and, fourth, to point up the contrast between freedom under law in the United States and governmental tyranny under communism in countries such as Czechoslovakia.

The Law Day theme for this year is: "Justice and Equality Depend Upon Law—and You." This theme is incorporated in billboard posters, newspaper advertisements, window display cards, and other informational and educational materials relating to the observance of Law Day. The theme was selected for its timeliness, and I think rightly so. In today's world of public disorder, rising crime, strained race relations, and social unrest, this year's Law Day theme serves to remind all Americans that equal justice and equal opportunity depend on the individual as well as the law. It reminds us that although the principles of justice are rooted in natural law, and the standards of justice are codified in law books, the achievement of justice depends in large measure on the willingness of every American to accept the spirit and the letter of the law, and to apply it in his relationship with others.

I believe that the spirit of Law Day is aptly contained in three statements written for Law Day, issued by the American Bar Association and entitled, "Law, Order, and Justice," "The Virus of Lawlessness," and "No Man Is Above the Law." I ask unanimous consent to have the three statements printed in the RECORD.

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

LAW, ORDER AND JUSTICE

Americans everywhere yearn for an end of violence in the streets of our cities and a general restoration of public order.

A free society cannot exist, let alone flourish, in an environment of mutual antagonism, distrust and hate. Public order is essential to achieving meaningful solutions of the domestic problems that beset our nation and people.

The same is true of social justice, which is the ultimate objective of a lawful society.

Maximum progress toward crime control, improved educational and employment opportunities, better housing, and urban development and renewal, cannot be attained in a volatile atmosphere.

Law alone cannot solve all of these problems. Their resolution depends upon all of us. We must develop a new national spirit—of faith in our country and its ideals, of respect for the rights of others, of confidence in our nation's destiny and the role each of us must play in its future.

We must recognize legitimate grievances and respond to them.

The virus of disregard for law must be eradicated.

We must look ahead, and build together. May first is Law Day USA. Congress and the President have urged all Americans to mark the occasion by rededicating themselves to "the ideals of equality and justice under law."

Nothing is more important to your welfare—and the nation's.

THE VIRUS OF LAWLESSNESS

Reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation disclose a shocking 89 percent increase in crime in the United States between 1960 and 1967.

Last year more than 3.8 million serious crimes were reported. Many more—no one knows how many—were not reported. The 16 percent increase in the figures for 1967 over the preceding year included an upward climb in violent crimes against persons and property.

Arrests reached a staggering five and a half million persons, of whom more than a third were under age 21.

The causes of crime and social unrest are many and varied. The remedies are not simple. They call for the combined efforts of government and individual citizens in many spheres of American life. Achieving social justice and equality under law must be the common goals of all of us.

This year on May 1 we again observe Law Day USA. The theme for 1969 is: "Justice and equality depend upon law—and you!"

It's a short way of saying that justice and equal opportunity do in fact rely both upon laws and courts and upon the attitudes of individual Americans towards other Americans.

And it is a meaningful reminder for everyone—on May 1 and every day!

NO MAN IS ABOVE THE LAW

The right of dissent has been cherished and preserved since the beginning of the republic. The day must never come when it will be otherwise. Vigorous and effective expressions of dissent and of legitimate grievances are essential ingredients of the democratic process.

But there are valid necessary limitations on dissent. Freedom of speech does not include incitement of riot. Seeking redress of grievances does not include the right to do violence to persons or the property of others.

A great American, Theodore Roosevelt, observed succinctly: "No man is above the law, and no man is below it."

Events of recent years have proved again that lawlessness and violence do not advance progress, but retard it. They destroy rather than extend civil rights, and they impede rather than promote real solutions to social ills.

They have confirmed that enduring advances toward full realization of the American ideals of equality and justice must come about through lawful channels. And they have reminded us that in a lawful society no one gains by attempts to enforce change by defying the law.

That is the essence of the message of the annual Law Day USA observance on May 1. Congress and the President have urged all Americans to observe Law Day by rededicating themselves to "the ideals of equality and justice under law." It is an appeal that merits the thoughtful attention of every American.

THE SANTA BARBARA OIL SLICK

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, although the Santa Barbara oil slick seldom makes today's headlines, the sad facts are that more than 3 months after the blowout from the drilling on platform A, the oil slick is still desecrating

the beaches of southern California. The fissures next to platform A are still disgorging oil. This very week, a wind shift again blackened the Santa Barbara beaches, whose sands have been so laboriously cleaned. Today, I have been told by Santa Barbara residents that the greasy blight on the beaches has been worse during the last 2 days than at any time for many weeks.

By now it is old news that our great national resource, the Pacific shore, is being despoiled by the oil blowout; it is nevertheless, a calamity of growing proportions.

Therefore, I was pleased to read on April 17, 1969, editorials about the Santa Barbara disaster published in two newspapers of national preeminence, the Los Angeles Times and the Wall Street Journal. The coincidence of these editorials in both east coast and west coast newspapers on the same day highlights the truly national magnitude of the Santa Barbara Channel tragedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 17, 1969]

BUSINESS AS USUAL IN TIDELAND OIL

The Interior Department seems to have a short memory.

Less than three months after the worst water pollution disaster in California history, oil drilling in federal tidelands off Santa Barbara has been allowed to resume by Interior Secretary Walter Hickel.

The secretary is apparently convinced that there will not be another leak blackening the water and shoreline. He must be, for Hickel has said several times recently he believes that protection of the environment is more important than oil production royalties.

The Times agrees that California's magnificent coastline and water resources are far too valuable to be jeopardized by the threat of oil pollution.

We do not agree that drilling should be resumed in the channel, even though more stringent rules have been imposed. No matter how tough the regulations, the possibility of another disastrous blowout remains.

Three companies, operating from five drilling platforms, are back in business as the result of Hickel's ruling. Phillips, Mobil and Humble crews are either sinking new holes or proceeding with drilling interrupted by the huge leak last January. "Therapeutic" drilling is also under way at Platform A-21, where it all started.

Santa Barbara County officials are going to court in an effort to halt the resumption of drilling and to protect what is left of their beaches and harbor. And although the county and the state have filed more than \$1 billion in claims, neither California nor any of its local governments have any jurisdiction over the tidelands beyond the three-mile limit.

The federal government, however, cannot simply order oil companies to remove their drilling platforms without compensation. Bonuses totaling \$603 million were paid by the companies bidding on federal leases. One alternative, proposed by Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) and others, would be to exchange the tideland leases for federal onshore oil reserve drilling rights.

It makes no sense to take the risk of damaging California's shoreline when so much oil potential remains untapped on land. The policy of holding petroleum reserves for a prolonged war is now obsolete.

Protection of the esthetics and ecology of our priceless coastline is the responsibility of the governor and the Legislature as well as that of local officials. It also would seem to be an obligation of University of California experts—even though they may be consultants to oil companies.

Californians have longer memories than the Interior Department. They still remember the huge and ugly oil slick that fouled beaches and imperiled marine and wildlife.

No amount of bonuses or royalties can compensate for such a tragedy.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 1969]

SANTA BARBARA SNAFU

It's obvious by now that the Johnson Administration bungled badly in leasing offshore oil lands at Santa Barbara, Calif. The snafu could turn out to be extremely costly.

The state of California has sued the Federal Government, Union Oil Co.—the major operator of a well that caused a vast oil slick off the coast—and three other oil firms for more than \$1 billion for the damage caused by the leaking well. Now six independent oil companies are suing the Government for \$230.7 million.

What upsets the independents is a regulation, announced by Interior Secretary Hickel on Feb. 17, that makes leasees on the outer Continental Shelf fully liable for any damage caused by oil escaping from the leased areas. The six firms, operating in the Santa Barbara Channel, have had no leaks up to now but plainly are fearful that they might.

According to Pauley Petroleum Inc., one of the plaintiffs, the leased areas, "as the U.S. knew, or should have known, when it solicited and accepted bonus payments in excess of \$73 million . . . are in deep water and in a known area of faulting which is subjected, from time to time, to earthquakes and tidal waves. Drilling in the leased areas requires operations which reach to the presently known limits of the relevant technology."

The oil firms claim Secretary Hickel's new rule on liability makes it economically impossible for them to continue operations in the areas. In addition to seeking return of the bonus payments, the companies contend the Government should reimburse them for exploration costs and a reasonable estimate of the profit they might have earned from the leases.

Without getting into the legal issues involved, the public has ample reason to be incensed about the whole affair—and not only because of the deplorable damage to waters and beaches. When the Federal and state governments were squabbling about rights to offshore oil lands, the areas were pictured as a governmental revenue bonanza. Surely few citizens realized that their representatives were risking billion-dollar damage suits.

If the Federal Government knew, or even if it should have known, that the Santa Barbara areas were highly risky, then drilling should have not been permitted—at least until there was assurance that the risks could be overcome. It certainly doesn't speak well of the Government's past performance that drilling now is suspended on many of the Santa Barbara leases until the Interior Department at long last investigates the underlying geological hazards.

Offshore oil resources could be important to the nation's future. Their cost could be prohibitive, though, unless the Government shows more wisdom than it did at Santa Barbara.

THE TIMBER INDUSTRY IN OREGON

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the people of my State of Oregon have been following with great interest the work of both the administration and the Con-

gress to solve the current problem of availability of timber to meet the shelter needs of this Nation. Oregon's interest in this problem is readily explained when it is noted that the largest industry in the State is the forest products industry. Of the more than 32 million acres in Federal ownership, which is some 52 percent of the total land area in Oregon, 15.4 million acres are forest land.

We in Oregon have long been concerned with the need for the management of Federal lands to be on the same high plane as the better managed private lands in the tree farm system. The Housing Act of 1968, in which the Congress established national goals for housing, raised that concern from the State to the national level when it suddenly became apparent that the forest industry did not have ready access to the amount of timber needed for the lumber and plywood to provide 2.6 million homes a year.

President Nixon has appointed a special Cabinet-level task force to look into the problem. That task force has made some recommendations which the President has followed to increase timber availability. But it became readily apparent in the hearings subsequently held by the Congress that additional action was needed—action that could be taken only by the Congress.

Therefore, it is with pleasure that I support the bill recently introduced by Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama, to establish a policy for more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands and to establish a high-timber-yield fund.

Mr. President, this bill recognizes that the immediate problem lies not in the Nation's total timber supply—for there is an adequate amount—but rather that it is a problem of availability of the timber. Most of the private timberlands in my State and particularly the industrially owned lands are under intensive management. The private forest landowners have provided adequate roads so that the timber may be managed. The industrial foresters engaged in reseedling, thinning, pruning, and other tree farm practices which will help to provide a high yield of timber today while insuring a continuing supply to meet the needs of the generation of tomorrow.

But the national forest lands are not as well managed—not through the fault of the Forest Service, but through the fault of the Congress which has not provided sufficient funds or a long-range program to enable the Forest Service to practice intensive land management. The difference made by availability of funds is well shown in the forestry practices of the Bureau of Land Management of the O. & C. lands of Oregon. Under the O. & C. Act, funds are available for proper land management, and the annual harvest from O. & C. lands shows the result.

For these reasons I am pleased to give my wholehearted support to the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN). I urge that the Senate support it to provide the raw material we need to fulfill the needs of the Nation for housing.

PROGRAMS OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a recent address to the National Council of Associations for International Studies, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, a highly creative member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, emphasized the need for restored and expanded Government support of international educational exchange and other programs of international education. Representative BRADEMAS advocates the creation of an independent Federal corporation, modeled, for instance, on the National Academy of Sciences, for the conduct and administration of governmentally supported educational activities abroad. The suggestion, it seems to me, is worthy of serious consideration. I commend it, therefore, to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Nearly three and one-half years have passed since President Johnson's historic address in 1965 at the Smithsonian Institution in which he envisioned a new and challenging level of responsibility for the United States in international education. The President extended an offer of educational cooperation to "all nations, friend and foe alike." At the same time he recognized the critical importance of the reciprocal nature of any endeavor in international education, and he called attention to the pressing need of Americans themselves for greater knowledge and understanding about the world in which they lived.

The major outcome of the President's Smithsonian address was the enactment of the International Education Act of 1966, a program designed specifically to strengthen our capacity here in the United States for international studies and research. The law represented the first long-range commitment by Congress and the Federal Government to supporting the international dimensions of American colleges and universities as educational institutions, not merely as resources for the overseas operations of the government.

This was truly a landmark measure, and its passage seemed to mark the opening of a new chapter in the history of international education in the U.S.

But, as we are all painfully aware, over the past two years certain facts have intruded on this bright picture—the war in Vietnam, the resulting drain on Federal budget resources and the growing economy mood in Washington. The great hope and promise of the International Education Act have been stillborn, for Congress has yet to appropriate any funds whatsoever for implementing the legislation.

NEED TO FUND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Passage of the Act has stimulated many institutions of higher education across the country to begin planning new international studies programs; interest and enthusiasm for the potential of the legislation has been remarkable. But so far the necessary follow-through, in terms of actual dollar support from the Federal Government, has not been forthcoming.

As one leader in higher education has put it (Landrum Bolling, President of Earlham College and head of an *ad hoc* committee of educators formed to press for funding the In-

ternational Education Act), "It seems an extraordinary kind of short-sightedness if our legislative representatives decide in the midst of this complex and costly war in Southeast Asia (which must in part be attributable to our lack of knowledge and skill in the handling of international affairs) to search for so relatively minor an economy as to abort [the International Education Act]."

This observation becomes especially pointed when we consider the appalling lack of American scholarly expertise on the subject of Vietnam. Two years ago Professor John K. Fairbank of Harvard observed at an International Congress of Orientalists that there were no American experts on Vietnam in attendance. He suggested that there were probably no more than eight full-fledged scholars in the United States pursuing research on Vietnam—at a time when Vietnam constituted the overriding problem in U.S. foreign relations.

Such gaps in our resources for study and research on other, particularly non-Western, parts of the world are those which the International Act is designed to help fill, through grants to colleges and universities in the United States for programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

The International Education Act, of course, is not the only casualty of the Vietnam War among the Federal Government's international education activities.

Cultural and educational exchange programs of the Department of State have been cut drastically—from \$46 to \$31 million—in the current fiscal year.

Support for the National Defense Education Act language and area centers program and the Fulbright-Hays program has actually declined slightly from 1968 to 1969.

Technical assistance activities under the AID program have also run into heavy seas in Congress.

Indeed, these have been bleak times at best for international education. The appeals of concerned educational organizations for reversal of this trend toward fiscal emasculation of our nation's programs in international education have taken on a tone of frustration and even of desperation, indicative of the fact that the gravity of the current situation has acquired emergency proportions.

The heads of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils in a letter to President Nixon dated last December 31, asserted that the trend of the past few years amounts to "intellectual disarmament" of the U.S.

In a recent position paper on Federal programs for higher education, the American Council on Education stated that, because of the reduction in funds, "the modest but successful efforts of 20 years of study and scholarly change are now jeopardized."

The U.S. Advisory Committee on International Education and Cultural Affairs, in its 6th Annual Report to Congress, bluntly assessed the current situation: "We assume that after 30 years of Government-supported educational and cultural relations, this nation is committed to such programs. If it is not, it should be."

NIXON EDUCATION TASK FORCE URGES MORE FUNDS FOR FULBRIGHT-HAYS ACT

There are, however, reasons for hoping that the Nixon Administration will make a careful review of the priorities in this field and will move to expand rather than contract, our commitment to the international education. The recently publicized recommendations of President Nixon's Task Force on Education, headed by Alan Pifer of the Carnegie Corporation, include two significant proposals for action in the international sphere.

First, with regard to the Fulbright-Hays program, the task force recommends that the Administration seek a supplemental ap-

appropriation of \$15 million early in 1969. This supplemental would return the level of appropriations for the exchange program to the point reached in fiscal year 1968, when \$46 million was appropriated.

The Task Force also recommended that the budget for fiscal year 1970 include a request for more than \$50 million for the exchange program, thereby equaling the level of funds appropriated back in the mid-1960's.

The second major recommendation concerns the International Education Act. The Task Force praises the Act as "an excellent piece of legislation which was prepared with tremendous effort and care." After noting the strong sentiment in university circles in favor of funding the programs envisioned in the IEA, the Pifer Report strongly recommends that the Nixon Administration request the necessary appropriations.

Indeed, said the Nixon Task Force, "the failure of Congress to provide any funds under the act has been a major disappointment to the colleges and universities and has unquestionably restricted the overall quality of the nation's performance in international affairs."

President Johnson's final budget for fiscal year 1970, contained a \$2 million request for launching programs under the IEA. We can all hope that the new Administration will take advantage of this opportunity to demonstrate its good faith to the academic community by recommending and pressing hard for at least this minimum figure and hopefully more.

SOME RETHINKING NECESSARY

But my plea for financing international education programs is only part of the message I want to communicate this morning. Beyond the need for money to carry out existing legislation, I believe that we need to do some hard rethinking on a whole range of issues affecting international education.

For in 1969 the mood and climate of the country are substantially different from only three and a half years ago. The complexity of events altering the American landscape since the President's Smithsonian address in 1965 is staggering:

The war in Vietnam and the growing disaffection in the country.

An emerging neo-isolationist sentiment in reaction to Vietnam and a widespread desire to pull back from far-flung American commitments around the globe.

The crisis of confidence engendered by the CIA-NSA and other disclosures of covert government involvement in private educational and research activities abroad.

The violence in American cities and our increasing preoccupation with the domestic crisis here at home.

The black revolution and the growing student unrest and disruption on American college campuses.

All of these factors impinge on the fate of international education and call for a reassessment of our efforts in the field.

With a new Administration now in office and the 1970 International Education Year nearly upon us, such a reassessment is particularly in order. Now is the time, before the new Administration "brings in the jury," to get our thoughts straight on where we are and to chart some of the paths that could be followed to get where we need to go in international education.

SOME SPECIFIC ISSUES

Several specific issues will force themselves on Congress and the Administration very soon:

1. The future of government-financed overseas research, especially in light of the Camelot affair.

2. The future of the "CIA's orphans" and of government support generally for important activities abroad.

3. The future of international exchanges in view of the recent budget cutbacks in this area.

4. The future of technical assistance in the foreign aid program.

5. The role of the Federal Government in relation to the more than 100,000 foreign students studying in the U.S.

But more broadly, I think we must do some soul-searching about the future of international education as a whole. What, in fact, do we mean by the term international education—what does it encompass—what are the goals we wish to achieve—and how should government financial support for it be organized?

THREE MAJOR COMPONENTS OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

There have traditionally been three major components of international education:

1. One is teaching and research on international affairs in American universities and colleges—area and language studies as well as the general study of international relations. The International Education Act was specifically directed at this particular aspect of international education by authorizing, to repeat, Federal grants to colleges and universities for programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

2. The second component relates to educational and cultural development overseas and the role of U.S. efforts, as under USIA and AID, in promoting this development. The many enterprises of educational cooperation between developed and less developed countries of the world fall within this particular meaning of international education.

3. The third component is the exchange of people between countries for educational and cultural purposes. Principally through the Government-sponsored Fulbright-Hays Program. The movement and exchange of people among nations provide a kind of connective link with the other two aspects of international education—international studies here in the U.S. and educational development overseas.

The Federal Government is involved in one way or another in all of these separate but interrelated components of international education. But the Federal response has clearly evolved on an *ad hoc* basis. As a result, international education activities cut across a number of different executive agencies and departments as well as committee jurisdictions in Congress. No broad-gauged, coordinated policy on international education has ever been implemented or perhaps even conceived.

In recent years, however,—partly as a result of the issues brought to light by the CIA-NSA disclosures and the Camelot episode—a number of proposals for reshaping and reorganizing government programs in the international sphere have been put forward.

Some persons have proposed, for example, a kind of superagency within the government in which would be consolidated all international education programs.

Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas, the new Chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, last year introduced and held hearings on a bill which would create a quasi-governmental corporation to provide open support for private activities in international education as well as health, labor and related welfare fields.

Another proposal, by Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma, to create a National Social Science Foundation has a bearing on international education in that it would probably encompass overseas social science research and study.

In addition, I understand that President Nixon's task forces have some definite although conflicting views on how to rationalize this fragmented field of government activity. I am told that one suggested approach would be to create a new government unit bringing together the cultural exchange functions of the State Department, technical assistance from AID, the Peace Corps, and the recently established Institute for Interna-

tional Studies in the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A NEW NON-GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY

My own feeling is that, at least in the area of government support for educational and cultural activities abroad, we need to create a new entity outside government—a basically private organization with a Federal charter. Some of the obvious analogues here are the Smithsonian Institution, the American National Red Cross and the National Academy of Sciences. We should consider the possibility that the basic legislation for such an institution would contain a permanent authorization for the appropriation of Federal funds, much as the National Science Foundation now enjoys.

But I do not wish here to lobby for my own conception of what is needed. Rather, my message is that we must intensify the dialogue among Congress, the executive branch, the colleges and universities, and the private education community on all of these alternative proposals and on the whole range of issues affecting international education. The issues are complex, and competing jurisdictions of separate government agencies and vested interests in the field complicate the problem of achieving a rational and comprehensive approach to government policy-making for international education.

But we must all join in the effort. What you of the National Council of Associations for International Studies must do and what all who understand the significance and value of international education must do is to think through clearly what we are trying to accomplish in all of our international programs. Then we must determine how we can best mobilize our not inconsiderable forces to reach the goals that we set.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT ON ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, last week President Nixon transmitted to Congress a compelling message on organized crime. His message described the menace of organized crime in a clear and forceful fashion, and outlined much needed remedial legislative and administrative action.

I fully agree with the President's declaration:

As a matter of national "public policy," I must warn our citizens that the threat of organized crime cannot be ignored or tolerated any longer. It will not be eliminated by loud voices and good intentions. It will be eliminated by carefully conceived, well-funded and well-organized plans.

The President's message is especially meaningful to me because I grew up in a community victimized by a predatory system of organized crime. I have seen firsthand the brutalizing, degrading, and often deadly effects of racketeering on the lives of decent citizens who respect the law. It is for this reason that I particularly welcome the President's initiative in his efforts to mount an effective attack on the problem of organized crime in America.

Mr. President, I believe that of all the disreputable activities conducted by racketeers, the illicit trafficking in narcotics ranks among the most significant. The black market for narcotics in the United States is a big one. It has been estimated that organized crime garners \$350 million a year from the heroin trade alone, and this is a conservative figure. The cost to individuals is equally staggering. It has been estimated that there

are approximately 60,000 drug addicts in the United States, and that drug addiction costs the average addict almost \$5,000 a year. Marihuana, in addition, may be used by as many as 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 persons in the United States.

Statistics, however, tell only part of the story. Adolescents, lured by the dope peddler into experimenting with narcotics, have their lives in effect suspended, and are forced into a limbo that has no future and offers no means of coping with the reality of the present. Not only does the drug addict cause his loved ones untold torment, he himself lives in a nether world with incessant craving his constant companion. Assaults, robberies, and murders are committed by desperate addicts who cannot find the money to purchase costly drugs.

The racketeers who make this entire tragedy possible profit handsomely from it. They think they are above the law and are immune to the ordinary legal processes that govern men's lives. It is the responsibility of Congress to pass the kind of legislation needed to put the controlling racketeers in penal institutions, and eradicate the system of criminal activity perpetuated by their underlings.

President Nixon has challenged Congress and the Nation to meet headon and crush the multifaceted system of organized crime. I share his faith that both the Congress and the people will be equal to the task.

CHINA'S SHADOWY ROLE IN THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the April 29 issue of *Look* magazine contains an interesting and important article on China's shadowy role in the Vietnam war between 1964 and 1967. The article was written by Allen S. Whiting, the well-known expert on China who is now professor of political science at the University of Michigan, and who served with distinction as Deputy Consul General of the United States in Hong Kong in the early 1960's.

Mr. Whiting's central theme is that our continuing policy of unremitting hostile confrontation toward Communist China poses extraordinary dangers of serious—even nuclear—conflict, and will continue to do so unless both sides recognize the need to disengage themselves from the passions of the past and develop a more realistic policy for the future. In the past decade, Mr. Whiting says, we have avoided major conflict more by accident than design. As he puts it, we can hardly keep hoping that luck will continue to save us from all-out war with China.

Mr. President, because of the significance of Mr. Whiting's article, 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:

HOW WE ALMOST WENT TO WAR WITH CHINA (By Allen S. Whiting)

Chinese antiaircraft gunners duel with low-flying U.S. fighter-bombers spraying rockets and napalm over Chinese troops in

North Vietnam. Hanoi's MiG's escape destruction by fleeing to China. American planes straying over Chinese territory are shot down by Chinese fighters.

No hypothetical war game in the Pentagon basement, these events punctuated the secret war between China and the United States that flared from 1964 to 1967. Mixing political caution with military brinkmanship, China and the United States shrouded their risks in secrecy and semantics. Another catastrophe like Korea was averted by both sides keeping their cool. Few outside the innermost councils in Peking, Washington and Hanoi knew how close China and the United States had come to the point of no return in their clandestine conflict.

Now, however, it is time to end the silence over China's involvement in the Vietnam war. Any assessment of China's willingness to take military risks must consider her actions in that conflict. Any analysis of military interaction between China and the United States must focus on Vietnam as well as the Korean War. And any consideration of new courses of action in Vietnam must consider the likely Chinese responses in terms of the record.

China's material involvement in the Vietnam conflict began with our retaliatory bombing of North Vietnamese naval bases following the Gulf of Tonkin incidents of August 2-4, 1964. The Chinese promptly sent a squadron of MiG-17's to Hanoi for use against future U.S. air attacks. In the United States, the implications of this move were lost in President Johnson's campaign pledge that year not to "carry the war north." North Vietnam, however, saw the MiG's as proof of China's willingness to keep Hanoi in the fight regardless of U.S. threats to bomb the home base of Vietcong insurgency in South Vietnam. This threat had been hinted throughout the spring of 1964 by White House and other Washington sources. The Chinese commitment was essential to North Vietnam at this time. Khrushchev had denied any responsibility for Communist moves in the Indochina peninsula, having already extricated Russian policy from involvement in Laos through the Geneva agreements of 1962. While the government in Peking sent aircraft, the Russians took the case to the United Nations in clear defiance of North Vietnam. Thus Chinese support was North Vietnam's only relief from the threat of U.S. air attacks as long as the war continued in the south.

China's commitment was impressive. The initial MiG deployment indicated a willingness to replace parts and planes should U.S. attacks continue. More important, in the fall of 1964, construction began on a number of new airfields in South China. Both the timing and location of these bases were a reaction to the threat of U.S. escalation in Vietnam. Most major air-defense developments in South China had ended in the mid-fifties, before China's abortive pressures on the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, still held by Chiang Kai-shek's forces. Now, at a time of relative inactivity elsewhere on the mainland, new bases appeared in the arc of southeastern China abutting North Vietnam.

Their location suggested that these airfields were related to anticipated U.S. air attacks on North Vietnam. One major base, Ningming, was built only 12 miles from the border, near the vital railroad transshipment point of Pingsiang. Had this airfield been designed exclusively for the defense of Chinese territory, it would have been located further inland to avoid an easy attack by U.S. aircraft operating from distant points in Thailand, South Vietnam and the Gulf of Tonkin. Its more vulnerable location could only be explained as offering fighter protection for North Vietnam from the nearest point of sanctuary in Chinese territory. The total base complex permitted a sharp increase of Chinese aircraft concentrated within a 300-

mile radius of the vital road and railroad lines on which most North Vietnamese military deliveries depended. It also provided alternate bases for North Vietnamese aircraft, otherwise limited to a few primitive, highly vulnerable fields at home. Finally, increased Chinese air strength on Hainan Island, together with the new base complex in South China, could offer added protection to the North Vietnamese heartland, the Red River Delta, with its industry, dikes and population centers.

But events moved more swiftly than did airfield construction. In late October, 1964, Khrushchev's fall from power reversed Russian policy on Vietnam. Missions shuttled amongst Peking, Hanoi and Moscow to assess the change in Russian policy and its implications for the war. Finally, in February, 1965, Premier Alexei Kosygin visited Hanoi. Coincidentally, a Vietcong terrorist attack against U.S. aircraft and installations at Pleiku set off fresh retaliatory air raids against North Vietnam. The Russians thereupon increased their support, agreeing to North Vietnamese requests for planes more sophisticated than the Chinese, and for surface-to-air missiles to defend North Vietnamese cities.

Chinese aid to North Vietnam now had to compete with or supplement Russian aid. Some evidence indicates that the Soviets proposed joint military aid to North Vietnam, including Soviet-bloc air defense from Chinese bases. Offers to supply volunteer pilots from East Germany and Czechoslovakia followed in the wake of systematic U.S. attacks against North Vietnam, beginning in March, 1965. The Chinese Chief of Staff, Marshal Lo Jui-ching, apparently argued strongly for accepting these bloc offers, a mistake that seems ultimately to have lost him his position in the fall of 1965.

In the midst of the debate in Peking over how to handle Russian participation in the war, the United States suddenly introduced large-scale American combat forces into South Vietnam. This turned on a war alarm that rang with increasing intensity during the summer and fall of 1965 in major cities throughout southern and coastal China. Pitched to the slogan of preparing for war "Sooner rather than later, nuclear as well as conventional," a Chinese civil-defense campaign built up, complete with air-raid drills, pamphlets and films on protection against atomic fallout. Shelters were designated, and factories earmarked for possible dismantling and relocation inland.

China's commitments to North Vietnam remained vague in the public declarations of Chinese leaders, and were rarely portrayed as risking war with the United States. In a rare exception, Chief of Staff Lo Jui-ching had faced the issue squarely in early May, claiming, "We will go on supporting and aiding the Vietnamese people, whether or not U.S. imperialism bombs our country and whether or not it enlarges the war." More frequently, however, the propaganda scenario followed one of two scripts, both of which played down China's role in Vietnam. One analysis portrayed the United States as driven to intensify its effort as it became frustrated at each level of escalation and was unable to achieve its goals. Ultimately, in this view, escalation would carry the war to China. Others saw the United States as bent on attacking the Chinese regime, once its forces in Vietnam were strong enough to attack the mainland. In both versions, it was conceded that war with the United States was a strong possibility in the near future.

We may never know the full details of policy debates in Peking over Vietnam in the summer and fall of 1965. It appears, however, that Mao Tse-tung and his successor-designate, Minister of Defense Lin Biao, felt trapped between the Soviet-bloc offers for joint air cover over North Vietnam from Chinese bases and the sudden, massive U.S. esca-

lation in South Vietnam. Whatever Chinese commitments for air defense may have been made to North Vietnam in 1964, when Russia was out of the game and U.S. air attacks posed the only likely escalation, circumstances had obviously changed.

The argument was sharp in Peking. Perhaps China could escape punishment, as it had in the Korean War when Communist aircraft operated from sanctuary in China against U.S. bombers over North Korea. Secretary Rusk had warned in mid-'65 against any "assumption" of such sanctuary again, but was this firm U.S. policy? Would the U.S. really take on war with China for the sake of stopping North Vietnam's war in the South?

Mao decided against air defense. However, a new Chinese commitment to North Vietnam at this time indicates that war was not to be avoided at all costs. In lieu of greater air defense, Mao sent regular forces of the Chinese Peoples Liberation Army (PLA) to North Vietnam. The first units crossed the border early in the fall of 1965, and rapidly expanded until, by the spring of 1966, they totaled some 30-50,000 troops. Primarily engaged in railroad, road and bridge construction, PLA engineers strengthened the entire network of transportation and communication linking North Vietnam with China. Northwest of Hanoi, Chinese troops built an elaborate air and logistics base so vast as to suggest a major jungle redoubt for North Vietnamese or possibly Chinese troops in case of U.S. invasion. In addition, Chinese anti-aircraft units moved to protect vital targets in North Vietnam, and to shield PLA engineering and construction personnel.

The overt preparation of the Chinese people for war and the secret presence of thousands of Chinese troops in North Vietnam provided sufficient guarantee to convince leaders in Hanoi that they did not have to knuckle under to U.S. threats. Refusing to meet with U.S. emissaries during the 37-day bombing halt of late 1965 and early 1966, Ho Chi Minh faced the possible full force of U.S. air attacks, the threat of total interdiction effort against the vital supply lines from China, and perhaps a U.S. invasion. But if the worst came, Ho would not have to face it alone.

The worst did not come. U.S. air attacks remained within essentially the same geographic and target limitations as before. The American Government made public that it knew Chinese troops were in North Vietnam but did not try to cut all supply lines from China. American aircraft attacked Chinese troop positions in North Vietnam, while Chinese gunners shot down U.S. pilots and planes. But neither side publicized its casualties or its kills.

Even the better known danger of American planes overflying China was handled with relative restraint by both governments. Mao's response to accidental violations of China's airspace ran from total passivity through political protest to shoot-downs.

The situation remained potentially explosive as long as U.S. escalation inched upward. In 1967, as American bombs hit Hanoi and Haiphong and attacks began on North Vietnamese military airfields, the Chinese reacted with claims of three aircraft shot down the week of April 24-May 1. The U.S. meanwhile steadily whittled down its self-imposed 25-mile-wide buffer zone along the Sino-Vietnamese border. By August, U.S. bombs fell within ten miles of China. American, North Vietnamese and Chinese fighters flew ever closer to each other, with Communist planes relying on the sanctuary of bases in China.

Before U.S. policy makers could be forced to decide on "hot pursuit" into China, both sides backed off a bit. U.S. attacks eased away from the border, and Communist air actions became less provocative. The winter monsoon further limited air attacks over North Vietnam, and on March 31, 1968, President John-

son ended all bombing of North Vietnam except in the immediate vicinity of the DMZ.

Both countries acted coolly throughout 1964-1967. China risked war but avoided extreme provocation. The United States was not deterred from escalation against the North but took every precaution not to blunder into war with China. Korea remained a restraining memory for both sides. Nonetheless, the nearness of an open Sino-American conflict over Vietnam leaves grounds for concern as long as China and the United States continue to clash.

The Chinese have been a force in stiffening the North Vietnamese will to resist U.S. escalation. In 1964, China provided the only outside support for North Vietnam's air defense. In 1965, Chinese Communist troops entered North Vietnam as the only substantial deterrent against a possible American invasion. In 1967, despite the ravages of Mao's Cultural Revolution, his regime reacted vigorously to increased U.S. bombing, and offered sanctuary to North Vietnamese fighters. As in the Korean War, the People's Republic of China proved its willingness to assist a besieged Communist neighbor even at risk of war with the United States.

The Chinese leaders did not assume this risk lightly. Throughout the war, China discreetly avoided provoking the Americans by remaining silent about aid to North Vietnam at a time when the Russians' surface-to-air missiles in North Vietnam were receiving worldwide attention. We will probably never know the extent of Chinese casualties in North Vietnam or how many of our planes fell to Chinese guns.

From all this, we have learned that China is willing to take risks in pursuit of vital interests. We have learned, of course, to distrust the crude stereotype of China's leadership as one dominated by reckless revolutionaries determined to advance their hegemony in Asia and the world by "people's wars," or, in the future, by nuclear weapons. However, three times in 20 years, the military might of China and the United States have stood in confrontation on China's periphery: Korea, 1950-53; Quemoy, 1958; and Vietnam, 1964-67. In Korea, we ignored a formal Chinese ultimatum against invading North Korea. Pursuing our advantage to the full, we triggered a massive Chinese intervention. In Quemoy, we stiffened local Chinese Nationalist resistance in the continuing civil war over islands within sight of the mainland and forced the Communists to back down. In Vietnam, we checked our use of force rather than risk enlarging the war to include the Chinese mainland.

President Johnson's luck finally ran out in the Vietnam war, but it served him well in 1964-65. Had policy splits within the Chinese leadership not toppled the advocates of forward air cover for Hanoi, he would have had to decide whether to abandon air attacks, live with the political problems of sanctuary for enemy fighters, or engage in "hot pursuit" into China. Fortunately, he was spared the decision.

But we cannot rely on luck to avoid war with China. The record of Korea, Quemoy and Vietnam leaves little cause for comfort, as China becomes a nuclear power. No anti-ballistic missile system can safeguard the United States from a war on the periphery of China.

In view of Red China's experience with American policy, we have little chance of accomplishing anything positive by our expressions of hope that the Communists "change their behavior" or refrain from using nuclear weapons. So far as Mao is concerned, our behavior and our nuclear weapons are the basic causes of Sino-American hostility.

For us, disengagement from the Chinese civil war is far less painful than disengagement from the Vietnam war. Still, in three successive administrations we have not been able to achieve it. Familiar bureaucratic ar-

guments firmly oppose change. In times of quiet, there is no "real need" to take any action. In times of tension, as in 1955 and 1958, "we can't cut and run." Now that we must admit a setback in Vietnam, it will surely be argued that we must not take any additional steps that might undermine the confidence of our Asian allies in our commitment to defend them against attack. If, however, we do not learn from Vietnam what separates our vital from our lesser interests in Asia, we will continue to place the military, eventually the nuclear, power of China and the United States in direct confrontation.

TIRE SAFETY

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, yesterday morning I had the opportunity of meeting with members of the Rubber Manufacturers' Association. During this meeting, I was invited to make a few brief remarks. I ask unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SAXBE ON TIRE SAFETY

I want you to know that I am aware of the work done by the rubber industry in developing a practical tire recall program. Until this past weekend, little had been reported in the press concerning the efforts of the various companies. And, it has been my personal opinion that too much has been written by self-appointed so-called protectors of the consumer, both outside and within the government. Sensationalism has no place here.

I was delighted with what I read last weekend concerning the tire recall bill introduced in the Senate last Friday by Senator Nelson. I'm pleased to see the Rubber Manufacturers Association supporting the intentions of this bill. And I'm pleased that . . . really after too long a silence . . . you are giving the public the correct information about tires and performance. Discussing performance on the road. Putting this issue in the right perspective.

Frankly, these careless assumptions made publicly concerning tire failures, unsafe tires, and the like have concerned me for a number of reasons. Firstly, it has taken the emphasis away from the motorist and the need for him to properly maintain his vehicle and tires. Much of the motorist's apathy regarding vehicle maintenance has resulted in serious problems which have been unfairly passed back to the manufacturer, although you have little control over the consumer once he buys the product.

Secondly, these charges reflect on the industry, the individual companies, their managements, and their employees.

I recently spoke to members of the United Rubber Workers, and I expressed my concern to them. It is very important that all this consumer safety legislation be kept in the right perspective so that it does not incorrectly reflect on companies which spend millions of dollars annually to better their products and fully test them before they are sold. And so it does not reflect on the conscientious employee who takes pride in his workmanship and in his company.

I told the URW members I was interested in a greater consumer education program, backed up by strong vehicle inspection programs which regularly remind and require the automobile owner to keep his car and tires in safe working condition.

There is no question that great advances have been made in educating the motorist along these lines. I know the RMA has an excellent program, complete with brochures, films and other materials. And many of the individual tire companies complement the

association's efforts with very professional programs of their own. I think you'll agree that even more can be, and should be done so that wheels are balanced and tires are rotated and properly inflated. And badly worn tires are replaced.

Now then, the basic plan for a recall program has been set forth and the mechanics are under way. We know there will be wrinkles and problems and frustrating expenses before a workable system is perfected. But it was obvious to me, after reading the New York Times and Sunday's Washington Post, that the Department of Transportation, the National Highway Safety Bureau and the industry are working together . . . in full cooperation . . . to develop this program and put it in effect as soon as possible.

The second plateau will be more difficult and I know the RMA and its members are concerned about coming up with a workable and uncomplicated system of grading tires. We are aware of the time and the thought contributed to date by companies to work with government in coming up with a set of guidelines for the consumer.

But unfortunately the general public has not been aware of the cooperation of industry with government. Considering the number of tire lines and the number of tire companies all meeting specific but often different consumer needs, it is obvious to me that the motorist will not be able to fill out a small card, answer two or three basic questions, and immediately learn what tire he needs and precisely what he can expect in overall performance. I know there are too many factors involved . . . from type of car, the power of the motor and air conditioning to the type of driving concerned, the type of roads and highways involved and even the climate. I appreciate the complexities of coming up with a good grading system to handle the consumer's needs and I appreciate the efforts made to date by the industry. Of course, there is plenty more to do. You know that far better than I.

But I want to stress one thing . . . and I pledge I'll do what I can to help you with this . . . More has to be done in consumer education. Not only in the area of tire maintenance, but also the industry has a major responsibility in keeping this in the proper perspective. The public must understand your concern and it must understand what you are doing to develop such a grading system. And it must know that you are not fighting government legislation. You are not only cooperating with government, you are working closely in the interest of the consumer.

If you fail to communicate regularly with the public, you are giving free license to those who tend to ignore the efforts of industry and D.O.T. You know as well as I that very harmful publicity will result. And the public will continue to be misinformed.

It is so very important that the public is aware that the recall program and the grading system are industry efforts supported so much by government that legislation will be passed to encourage its use by all companies and by the consumer.

This attitude by your industry was suggested in your statement following the introduction of the recall bill last Friday. To maintain public confidence in your industry, in your individual companies, in their management, in their products, and in their employees, you must keep your public informed.

THE ROLE OF THE ABM IN THE SEVENTIES

Mr. JACKSON, Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services con-

ducted public hearings last week on the anti-ballistic-missile defense system under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS). These hearings were held in connection with the yearly legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1970 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, ships, and research and development.

On April 23, Prof. Albert Wohlstetter, university professor at the University of Chicago, and a fellow of its Center for Policy Studies, testified on the role of an anti-ballistic-missile system in the 1970's and particularly on the importance of the role of ABM in defending our Minuteman missiles.

Trained as a mathematical logician and economist, during World War II Professor Wohlstetter worked on problems of reliability and quality control in electronic and electrical equipment. He has been a member of the Rand Research Council, professor in residence at UCLA, Ford Professor at the University of California at Berkeley. For the last 18 years he has done research on problems of arms and arms control and specifically on protecting strategic forces and stabilizing deterrence. He is the author and coauthor of numerous articles and several book-length studies. Some of these studies originated the first-strike second-strike distinction, fail-safe procedures for reducing the probability of accidental war, programs for hardening strategic vehicles against ballistic missile attack and other devices and methods of operation now in use by our strategic forces.

I commend Professor Wohlstetter's opening statement before the Armed Services Committee to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ROLE OF THE ABM IN THE 1970'S

(Statement by Prof. Albert Wohlstetter, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, April 23, 1969)

I appreciate the honor of testifying before this Committee on the role of an anti-ballistic missile system in the 1970's.

Since I believe the Safeguard program warrants the sums involved, and I support it, perhaps I should begin by saying that I am entirely sympathetic to a rigorous review of the Defense Budget. I favor getting our safety as cheaply as we can. Moreover, I believe the Defense Budget has a good deal of fat that can be cut without substantial harm. I would recommend, for example, a careful look at the equipment and support costs of our ground forces, and at our tactical air forces, both land and sea-based. Some of these seem ineffective, or levelled at threats that are poorly defined or not grave enough to be worth the cost.

Sensible efforts to reduce the Defense Budget, however, would not center on the strategic offense and defense force. There are, of course, arguable choices about strategic offense and defense. But the \$8 billion plus strategic budget makes up a small part of the total Defense Budget. It has a paramount importance for the safety of the country and indeed of international society. Detering nuclear coercion and nuclear attack

on ourselves or our allies, reducing the damage done in case deterrence fails are complex and uncertain functions; but because they are crucial, the part of the Defense Budget devoted to them has been the most studied and is better understood than any of the rest.

Nonetheless, sizable uncertainties are intrinsic. They affect the predictions of scientists as well as the military and limit the reductions we can make without excessive risk. The strategic forces will need continuing adjustment to predicted and to some unanticipated changes in the state of the art. But such adjustments need not entail drastic changes up or down in long term levels of spending.

A start in deploying ABM, I believe, is a prudent response to changes in the state of the art available to ourselves and to our adversaries. As strategic systems go, it is a modest program. It is subject to review and can be halted or stretched out. The average annual cost of the completed program, on a five year basis, is less than one-fifth of what we were spending for active defense against manned bombers at the end of the 1950s. Nor is it at all likely to start a quantitative arms spiral. Indeed, despite the stereotype, there has been no quantitative arms race in the strategic offense and defense budget, no "ever-accelerating increase," nor, in fact, any long term increase at all. The budget for strategic offense and defense forces in fiscal 1962 was 11.3 billion dollars.¹ The proposed fiscal 1970 budget, I understand, comes to about 8.3 billion dollars. Adjusted for price changes, the 1962 figure was well over 50% higher than that for 1970.

There is an important difference between making qualitative adjustments to technical change and expanding the number of vehicles or megatons or dollars spent. The difference has been ignored in a debate on ABM that seems at the same time impassioned and very abstract, quite removed from the actual political, economic, and military history of nuclear offense and defense. For example, one alternative to protecting Minuteman is to buy more Minuteman without protection. But adding new vehicles is costly and more destabilizing than an active defense of these hard points, since it increases the capacity to strike first. A one-sided self-denial of new technology can lead simply to multiplying our missiles and budgets; or to a decrease in safety; or to both.

Active defense against ballistic missiles in the 1970's will have an important role to play in maintaining a protected and responsible second strike capacity. (The projected Safeguard defense of the national command authority and of the bomber and Minuteman bases are directed to this end.) And it has a useful function in providing an area defense against attacks involving modest numbers of apparent incoming missiles.

There have been so many charges that the Safeguard program was invented in bad faith in March of this year as a gimmick to answer critics of the Sentinel city defense that I would stress that in 1967, long before the present Administration quite independently decided on the Safeguard, the evidence of advancing technology convinced me that ABM in the 1970's would have essentially the uses the Administration suggests for Safeguard, and in the same order: to defend the offense and, given this, at a small extra cost to provide a light area defense of popu-

¹ DoD Appropriations for 1969 Hearings, Part I, Financial Summary. Expenditures in the 1950s were not then broken down by mission but strategic budgets appear to have been even higher in the late 1950s than in 1962.

lation.² In fact, there is a substantial continuity between the ABM decisions of the present and past Administrations. The last Administration called for an ABM area defense but said it would furnish an economic basis for defending Minuteman if the threat grew. It had been weighing and it continued to weigh this for some time—indeed itself requested some funds for hardpoint defense in its own version of the 1970 fiscal budget.

Like the Republicans now, the Democrats in 1967 were charged with directing their ABM decision against the opposing party. I would recommend to opponents of ABM that they contemplate the possibility that the decisions were made in good faith in both cases; and that we turn to the substance of the issues.

There are other political and military functions of an ABM system than protecting the offense and offering an area defense of civilians against light attack. I would like to say something about each of these two latter roles and also something about the doctrine of Minimum Deterrence on which much opposition to the ABM is based, but time permits comment mostly on the protected offense function.

ABM AS A PART OF A SECOND STRIKE FORCE IN THE 1970'S

For one superpower as against another, getting and keeping a responsible strike force is feasible but hard. It requires thought, effort, and continuing realistic adjustments to technological change. Minimum Deterrence theorists, who call for no defense of our civilians and nearly total reliance on a threat to bombard enemy civilians, have always claimed that the attacker inevitably must expend many strategic vehicles to destroy only one of the vehicles attacked. No such generalization holds. It has depended and always must depend on the changing capabilities of the offense and on the kind and degree of protection of the force attacked. At one time, for example, both we and the Russians had very many unprotected aircraft concentrated on a base within the lethal radius of a single bomb. On a two-wing base, for example, we had as many as 130 aircraft; on a one-wing base 65 medium bombers and tankers. And the planned response time was too slow for the reliable warning likely to be available. Small numbers of vehicles could have destroyed much larger numbers of the vehicles they attacked. Under some realistically determined conditions, the ratio would have favored the attacker by 1 to 8 or more. These vulnerabilities had nothing to do with the supposed missile gap. In fact they preceded such predictions.

There is always a temptation in such circumstances to resort to responses that are automatic or that bypass national command. Advocates of sole reliance on city bombard-

ment forces have from the time this doctrine first gained currency been tempted to prove that response was certain by making it automatic, by shortcutting responsible political decision.³ But the decision to launch ICBMs against Russian cities would be perhaps the most momentous choice ever made in all of history. It would be the decision for World War III. If this awful decision is ever made it should be based on as much information as we can get and it should be made by as high a political authority as possible. It is the last decision we should contemplate delegating to a computer.

The revival today, by several distinguished senators and some able physicists opposing ABM, of the suggestion that, rather than defend ICBMs, we should launch them at Russian cities simply on the basis of radar represents a long step backward. If we were willing to do this, we would dispense with silos or Poseidon submarines or any other mode of protecting our missiles. And we would increase the nightmare possibility of nuclear war by mistake.

Understanding of the complex problems of designing a protected and responsible nuclear strategic force has grown slowly among scientists as well as laymen, civilians as well as soldiers, Democrats as well as Republicans. But it has grown, and decisively. The United States has designed and deployed a second strike force capable of riding out an attack; and there have been large improvements in protecting responsible command. This was accomplished not by merely expanding nuclear bombardment forces, but in essence by shifting to forces with protection against the changing threat. The stereotype repeated throughout the 1960s that our security has declined while our strategic force grew at an accelerating rate is grossly wrong on both counts. In the past some key programs increased the protected second strike capacity of the force, while cutting at the same time billions of dollars from the spending projected.

In the 1970s unless we continue to make appropriate decisions to meet technological change, once again the viability of a large part of our second strike force will be put in question. Several related innovations, but in particular the development of a rocket booster carrying many reentry vehicles each aimed precisely at a different target, raises once again the possibility of attack ratios favoring the attacker. One reentry vehicle may kill a booster carrying several. One booster can carry the means of destroying many boosters.

Raising a question about the future second strike capacity of any part of our strategic force implies nothing about the present intentions of an adversary to strike first or even to be able in the future effectively to strike first. The recent debate on whether the SS9 is a "first strike weapon" or whether the Russians intend it to be is beside the point. If by maintaining our second strike capability we can make the risks of striking very great, this can affect an adversary's intentions favorably to ourselves. It can deter him even in a crisis, like the one over missiles in Cuba, when the alternative to striking may look bad, but not, if we are careful, as bad as striking. Moreover, we ought not to talk of "first strike weapons" and "second strike weapons" as if this could be settled simply by looking at the weapons on one side. Whether or not a weapons system can preclude substantial retaliation will depend on many uncertain future performance characteristics of the forces on both sides. The test of whether one has a responsible

second strike capacity is whether one can, under nuclear attack, preserve vehicles, decision centers and the flow of communications among them, whether one can transmit the order to retaliate and penetrate adversary defenses to reach targets. If we were unwilling even to entertain the hypothesis of a first strike, we would do nothing to protect any part of our strategic forces or its control centers by making it mobile or hard or by ABM. Some leading scientists who oppose currently deploying ABM say they will favor it for the defense of Minuteman when precise MIRVs and the related offense technologies are likely to be available to the Russians. That calendar date, and not present Soviet intent, is then a major substantive issue for these opponents. And their position recognizes that we want to maintain the second strike capacity—not of just one, but of all major vehicle types in our strategic force: Minuteman, bombers, and Poseidon.

In designing a second strike force, there are excellent reasons for making it a substantial mixture of vehicles of several quite different types: land as well as sea-based, manned as well as unmanned, each with its own mode of protection. Such systems have differing limitations, are subject to varied and independent uncertainties, require distinct modes of attack and, if each type is protected, greatly complicate the attack. It is a serious matter, then, if a large part of this mixture is badly affected by changing adversary forces and technologies. The forces deployed and the state of the art available to the Russians will influence other parts of our strategic force than Minuteman silos. And ABM has a role to play, for example, in protecting the important fixed elements of a mobile force, including the politically responsible command centers. Preserving command, control and communications is always hard, and particularly so for mobile sea-based systems.

My remarks, however, center, so far as the second strike function of ABM is concerned, on the problem of protecting Minuteman. We have good cause to preserve the second strike capability of so large a proportion of our strategic force. Even if it were true that the United States needed only a few strategic vehicles surviving, buying and paying for the operation of a great many that had become vulnerable to attack would be a very poor way to obtain those few surviving. There are safer and cheaper ways of getting a force of a given size than to buy a much larger one, most of which is susceptible to annihilation.

How does the planned timing of our ABM deployment compare to the date when it is reasonably likely that Russian offense technology could badly worsen the effectiveness of our projected Minuteman III? The first point to note is that the proposed Safeguard deployment has extended lead times. It can stretch out further if continuing review of intelligence suggests it should, but the shortest schedule calls for completing this program early in 1976. If, as ABM opponents stress in other connections, there is likely to be a substantial shakedown period, we are talking of 1977 or later. If, as has been suggested, we delay decision for another year or more and then proceed to design and develop an entirely new ABM we are talking of the 1980s.

Second, predicting exact calendar dates at which technologies will be available to adversaries and what their strategic significance will be is very hard, and we are not very good at it. Moreover we have erred not only on the side of overestimating Russian capabilities, but often by underestimating them. At earlier dates we were surprised by the rapid Soviet achievement of the A-bomb, the H-bomb, advanced jet engines, long-range turbo-prop bombers, airborne intercept ra-

² See for example one of the first classic sources of Minimum Deterrence Doctrine, NFA 1970 Without Arms Control, pp. 32-33, 44. Special Committee Report, 1958.

³ . . . "First, an offence force with such increased accuracies and reliabilities and with an extensive use of MIRVs is very much more efficient in attacking the fixed offence force or the important fixed elements of the mobile force of an adversary . . . Second, one result of this sort of change in Russian offence forces is to make improved anti-ballistic missiles (rather than simply more hardening or more missiles) an economic way for the United States to protect the hard fixed elements of a strategic force. . . Third, at a minor increment in the modest cost of a hard-point ABM defence, it is possible to make available a light ABM for defence of civil societies against a small submarine or land-based missile force or part of a large one launched by mistake or without authorization. . ." Address to the September 1967 Institute of Strategic Studies Conference on the Implications of Military Technology in the 1970s at Elsinore, Denmark. Adelphi paper No. 46, p. 4.

dars, and large-scale fissile-material production. And scientists have been surprised; not only military men.⁴

Third, the public discussion has not stressed how sensitively the accuracy of attack affects the viability of the hardened force attacked. Accuracy affects the number of weapons required to destroy a hard target very much more than the bomb yield or the overpressure resistance of the target. Roughly speaking, for such targets, improving accuracy by a factor of slightly more than 2 is the same as increasing bomb yield tenfold and serves essentially to offset a tenfold increase in overpressure resistance.

I have tried to reconstruct various numerical proofs recently presented or distributed to the Congress that purport to show our Minuteman will be quite safe without any extra protection; these proofs depend heavily on optimistic estimates of limitations in Russian delivery accuracies, reliabilities, and associated offense capabilities and sometimes on very poor offense tactics. Suppose, however, that by 1976 when Safeguard is deployed, or by 1977 when it may be shaken down, the Russians have:

- (1) accuracies like those of the systems we are deploying now
 - (2) overall reliabilities currently attributable to them
 - (3) methods familiar to us for using extensive and timely information as to which missiles have failed so that others can replace them
 - (4) continued production of SS9 boosters at past rates
 - (5) modest numbers of MIRVs per booster (e.g., the three five-megaton reentry vehicles stated by Secretary Laird for the SS9)
- Then the percentage of the Minuteman force that would be destroyed, if undefended, comes to about 95%.

These results are based on quite moderate assumptions about Russian capabilities. Better accuracies, for example, may be expected in the late 1970s, and higher degrees of MIRVing. Reliabilities of any given offense missile system improve with use. Do those who favor a hardpoint defense but would postpone a start really consider these Russian capabilities I have outlined "extremely implausible"? Or at all implausible?

There is a striking inconsistency in the way ABM opponents treat the Chinese and the Russians. In contemplating the possibility of a Russian offense against our Minuteman, they assume Russians who cannot by 1976 or 1977—twenty years after Sputnik—do what we know how to do now. When considering the ability of the Chinese to penetrate an ABM defense, they attribute to them penetration systems that cost us many billions of dollars, a dozen years of trials and many

⁴ We have not been very good at predicting our own or our adversary's technologies. These matters are intrinsically uncertain. Eminent scientists at the end of the 1940s predicted that fusion weapons would be infeasible, and if feasible undeliverable, and if delivered of no strategic significance, since they thought (erroneously) it could be used only against cities. (Some of those who then thought the threat of fusion bombs against cities neither moral nor important strategically now take it to be both.) In February 1953 an important scientific study group expected the Soviet would have no ICBMs before the late 1960s—a prediction plainly in error by the end of the year. Writing in October 1964 some scientists opposing ABM were quite sure that no technological surprises could substantially change the operational effectiveness of intercontinental delivery systems, and thus entirely missed the major strategic potential of precisely aimed MIRVs, a concept that was at that very time emerging in the classified literature. These were able and informed men. But exact prediction on these matters defies confident assertion.

failures to develop—and they assume this for first generation Chinese missiles. These are rather backward Russians and very advanced Chinese. Moreover since in the Russian case we are considering a potential threat to our second strike capability and we want this to be highly reliable, we want particularly to avoid underestimating the threat. But we should undertake a modest defense of population if it works in the expected case, even if on extremely pessimistic assumptions it might not. Here again it seems to me the ABM critics get things exactly backwards.

Finally, the fact that such impending developments in Russian offense may make it necessary to do something more to protect the fixed elements of our force should come as no surprise. It was the sensitive effects of missile inaccuracy that in the early 1950s suggested to the original proponents of programs for hardening strategic vehicles against ICBM attack—

(a) that hardening would be an important and effective method of protection against ICBM attack in the 1960s.

(b) that by itself hardening would not be adequate for much past the 1960s.

The ICBMs then expected in the 1960s were, of course, enormously faster than manned bombers, and therefore would outmode some programs that served very well in the 1950s; but the early ICBMs were likely to be very much less accurate than the manned bombers. They were expected to have inaccuracies measured in miles, perhaps, it seemed then, as large as 5 miles, compared to the quarter of a nautical mile or 1500 ft median miss distance associated with manned bombers. Since just doubling inaccuracy could affect weapons requirements by a factor of 4, hardening clearly seemed a good idea. The paper proposing hardening for the 1960s was entitled "Protecting a Strategic Force After 1960" and was put out on February 1, 1954. That paper included a very short section called "After 1960" that is quite relevant for understanding why we should expect that we will have to adapt the current Minuteman to impending changes in opposing offense technology. The section read in full:

"The foregoing also suggests that even against the ballistic missile this defense would have a finite life. The missile might improve drastically in accuracy and payload. However, the date at which the Russians will have a missile capable of carrying a 25 MT bomb with a 1500 ft CEP appears sufficiently far removed to make the defense good, let's say, until the end of the Sixties." (p. 19.)

That the numbers cited in this paper of February 1954 so closely match some of those being talked of for the SS9 is, of course, purely a coincidence. They were performance characteristics of bombers then current. However, the quotation illustrates that, from the outset, it was to be expected that sooner or later, and probably in the 1970s, hardening would not be enough by itself. The discussion also suggests that to depend merely on further hardening would make the system vulnerable to further improvements in accuracy.

Hardening can be outpaced by further development in precision. This does not mean that for some possible threats a combination of ABM and extreme hardening might not be useful. It might. But as a complete substitute for ABM, extreme hardening has drawbacks. It is subject in my opinion to much larger uncertainties as to both performance and costs than the ABM.

The major components of the Safeguard system have received elaborate study and testing. Ideas for brand new ABM systems to defend hard points that I am familiar with are not serious competitors in this time period. We should start deploying the system now on the schedule suggested and we should expect, as in the case of every other offense and defense system, that we shall

learn a great deal from operational experience, make some changes and retrofits. This seems to me a sound way to supplement the protection of the Minuteman in a period when we can expect it to be endangered.

I have used the time available to comment mainly on the role of ABM in defending Minuteman. I also support its utility for a thin area defense of population and shall be glad to try to answer questions about that subject as well.

DIVIDENDS FROM SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the April 1969 issue of Soil Conservation magazine contains an interesting and informative article written by Mr. F. DeWitt Abbott, State resource conservationist, which focuses on the continuing achievements of soil conservation programs. Conservation practices being carried out on the 275 acres comprising the Agricultural Hall of Fame and National Center near Bonner Springs, Kans., are featured by Mr. Abbott.

Unfortunately all too many of our citizens, both urban and rural, seem unaware of the outstanding accomplishments and benefits accruing from this splendid program.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "Agricultural Hall of Fame a Conservation Showcase," be printed in the RECORD.

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

AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME A CONSERVATION SHOWCASE

(By F. DeWitt Abbott, State resource conservationist, SCS, Salina, Kans.)

The Agricultural Hall of Fame and National Center, Bonner Springs, Kans., with its 275 acres under conservation land use and treatment, will provide visitors with an opportunity to view firsthand and at close range conservation practices on the land.

It is not unusual for more than 1,500 people to visit the center on summer weekends. Many of these people are from nearby cities, and many are from all over the United States.

Conservation is being featured on the land for several reasons: The land needs conservation treatment. Conservation fits in with the non-profit Agriculture Center's aim to exhibit the past, present, and future of agriculture and agribusiness, as provided in its Congressional charter, and it will give thousands of people a chance to observe conservation work.

With technical help from the Soil Conservation Service through the Wyandotte Soil Conservation District, the board of directors of the center has developed a conservation plan for the acreage involving a wide variety of conservation practices and treatments.

Some of the conservation work includes healing gullies with grassed waterways; building a multipurpose dam near the main exhibit hall to function as a small flood-detention and grade-stabilizing structure, a 2-acre pond for providing stockwater, a diversion channel to bring storm runoff into the pond, and an access highway; and reserving a 114-acre smooth brome meadow for planned exhibit buildings.

Forty-five acres of cropland with waterways and graded parallel terraces will be used to grow adapted crops, such as corn, sorghum, soybeans, wheat, and alfalfa-grass in rotation and on the contour.

A few head of domestic livestock will be kept on 24 acres of brome pasture where gullies will be smoothed and seeded, grazing regulated, land fertilized, and a field border of multiflora rose planted.

Other plans call for 12 acres of rangeland to have brush control, range seeding, and a grade-stabilizing structure; 27 acres to be in smooth brome for hay; a wooded area of 28 acres to have hiking trails, woodland management, and evergreens; trees and shrubs along the trails labeled; and a pond in a 22-acre wildlife area rebuilt by deepening and reshaping the edges. It and the multipurpose pond will add to the scenic beauty of the Agriculture Center's grounds.

Also an acre below the wildlife dam will be planted to trees and shrubs for wildlife habitat; 2 to 5 acres will be kept in grass for nesting cover; a three-row windbreak will be planted near residential buildings; and several other measures applied for the encouragement of wildlife throughout the property.

The Agriculture Center directors are determined to set up an outstanding demonstration of conservation of soil and water. They realize how important it is to remind all who come that way of the need for land protection and wise use for a permanent and productive agriculture and national economy.

SERMON BY JOHN H. SHARON

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, some days ago I had the pleasure of hearing John H. Sharon preach a moving and inspiring sermon in Washington.

Because it is so excellent, I believe it will be of interest to Senators. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

GOD WITHIN THE SHADOW

I want to share with you this morning a precious story of a conversation a friend once had with his six-year-old daughter: My friend had instructed his secretary that whenever one of his children telephoned him at his office, that the call was to be put right through—no matter how busy he was or how important the people were with whom he might be in conference. One day, he received one of those calls. The father was in the middle of an important conference with several people, but his daughter's call was put right through, and this was how the conversation went!

The daughter said, "Hi, Daddy. Why is God invisible?" And the father replied, "Because God made himself invisible."

There was a short pause, and the daughter said, "All right, Daddy, I accept that, but why? Why did God make himself invisible?"

At this point the father paused; he turned his back on the men in his office, and then he said, "Darling, there are lots of things in life that God has made invisible. Take love for example. You know I love you; and I know that you love me; but you cannot touch that love; you cannot see that love; but you can feel it, because you know it's there."

"And the same is true with God. You cannot see him; you cannot touch him; but you can feel him because you know he's there. It is as if God were standing in the shadow; invisible, but you know he's there."

And then there was a long pause—a somewhat anxious pause for the father—and finally his daughter said with a cheerful, bouncy voice: "Thank you, daddy, I'll see you tonight."

Today as we commemorate the convening of the 91st Congress, it is essential that we pause. That we pause to look back at 1968; at the events that have transpired since we last worshipped together; and that we pause to look ahead at 1969 and beyond.

Life Magazine described 1968 as the "Incredible Year." Let us look at a few of the highlights.

1968 was a year that began with hope and excitement; for in far off South Africa, a man named Phillip Blaiberg received the heart of a dead man and survived.

But then the American intelligence ship—the Pueblo—was seized, and the men aboard taken prisoners. And America and the world began to wonder.

Then the youth of America—like the youth in so many countries—began to cry out on many issues, but the meaneast slogan of them all was their recurring chant "LBJ, LBJ, How many men have you killed today." Hippies, Yuppies, honest dissenters, call them what you will; we must remember that they too are God's children; and they are your children and mine.

Then in March, 1968, President Johnson declared a partial halt in the bombing of North Vietnam in the hope of getting peace talks off the ground; and he also announced, to everyone's surprise, that he would not seek re-election to better serve the cause of peace.

And then Martin Luther King was assassinated in Memphis. As soon as he heard the news, Senator Robert Kennedy rushed to a Negro rally and said: "You must remember that my brother too was killed by a white man." But the cork was out of the bottle. And America burned.

And then, only 60 days later, Senator Robert Kennedy was assassinated in Los Angeles. And together with the rest of the world, we took another long trip to Arlington National Cemetery. And America wept.

Whether or not you agreed with these two men is irrelevant. Our nation was in shock. We had too many questions to ask ourselves, and no one but God to turn to for the answers; while the world looked at America and asked, "What kind of a nation is the so-called United States of America?"

And here in America we hoped and prayed that the bullets that snuffed out these two prominent lives, the violence that brought death to two men of non-violence, might possibly be the means of once again making us "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." But no, America and the world has to wait.

We had two political conventions and an election to face.

Both major parties nominated four men of faith and courage, conviction and hope. A third party nominated another ticket; one that turned to the hate and prejudice in America and not to its faith, its hope, its love. Saddened, sick and hurt by events, angered at what television showed at the Chicago Convention, we tried to get ready for the campaign.

But before that campaign could even begin one of our beloved former Presidents became desperately ill. I remember the night in 1956 when the late Adlai Stevenson was defeated by President Eisenhower for the second time. Mr. Stevenson called upon the country to unite behind President Eisenhower and then he added these words: "We pray as one." So we prayed as one for this brave soldier as he began his valiant but final battle. How relieved we were that his passing came with dignity, peace and non-violence.

But last November, our country, emotionally spent, bewildered, hopeful that the election would not be thrown into the House of Representatives, was gratified that we actually had elected a new President and Vice President.

But 1968 was not over. During Christmas week America sent three men to the moon, and once again "we prayed as one" for their safe return. And on Christmas Eve the crew of the Pueblo, after a savage experience not unlike the ordeal of 1968 for all Americans, were released and sent home to their families.

No one will ever be able to deny the historical and spiritual facts that our prayers and the spirit of Christmas were responsible for these two events.

No, 1968 was not an "Incredible Year." It was a Triumphant Year: not because Phillip

Blaiberg is alive today; not because of the safe return of the Apollo Astronauts; not because of the release of the Pueblo crew; but because in 1968:

"The rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, but it did not fall; because it had been founded on the rock."

The rock of faith and trust: faith and trust in our fellow man, in our country, and in God. Many people throughout the world have asked themselves the question, "What would have happened to the United States during 1968 had there not been a God within the shadow keeping watch above his own?"

But the fact that we survived 1968 does not mean that we solved the problems of 1969 or beyond. We still have the problem of white America against Black America; the problem of unrest on college campuses, the problems of the hungry, the poor, the cities, the handicapped, the aged, and we still have the problems of crime at home and war abroad. And there are many more.

Recently, my wife and I attended a very moving service at St. Martin-in-the-Fields in Pompano Beach, Florida. It was a service of Holy Communion using the new liturgy. At the prayer of intercession, the priest said:

"For all who bear authority in this and every land, and especially for the President of the United States: we pray that in thy Holy fear, they govern the peoples in wisdom, justice and peace."

And the congregation responded in a loud and clear voice: "Hear us, Good Lord; hear us, Good Lord."

To the leaders in this and every land—especially to our President and Vice President—they should know that they shall continue to have our prayers; for as former President Johnson said when he left office: The burdens of our new President are the burdens of each of us. But let none of us forget the admonition we heard this morning in St. Matthew: By your fruits you shall be judged.

Shortly before President Nixon took office, Mr. Herbert Klein, his Director of Communications, said "Truth shall be the hallmark of this Administration." Truth, of course, should be the hallmark of the life of every man. But today at this service we look to the future, the essential question is: How do you define truth?

There are three sources we can turn to: If we turn to Webster's Dictionary, we would find truth defined as: "Honesty; veracity; fidelity; fact; conformity to rule or example; righteousness."

If we turn to the Bible, we find Jesus quoted as saying: "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

Or in the Book of Psalms: "Seek ye the truth and the truth shall make you free." There are endless Biblical citations. But there is another source to which each of us can turn; and it is a most important source: you. How do you define truth?

Let us, agree as to what truth is not.

Truth is not coming to church every Sunday to give a gratuity to God.

Truth is not letting money be your God, so that every act in your life puts the material before the spiritual.

Truth is not found in a bottle or in a needle.

To define truth we must accept four historical facts:

First: Christ was born into this life; He was a man's man in a man's world.

Second: Christ was the greatest dissenter of all time. He fought the establishment; and He won, for He knew How to dissent.

Third: Christ was a carpenter and He knew how to build.

Fourth: Christ faced adversity the likes of which make none of us worthy to "gather up the crumbs" under His or anyone else's table.

As our Lord said in this morning's scripture: "Everyone who hears these words of

mine and doeth them will be like a wise man who built his house upon the rock; and the rain fell, and the floods came and the winds blew and beat upon that house, but it did not fall, because it had been founded on the rock."

The key word in this parable is *Doeth*.

Truth, therefore, means:

A complete *acceptance and identification* with Christ, His life and His teachings;

Truth is an absolute integrity in your *own* faith and beliefs; and

Truth is a commitment to *Do* that in which you believe.

If you can accept this definition of truth, then your life, whatever your station, will take on a new dimension, a new meaning, a new purpose. And the "leaders of this and every land" will have the *knowledge* and the *will* and the *ability* to act:

When you see hunger and poverty, you will *act* to bring abundance;

When you see doubt, you will *act* to bring faith;

When you see despair, you will *act* to bring hope;

When you see sadness, you will *act* to bring comfort;

When you see darkness, you will *act* to bring light;

When you see hatred, you will *act* to bring love;

And when you see war, you will *act* to bring peace.

In this and only in this way, can you become a true, dedicated, committed Christian; an honest instrument of the Lord's will, a *true leader amongst leaders*.

The tasks facing us and the world are not easy; the road is full of obstacles. But remember to always: "Seek the truth; come whence it may, cost what it will."

And finally, as we march "forward together" let us never forget:

"Once to every man and Nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood,
For the good or evil side . . .
"Though the cause of evil prosper,
Yet 'tis Truth alone is strong;
Though her portion Be The scaffold,
And upon the throne be wrong,
Yet that scaffold sways the future;
And, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow,
Keeping watch above his own."

Let us pray.

HOG CHOLERA ERADICATION IN SIGHT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture proposed a ban on interstate shipment of all hog cholera vaccines effective March 1, 1969. This action, taken after consideration of the views of all interested parties, was hailed as an important step in the final phases of the hog cholera eradication program. Regrettably, due to procedural objections, the Department decided it was necessary to republish its regulations in the Federal Register on April 3, 1969, and hold new hearings. This proposal is the same as that published on November 20, except that its effective dates restricting interstate shipment of swine vaccines would be changed from September 1, 1969, to December 1, 1969. New hearings were held on April 15.

The hog cholera eradication program has passed the midpoint of its 10-year schedule. This program has been a record of success for Federal-State cooperation and has advanced progressively toward its goal of cholera eradication which will benefit a nationwide industry.

It is reported that in fiscal year 1962, hog cholera cost an estimated 70 cents per pig marketed, but that by fiscal year 1967, this cost had been reduced to an estimated 40 cents. This reduction is projected to reach 20 cents in fiscal year 1969. This savings is due to the reduction in hog cholera outbreaks and the decreasing reliance on vaccination, both attributed to program gains. Of course, these savings will be short-lived unless the program is carried out to the point where hog cholera cost is zero.

Vaccines were useful in the earlier stages of the eradication program when major efforts were needed to reduce the incidence of hog cholera. However, it has been found that the vaccine can cause the disease as well as prevent it. The Department of Agriculture informs me that 21 percent of the 849 outbreaks which occurred in fiscal 1968 were caused by vaccine.

The use of vaccines unfortunately creates immune carriers of the virus. Although the number of carrier animals is small, such a reservoir of infection cannot be tolerated if the disease is to be eradicated.

Since present eradication methods are effectively halting outbreaks before they reach epidemic proportion without resorting to use of vaccine, the risk of vaccines is no longer worth taking in States using these methods. Such methods were proven in North Dakota in 1967 and Georgia and Florida in 1968; each State experienced a rapid buildup in outbreaks over a short period of time. Although their swine population had become highly susceptible, these outbreaks were contained through the usual disease eradication procedures. No need for exceptional procedures, such as return to vaccine use, arose. Similar progress toward eradication has been made by many other States.

My home State of Nebraska, I know, has made excellent progress in eradicating hog cholera under the national hog cholera eradication program.

Nebraska has been in the eradication program since October 1967. The use of modified live virus vaccines and all other vaccines for the disease have been prohibited in Nebraska, and have not been used since the beginning of the program. During the first year of the program the total cost of losses in Nebraska from hog cholera was about \$98,000. This cost was divided between the State and Federal Government.

Under the Federal-State cooperative program, the owners of swine unfortunate enough to experience infection in their herds are indemnified by the program for the value of the animals ordered destroyed. Infected herds are ordered destroyed in order to prevent further spread of the disease.

Despite the occasional animal destruction, swine owners in Nebraska have been greatly benefited by the program because they no longer face the cost of vaccinating their animals. The saving in Nebraska as a result of not vaccinating swine for cholera has been in excess of \$1½ million since 1957.

One swine producer in Nebraska told me that he raises about 500 hogs per

year, and has not vaccinated a hog since 1967. His savings have amounted to about \$225 a year not counting the labor that is saved. Such savings can make a big difference to a producer faced with increasing costs of production.

The proposed regulations of the Department of Agriculture to prohibit the movement of modified live virus vaccines and of vaccinated swine would increase the benefits of the Nebraska program to the Nebraska swine industry. These regulations would be of real help in further reducing the possible exposure of our animals.

During the recent hearings of the Department on the regulations, the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and Economic Development was represented by Mr. I. W. Hember, Assistant State Veterinarian, and the Nebraska Swine Council Inc., was represented by its President Mr. Gerald Beattie. Both the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and the Nebraska Swine Council feel very strongly that hog cholera eradication in Nebraska can be accomplished much more readily if Nebraska animals are not exposed by movement in interstate commerce to modified live vaccine or swine that have been vaccinated. The effective way to accomplish this is to prohibit their movement, it is felt, in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, with unanimous consent I wish to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the statements of the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and the Nebraska Swine Council which were submitted at the USDA hearings on the hog cholera regulations on April 15.

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

The Nebraska Department of Agriculture strongly urges the adoption of the proposal to Amend Part 76 of Title 9 of the Federal Register relating to the interstate shipment of Hog Cholera Vaccine.

Nebraska is in Phase III of the Hog Cholera Eradication Program and adoption of this proposal will allow advancement in the program as well as protection of the status already attained.

Modified Live Virus is a constant threat to states in the final phases of Hog Cholera Eradication, and we have shown that outbreaks can be stopped without the use of vaccine by the prompt reporting and investigation of reported suspicious cases and by depopulation of all infected animals before they have an opportunity to infect additional herds. No vaccine has been permitted use in Nebraska since October, 1967.

Nebraska imports of swine number over 148,000 head annually and pigs farrowed on Nebraska farms number four and a half million annually—all of which are highly susceptible to infection if exposed to swine vaccinated with Modified Live Virus. If swine moving in commerce are permitted to be vaccinated with Modified Live Virus or come in contact with swine vaccinated with Modified Live Virus, the Nebraska Eradication Program will be jeopardized by such continued use through possible infection and through interference with recognized methods of diagnosis.

The Hog Cholera Eradication Program is saving the Nebraska swine industry one and one-half million dollars annually in vaccination costs alone.

We respectfully submit this statement to this body.

NEBRASKA SWINE COUNCIL, INC.,
April 11, 1969.

DIRECTOR,
Animal Health Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Federal Center Boulevard, Hyattsville, Md.

DEAR SIR: The Nebraska Swine Council is on record as supporting the interstate Hog Cholera Ban previously due to go into effect March 1, 1969 and the ban against interstate shipment after September 1, 1969 of swine vaccinated after March 1, 1969.

In nearly every instance, the cholera breaks in Nebraska have been traced to swine which have been shipped interstate either legally or otherwise from states still allowing vaccination.

The members of the Nebraska Swine Council feel that the proposed bans are an important step in eradicating hog cholera, as well as protecting the swine producers in those states which have voluntarily stopped cholera vaccination.

We can see no reason why these bans should be delayed and ask that they be put into effect immediately.

GERALD BEATTIE,
Nebraska Swine Council.

POLLUTION BY PESTICIDES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on May 19, the Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Environment of the Committee on Commerce will hold hearings to consider the effects of the use of pesticides on commercial and sport fisheries.

The subject is controversial. Evidence is accumulating to indicate that the widespread use of long-lived pesticides may lead to substantial hazards for certain species of animals—perhaps including man.

A summary of the wide variety of risks which may result from the use of chemical pesticides was published in the April 25 issue of the Conservation Foundation Newsletter. Since this subject is a matter of vital importance to each of us, I ask unanimous consent that the newsletter be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLLUTION BY PESTICIDES—SOME NOT VERY WELL CALCULATED RISKS

Pesticides, complex chemical compounds, pose a complex dilemma. They have caused incalculable damage to the world's fish and wildlife resources. They are causing serious and subtle changes in the environment. Indeed, they are under suspicion of endangering man himself. Yet man finds them tremendously useful in his struggle for health and survival.

For some 25 years, man has been concocting an astonishing assortment of synthetic chemical poisons and spreading them over the planet. In doing so, he has been taking some not very well calculated risks. He has been rebuked and warned for being careless, for not fully understanding the consequences. Some restrictions have been imposed; somewhat greater care is being taken; but man continues the liberal use of pesticides to wage war on the endless varieties of insects, bacteria, rodents and other small creatures which plague him so relentlessly—by attacking him directly, or by devouring much of his precious food and fiber supply.

To be sure, the widespread dissemination of pesticides has had extremely tangible benefits which, it is argued, would otherwise have been unattainable. Pesticides are credited with making life comfortable and nuisance-free, indoors and out. They are credited with saving countless lives through

the control of malaria, cholera, typhus, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, encephalitis and other diseases. And they are credited with helping man raise and protect an extraordinarily plentiful supply of inexpensive food.

The farm and chemical industries point to the crops and livestock saved from destruction, with values measured in the billions of dollars each year. Put another way, it has been estimated that for every dollar invested in protection by pesticides, between \$4 and \$5 worth of production is saved.¹

But the evidence also shows that, in the headlong rush to rely on expedient chemicals, many mistakes have been made and many safer alternatives have been passed up. There have often been unintended, damaging side effects, including heavy losses of fish and wildlife. Finally, the evidence suggests, at least, that man may be seriously harming himself in the process. Certainly he is taking risks. Dr. Robert L. Rudd, zoologist at the University of California at Davis, warned in a study for CF: "The appearance of new kinds of pesticides and of new and profound effects from those long in use has outpaced the rate at which their effects can be investigated."² Says Dr. William A. Niering, Connecticut College biologist: "We are obviously dealing with many biological unknowns in our widespread use of presumably 'safe' insecticides."³

How extensive is the use of pesticides? U.S. farmers last year spent an estimated \$800 million on them. Total domestic sales this year are forecast at \$1.7 billion, most for agriculture, but including \$255 million for household and garden use, \$255 million for industrial and institutional use.⁴ The \$1.7 billion represents a dramatic increase from the 1965 total of \$1 billion.

Other indications of increasing use: the percentage of corn acreage treated for insects or disease rose from 1% in 1952 to 33% in 1966; for tobacco crop land the increase was from 47% to at least 81%.⁵ In 1966, agricultural aircraft flew a million hours, spraying pesticides over 65 million acres.⁶ Many additional millions of acres—roadsides and utility rights-of-ways as well as crops—are treated with herbicides to stunt growth or control weeds.

There are some 900 basic chemical compounds used to formulate thousands of synthetic commercial pesticides. Classed according to purpose, these include insecticides, herbicides, miticides, fungicides and rodenticides. Most famous—or infamous—is the ubiquitous DDT. But there are many others—endrin, dieldrin, aldrin, chlordane, toxaphene, lindane, methoxychlor, heptachlor, parathion, malathion, 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T, captan, carbaryl, warfarin etc.

There are chlorinated hydrocarbons (DDT) organic phosphates (malathion), and carbamates (carbaryl). Their properties, effects, dosage and use vary widely. The crucial questions raised by the use of a pesticide are: Is it effective on the target insect? What other organisms does it kill? Is it dangerous to fish, wildlife, man?

A pesticide may or may not be highly toxic, or poisonous, on direct contact, to various living things. It may or may not be highly persistent, or resistant to being broken down by nature into harmless components. The insecticide parathion, for example, is extremely toxic. A user who spills some on his skin can expect to die soon afterwards, as has happened to thousands throughout the world. Yet it breaks down quickly in the environment. On the other hand, DDT is considered only slightly toxic to man; but it may persist for years, with consequences unknown.

SOME EFFECTS OF PESTICIDE USE

Many ill effects of pesticides on marine life and wildlife are well documented; the literature on the subject is voluminous. A sample of the findings:

Footnotes at end of article.

Experiments indicate that DDT in very small concentrations can reduce growth and photosynthesis in certain marine plankton. "Such single-celled algae are the indispensable base of marine food chains," says Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Jr., of State University of New York, Stony Brook. Photosynthesis by marine plankton is estimated to account for more than half of the world's oxygen supply—and some scientists theorize that we are already in an oxygen deficit situation. Wurster says that "interference with this process could have profound, worldwide biological implications."⁷

"Marine organisms, especially crustaceans," says Niering, "are extremely sensitive to the persistent pesticides. As little as 0.6 to 6 parts per billion (in the water) will kill or immobilize a shrimp population in two days."⁸ The Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries says tests show that "oysters stopped feeding and exhibited erratic shell movements when exposed to less than one part per million of many chlorinated hydrocarbons. Shell formations in oysters was inhibited by concentrations of a few parts per billion."⁹

Cases in which large numbers of fish have been killed are plentiful. The most celebrated, probably, were the massive kills in the lower Mississippi River from 1960-64.¹⁰ An elaborate investigation traced the cause to endrin, apparently from a chemical plant.¹¹

Nearly a million small coho salmon were killed recently because of DDT, says Dr. Howard E. Johnson and Charles Pecor of Michigan State University, who deduced that residues were accumulated in the egg yolk of adults, and their fry were poisoned during final absorption of the yolk sac.¹²

The widespread loss of robins and other birds—where elm trees are treated with DDT for Dutch elm disease—provides a simple example of "biological magnification," or the unique way in which "hard" or persistent pesticides can be concentrated in more and more potent doses as they move up the food chain. When leaves from a sprayed elm fall, they are eaten by earthworms. The DDT doesn't harm the worms; but it accumulates in their tissues. When robins eat the worms, they accumulate it in ever larger and finally lethal doses.¹³

The magnification process also occurs when minute quantities of a pesticide accumulate in tiny marine organisms, and are transferred in ever increasing amounts to plankton-eating fish, carnivorous fish and finally birds of prey. This is possible because pesticides such as DDT are almost totally insoluble in water, but very soluble in fat. So they accumulate and are stored in the fatty tissues of birds. When fat reserves are used up rapidly, such as in migration or reproduction, the poisons enter other parts of the system, apparently attacking the nervous system. Says Dr. Ralph A. MacMullan, director of the Michigan Department of Conservation: There is "strong circumstantial evidence" that this sort of magnification is responsible for the alarming decline of many species of birds such as the bald eagle, osprey, peregrine falcon and sparrow hawk.¹⁴

Oddly enough, such birds are not normally poisoned directly by the toxic pesticides. It is now widely believed that reproduction is severely hampered, because residues of pesticides such as DDT are transferred in lethal amounts to embryo birds via the egg yolk, or because the pesticides upset liver enzyme activity and therefore calcium metabolism, resulting in eggshells so thin embryo chicks cannot survive in them. Studies have also indicated that some birds become strangely nervous and aggressive and destroy their own eggs.

There have been innumerable cases in which frogs, snakes and birds, as well as wild and domestic animals—have been killed by pesticides, sometimes in massive numbers. Rachel Carson, in her eye-opening best-

seller *Silent Spring* (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962), cited dozens of instances. Many such kills are due to outright misuse, which of course greatly magnifies the dangers and damage of pesticides.

But knowledge, or communication of it to the right people, has not been sufficient to prevent misuse. We do not in fact yet know all the ways in which pesticide applications may be upsetting the balance of nature, though examples from the past are plentiful.

We do know that persistent pesticides are carried throughout the world by wind, water and living organisms. Often cited is the fact that even penguins in the Antarctic—so far from any pesticide use—contain residues of DDT. Dr. George M. Woodwell, an ecologist at Brookhaven National Laboratory, speaks of the "serious and subtle changes caused by continuous exposure to low levels of pesticides in the environment . . . that threaten to degrade the biota of the earth and especially the oceans in a very serious way."¹²

THE DILEMMA FOR MAN

The weight of expert opinion currently holds that humans are not *directly* harmed by careful use of pesticides. There is apparently no solid evidence of such harm. But practically every human accumulates some pesticides which, as in birds, are stored in body fat. In the U.S. the average is thought to be about 10 to 12 parts per million. (In some countries it is apparently much lower, in some much higher.) Scientists believe that man manages to get rid of pesticide accumulations over a certain level, given a reasonable amount of time.

Research on the long-term effects of pesticides on humans is virtually impossible; and it is extremely difficult to extrapolate research on animals to humans. So while there is no convincing evidence that pesticides seriously damage man, neither is there proof that they don't. In fact, there are ominous signs that some long-term surprises lie ahead. Some examples:

A number of scientific studies have linked pesticides and other chemical compounds with cancer. They have been thoroughly discussed at congressional hearings.¹¹ "The total number of pesticides capable of producing cancers in various organs and tissues of man and/or animals is appreciable," Dr. W. C. Hueper, former director of the National Cancer Institute, has said. He also had a comment for an industry scientist who claimed that "there is little likelihood that an epidemic-like occurrence of cancers will result in 10 to 30 years":

"He is distinctly whistling in the dark. The facts already on hand do not support such a soothing prophecy."¹¹

And in early March it was reported that preliminary analysis of a large-scale study of 130 such compounds—conducted for the Institute—indicates they are carcinogenic to mice (in very large doses). Pesticides are reportedly among the compounds under suspicion.¹⁰

Other reports suggest that pesticides are a genetic hazard to man, capable of producing mutations, which are usually harmful. Dr. James F. Crow of the University of Wisconsin says "there is reason to fear that some chemicals (including pesticides) may constitute as important a (mutagenic) risk as radiation, possibly a more serious one."¹⁷

Dr. Osny G. Fahmy of the Chester Beatty Research Institute in London says "the amount of pesticide chemicals man is now absorbing from his environment is enough to double the normal mutation rate."¹⁸ He says they are capable of disrupting the DNA molecule; the effects are cumulative; and the mutations may not show up for generations.³

Dr. Marvin Legator of the Food and Drug Administration says the widely used and relatively nontoxic fungicide captan breaks chromosomes in mammalian cell cultures and

may be capable of inducing mutations in man. Dr. M. Jacqueline Verrett, also of FDA, says such chemicals can cause birth deformities in chickens. (The chemical structure of some fungicides is similar to that of thalidomide, she notes.)¹⁹

Medical World News has reported that a great many genetics experts are concerned about mutagenic chemicals "as either a proved or at least a potential menace to human health . . . Most believe that direct evidence of a chemical's deleterious effect on man could be difficult or impossible to obtain—and incalculable damage could already have been done before it became apparent."²⁰

Dr. Richard M. Welch, a pharmacologist with the drug firm Burroughs Wellcome & Co., says sex hormones in rats are affected by enzymes activated by DDT, and the same hormones are found in man, whose residue of DDT is "within a range" to produce the same effect. "Thus, if one can extrapolate data from animals to man, then one would say that the changes in these enzymes probably do occur in man."²¹

Dr. Robert W. Risebrough of the University of California's Marine Resources Institute says consideration is not being given to the enzyme inducing ability of pesticides. "No responsible person could now get up here and say that this constant nibbling away at our steroids (sex hormones) is without any physiological effect. It would be irresponsible."²²

Very little is known about the possibilities of synergistic effects when different pesticides interact in man, or when a pesticide interacts with a medical drug. Tests have shown that a pair of chemical compounds in tandem may be more than 100 times as toxic as either one alone. Since the symptoms of pesticide poisoning are likely to be common to other diseases, diagnosis is difficult. Stanford University's Dr. Joshua Lederberg, a Nobel Prize winner, speaks of the way in which DDT and other compounds cause changes in the metabolism of the liver, adding that man "can therefore be expected to show a changed reaction to a number of other chemicals and drugs, even under conditions where the DDT alone shows little toxic effects. The long-term effects of such combinations are poorly understood."²³

Since pesticides interfere with drug metabolism, says Chicago pharmacologist Dr. Kenneth P. DuBois, they can have a marked effect on patients. He says that barbiturates, for example, are counteracted by DDT. "Such a counteraction has generally been written off by physicians as the patient's natural resistance to the drug."²⁴

None of these scientists claims to have *proved* any mass dire effects due to pesticides. But they are warning man that he should not be blind to the possibilities.

Man was surprised, after all, when he found that the drug thalidomide could cause children to be deformed; that cigarette smoking could cause cancer; that simple X-rays could cause a skin ailment that didn't show up for decades; or that amounts of radiation presumed to be safe could apparently cause tumors in children more than 10 years later.

More obvious are the effects of pesticide poisoning in household, occupational and industrial accidents. "Each year," says a government study, "approximately 150 deaths are attributed to misuse of pesticides in the United States. About half of these occur in children who were accidentally exposed at home."²⁵

It would be impossible to guess the number of non-fatal poisonings. But cases of occupational poisoning "have become more frequent," and "the adequacy of safeguards . . . is put in question by reviews of the effects of pesticides on human health."²⁶

In California alone in 1964, there were some 1,328 reports of occupational disease attributed to pesticides and other agricultural chemicals.²⁶ This has now become a major new issue in the long, bitter strike and boycott against California's table grape

growers. The union argues that many cases of poisoning are not reported, and many others are mistaken for other illnesses because the symptoms are so similar.²⁷ It has filed suit to halt the use of DDT in the state.

In Mexico, 17 were killed and some 600 made violently ill in 1967 when parathion contaminated bread supplies. A week later, a truck loaded with parathion overturned and spilled the deadly pesticide over a California highway. The pavement had to be ripped up to prevent death or injury.

THE IRONIES OF IT ALL

Aside from misuse and danger, the application of pesticides is likely to be fraught with irony and paradox—in fact, with failure.

In the first place, it should be noted that agriculture, particularly in the U.S., has tended to spread single crops over larger and larger areas, sometimes over thousands of acres. Such monoculture is efficient and economical. But it is also an invitation to pests which thrive on a particular crop, especially since their natural enemies may no longer find the area to their liking. Such invitations, of course, have been answered with massive invasions.

Perhaps the greatest irony in pesticide use is the destruction of beneficial insects and rodents in addition to the target species. (There has been some limited success in developing pesticides with narrow, specific effects.) Thus the victims are likely to include the very natural enemies which have been holding the target pest in check. There are many cases in which pest populations have burgeoned anew as a result.² Sometimes the destruction of parasites and predators simply clears the field for a surge of *several* new crop pests, compounding the problem of control.

Says Wurster: "DDT is like a drug. The more you use it, the more you need to use it."²¹

A second irony is that pests have a perverse tendency to develop resistance to the poisons man lavishes on them. Says a congressional report: "When a pest population, reproducing rapidly, is exposed to a lethal chemical, the laws of natural selection are dramatically demonstrated. The variety of genetic makeup, even within a single species, means that some insects in the population will have a biochemical mechanism for resistance and a new population will build up, unaffected . . ."²⁸

Then there is an inclination to increase the dosage, or shift to another, perhaps more poisonous chemical, to kill off this tougher breed. But the report cautions that "there appears to be no toxicant powerful enough to kill every member of a large population."²⁸

There's another kind of "resistance." For example, Professor Walter Ebeling and Donald A. Reiersen of UCLA write of cockroaches that learn to avoid hazardous insecticides even after the first contact, with the result that the most toxic substances may be the least effective.²⁹

A further problem, even when spraying is done carefully, is drift. Winds frequently carry a pesticide many miles from the target area, fouling another's land. Thus, alfalfa and other crops have often been inadvertently contaminated, and many a dairyman has had his milk barred from the market because its pesticide content was too high. (Farmers in this predicament often receive indemnity payments from U.S. taxpayers.)

Typical of the farmers' dilemma is this comment in the Wisconsin Farm Bureau's newspaper: "On one hand, dairymen have been penalized when a trace of the chemical (DDT) is found in milk. On the other, vegetable, field crop and fruit growers have found no substitute for the compound in assuring a crop for market."

There is a similar dilemma because many crops and orchards depend heavily on bees to pollinate them. But, says Ward Stranger, extension apiarist at the University of Cali-

Footnotes at end of article.

fornia: "Honey bees are exposed to a great variety of pesticides . . . Approximately 19% (76,000 colonies) of California's bees used for pollination were killed by pesticides in 1967. This is more than twice the kill reported in 1963. In addition, hives of bees are damaged to such an extent that they are no longer productive or effective pollinators."³⁰

So one farmer's meat may be another's poison.

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

Foreign countries are fertile ground for the sale of pesticides. They are often desperate to increase agricultural production, or protect their crops from insects and rodents. Much of their pesticide use is to control malaria. Says Dr. Ray F. Smith of the University of California, "in many countries nearly 100% of the pesticides used go onto cotton." (In fact, half of those used in the U.S. are for cotton crops.)³¹

The United States produces an estimated two-thirds of the world's supply of pesticides. Of some 900 million pounds manufactured in 1967, more than 400 million pounds were exported. The value (at the manufacturing level) was \$195.7 million, up 13% from 1966.³²

Moreover, the chief federal law controlling the registration and labeling of pesticides in the U.S. does not apply to exports. Thus pesticides could be marketed and used abroad in varieties and doses considered unfit in this country.

The catalog of mistakes in international pest control is long. A classic case occurred in the Canete Valley in Peru where, says Professor Teodoro Boza Barducci, the progressive use of a wide variety of pesticides on the cotton crop proved to be "disastrous." For one thing, after temporary control of the primary pest insect, resistance developed and it returned along with six new insects that needed control. Damage to the crops was extremely heavy, with a 50% loss in one year.³³

A number of experts have spoken of the great publicity and promotion used to market pesticides in foreign countries and encourage their heavy use. They also tell of the resistance of farmers to using other methods recommended by scientists. Says Smith: "This is the case everywhere in the world. They don't change until there is a crisis that forces them to do it."³⁴

Then there is the problem of misuse and misapplication, perhaps more serious in underdeveloped countries because of more limited literacy and education (the fine print on labels is a challenge to anyone), fewer technical and legal safeguards, and less effective or immediate medical attention in case of exposure. As an extreme example, for a time Japan alone had several hundred fatalities a year attributed to accidental parathion poisoning. Then there was this report from Rome not long ago:

"City health workers wearing rubber suits and gas masks filled a crowded market with white, stinging insecticide spray today, poisoning 13 persons, who were sent to a hospital. Merchants who have stalls in the market said they had asked the city to spray the area but had meant after the market closed."³⁵

The Russians, too, have their problems with pesticides. These have been discussed by Harry Rothman of Manchester University, who cites in particular a case in August 1966, when a wasteland area 30 miles from Yaroslavl was sprayed with a herbicide to increase the amount of meadowland—despite warnings of the dangers to wildlife. The result was the death not only of many birds, but 27 rare and highly-prized elk. This and other elk kills, he indicates, have galvanized concern in the USSR.³⁶

Smith warns that some cotton-growing nations in Central and South America "are on the brink of disaster through misuse of pesticides." He says "the possibilities of a

cotton crop failure . . . are very great in the next year or two if current practices are not modified. The possible social and political implications are many, especially when one considers that over 30% of the export dollars for countries like Guatemala and Nicaragua come from the sale of cotton fiber. It is no exaggeration to say that pest control advice which leads to an economic calamity may topple a government."³⁷

There is no telling what the future may hold. For instance, recent research indicates the possibility that the insecticide lindane, much of which is used in vaporizers, is far more toxic when exposure is linked with malnutrition, and perhaps should be used with particular care—or not at all—in countries where the diet is low in protein.³⁸ Other studies indicate similar links for other pesticides.

Clifton E. Wharton, Jr., vice president of the Agricultural Development Council, warns of possible dangers in the widespread use of the new highly productive varieties of grain. "Large tracts planted in one of the new varieties may be susceptible to disease and infestation which could cause massive losses. Heretofore . . . heterogeneity provided a built-in protection . . ." He also notes that such losses to thousands of farmers are "far more likely to be blamed on the producers and spreaders of the miracle seed than on Fate."³⁹

TO BAN OR NOT TO BAN, THAT'S THE QUESTION IN WISCONSIN

Rarely has there been a dispute over pesticides as hearty and full-blown as that now going on in Wisconsin. Rarely have the issues been more sharply and vigorously drawn.

The scene of the dispute is Madison, where the Department of Natural Resources is holding administrative hearings on a petition to ban the use of DDT in the state. The Department has jurisdiction over the state's water quality standards, and can prohibit the use of a pollutant which reaches the water and causes health problems or "acute or chronic (injury) to animal, plant or aquatic life."

The petition was filed by the Citizens Natural Resources Association, which was joined by several other conservation groups. CNRA also invited help from the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., an organization founded in the fall of 1967 for the purpose of bringing environmental issues to a legal test. The result, at the first stage of the hearings last December and January, was a strong indictment of DDT by a formidable array of expert witnesses, bolstered by EDF's attorney, Victor J. Yannacone, Jr.

This attack, said the Wall Street Journal on March 4, "seemingly caught (the pesticide industry) off balance." But the industry expects to make a full-scale effort to rebut when the hearings resume. This is scheduled for April 29.

The anti-DDT case rested to a great extent on damage to fish and wildlife. The industry—led by a DDT task force organized by the National Agricultural Chemicals Association—has made some attempts to mock its opponents, but in its rebuttal is expected to emphasize the benefits of pesticide use and the lack of evidence that they harm man.

Though the issues are limited to Wisconsin, to DDT and to water pollution, the nature of the hearings and the publicity they have spawned have created nationwide interest. The outcome is seen as an important precedent for other states whichever way it goes. Both sides have indicated that they would appeal a loss to the courts.

(Meanwhile, on April 16, the Michigan Agriculture Commission moved to cancel the registration of DDT for all uses in the state. This would make the sale of DDT illegal in the state.)

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Restoring the Quality of Our Environment*, Report of Environmental Pollution Panel, President's Science Advisory Committee, 1965.

² *Pesticides and the Living Landscape*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

³ *BioScience*, September 1968.

⁴ *Farm Chemicals*, January 1969.

⁵ *Extent of Farm Pesticide Use on Crops in 1966*, Agricultural Economic Report No. 147, U.S. Department of Agriculture, October 1968.

⁶ *The Pesticide Review 1968*, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, USDA, December 1968.

⁷ *Biological Conservation*, January 1969.

⁸ *Garden Journal*, November-December 1968.

⁹ Testimony before Senate Commerce Committee, May 17, 1968.

¹⁰ *Nuclear Information*, May 1964.

¹¹ Hearings of Senate Government Operations subcommittee on reorganization and international organizations, 1963-64.

¹² Address to 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, 1969.

¹³ Conference on the ecological aspects of international development, sponsored by CF and the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems, Warrenton, Virginia, December 8-11, 1968.

¹⁴ *The Case Against Hard Pesticides*, Michigan Department of Conservation.

¹⁵ Letter to Washington Post, June 2, 1968.

¹⁶ Washington Post, April 17, 1969.

¹⁷ *Scientist and Citizen*, June-July 1968.

¹⁸ *New York Times*, May 4, 1967.

¹⁹ *New York Times* May 7, 1967.

²⁰ *Medical World News*, April 26, 1968.

²¹ Testimony before Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, December 1968.

²² Washington Post, January 4, 1969.

²³ *World Medicine*, January 10, 1968.

²⁴ *The Use of Pesticides*, President's Science Advisory Committee, May 15, 1963.

²⁵ *The Pesticide Problem*, Resources For The Future, 1967.

²⁶ *Occupational Disease in California Attributed to Pesticides and Other Agricultural Chemicals*, California Department of Public Health, 1964.

²⁷ *New York Times*, March 16, 1969.

²⁸ *Interagency Environmental Hazards Coordination*, Senate Report No. 1379, Senate Government Operations subcommittee on reorganization and international organizations, July 21, 1966.

²⁹ *California Agriculture*, February 1969.

³⁰ *Congressional Record*, February 24, 1969.

³¹ *United Press International*, October 19, 1968.

³² *Journal of the Soil Association*, January 1969.

³³ *Archives of Environmental Health*, August 1968.

³⁴ *Foreign Affairs*, April 1968. *For Further Information: Pesticides and Pollution*, Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1969, \$4. Fish and wildlife legislation hearings before House Merchant Marine and Fisheries subcommittee on fisheries and wildlife conservation, March 14, 1968. *Pest Control*, edited by Wendell W. Kilgore and Richard L. Douth, Academic Press, New York, 1967, \$19.50. *Review of the Persistent Organochlorine Pesticides*, British Ministry of Agriculture, 1964, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 4s 6d. *Mass Insect Control Programs: Four Case Histories*, a CF study by William L. Brown, Jr., 1961.

THE PROPOSED JOB CORPS SUSPENSION

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I understand that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on April 29 ordered favorably reported Senate Resolution 183, which urges that all action to shut down Job Corps installations be suspended un-

til the Congress completes its authorization and appropriations action on this program.

The Koko Head Job Corps Center has been ordered closed by the Department of Labor. It is my understanding that a team of Labor Department experts has just returned from a factfinding trip to our Job Corps center and it has been reliably reported that this team has recommended the retention of this Job Corps center. Undoubtedly a final decision will be made in this matter in the next few days. I urge that primary consideration be given to the object of our concern—Job Corps trainees and, of course, to the Job Corps personnel who provide their training. Should a decision be made to change the present designation from a conservation camp to an urban skills or so-called minicenter, I hope that every effort will be made to provide a continuity of training for the Job Corps members themselves. It would be a cruel injustice indeed if this Job Corps center was temporarily closed only to be reopened later as a minicenter with a new group of enrollees but with no provision made for those enrollees who were unable to complete their training because of the premature shutdown. I am hopeful that the Department of Labor will weigh these considerations with great care, and I am also hopeful that decision to retain the Koko Head Job Corps Camp and its satellite camps can be made in the near future.

While the news that the Job Corps center in my own State may be retained is most heartening, I am still deeply concerned with the precipitate closing of the other Job Corps camps throughout the Nation. I, therefore, hope that the Nixon administration will reconsider its decision and wait until the Congress has had an opportunity to complete its normal authorization and budgetary processes, as expressed in Senate Joint Resolution 183, which I joined other Senators in sponsoring.

THE U.S. WHEAT SITUATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, March 26, 1969, marked the third annual congressional breakfast sponsored by three organizations, Great Plains Wheat, Inc.; Western Wheat Associates, U.S.A., Inc.; and National Association of Wheat Growers; all concerned with improving the lot of wheat farmers.

On this occasion, one of the speakers was a personal friend of mine, Mr. Carl Dumler, a prominent wheat farmer from my home county, Russell County, Kans. Mr. Dumler has long been active in promoting the best interests of wheat farmers. Because of the effective manner in which he presented the problems facing our wheat farmers at this time, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRICE COMPETITIVENESS

(Remarks by Carl Dumler, President, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., at the third annual congressional breakfast sponsored by Great Plains Wheat, Inc.; Western Wheat Associates, USA, Inc.; National Association of

Wheat Growers; Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969)

Senator Goodell, distinguished Senators and Congressmen, and fellow wheat producers. Like most people today, we farmers are prone to complain about our problems while taking many of our blessings for granted. Before I go any further, I would like to take note of one of our blessings—these gentlemen of the Congress who have made a special effort to visit us this morning and the interest they express in our problems by their attendance. Thank you, gentlemen, for attending.

The year since our last meeting here in Washington, however, has really not been one with many blessings to count in the export market, let alone take for granted. It has been a crucial year with many factors combining to send U.S. Wheat exports sliding downhill. Shipments of wheat from July 1 to the end of February were down more than 40 per cent compared to the same period last year. I will discuss here new barriers which have faced U.S. Wheat this year.

Of immediate concern is the dock strike, resolved in some areas, continuing to stifle export movement in others. The strike has taken its toll in our exports. Up to the end of December, U.S. shipments for dollars showed a gain of more than 461,000 bushels compared to the same period last year. These same dollar shipments, however, have now slipped into a 14 per cent deficit since the beginning of the dock strike.

Another deterrent to sales was the embargo initiated by Japan. Shipments to this leading cash customer are off about 25 per cent. We are pleased that shipments have been resumed and the important role played by marketing organizations in the negotiations leading to the lifting of the ban.

But the principle barrier to U.S. Wheat exports has been the loss of price competitiveness. Precipitating this crisis has been an abundant world supply of wheat. The fears of world starvation a few years ago have now been replaced by concern of oversupply. Wheat production soared in the major food-deficit countries last year. Coupled with recent high levels of production in the developed countries, world wheat output has surpassed the 10-billion-bushel level, something like the four-minute mile in track, for the last three years. This year's production set a record at 10.8 billion bushels.

Also influencing the loss of price competitiveness has been the International Grains Agreement. The wheat marketing organizations supported the I.G.A., providing we could remain competitive in our traditional markets. This we have not been able to do. In fact, we have had to price below the IGA minimum in order to make sales. And we have lost sales because of this non-competitiveness.

For instance, Brazil issued a worldwide tender for 100,000 tons on October 23. The United States sold 75,000 tons. To make this sale, however, we had to price our wheat 10 cents per bushel below the IGA minimum. And in spite of being below the minimum, Argentina, whose IGA pegged price at the Gulf is the same as the United States, offered at three cents per bushel below our price and sold 25,000 tons. Other f.o.b. offers were received from Australia at six cents under the U.S. price, France at 21 cents under and Spain at 17 cents under. Romania offered wheat at the same price as the United States.

Also, the United Kingdom estimated a need for 500,000 to 700,000 tons of filler wheat this year. We have not been able to take advantage of this opportunity because our wheat has been priced 10 to 15 cents per bushel higher than wheat offered by the EEC, Sweden, Spain, Bulgaria and Romania.

A French sale was made to Turkey at more than 12 cents per bushel under the I.G.A. minimum due to freight interpretations of the agreement. This again prevented a possible U.S. sale.

Other freight interpretations and quality up-grading of I.G.A. pegged wheats has made the United States non-competitive in many areas. Non-member wheats are being priced under U.S. wheat. For instance, Russian 441 is priced at more than \$2.00 per ton under Hard Red Winter, 13.5 per cent protein, in Rotterdam and Russian SKS, 14 per cent protein, is about \$4.80 per ton under U.S. Spring, 14 per cent protein, in the United Kingdom around the first of March.

The facts clearly show the United States is not price competitive in many of our traditional markets. And we must be competitive if we are to sell. Our wheat exports can bounce back with an aggressive price competitiveness program through the coordinated efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, grain trade and producers.

EDITORIAL COMMENDATION OF SENATOR ANDERSON

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a recent edition of the American Farm Bureau Federation's Newsletter contained an editorial entitled "Copy Success," written by Donald T. Donnelly. The article was written to offer advice to the new Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Clifford Hardin.

In the course of his writing, Mr. Donnelly paid great tribute to our colleague from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), who is a former Secretary of Agriculture.

I commend its reading to Senators as a deserving commendation to Senator ANDERSON for his outstanding work in the field of agriculture and for his profound insight into the responsibilities of the legislative branch of our Government.

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

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

[From the American Farm Bureau Federation's News Letter, Jan. 20, 1969]

FOOD FOR THOUGHT: COPY SUCCESS

(By Donald T. Donnelly)

The new Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Clifford M. Hardin, who takes office today, is getting a great deal of advice as he begins his new work in Washington.

I can think of no one better qualified to advise the Secretary than a man who held the same position under comparable conditions, Senator Clinton P. Anderson (D.) of New Mexico.

Mr. Anderson had been a member of the House of Representatives before he joined President Truman's cabinet in 1945. In the 1946 election the Republicans gained control of both Houses of Congress, and the Administration faced a situation where members of the other party controlled the Legislative Branch. Because the Secretary of Agriculture had a thorough understanding of the legislative process, he made some wise decisions in a period which could have been a very trying one for a man of less experience.

Mr. Anderson recalled the events of 1947 and 1948 in an address at Michigan State University in February, 1961, when he appeared on the platform with four other former Secretaries of Agriculture. Here are his words:

"The first thing a Cabinet member must understand—and never forget—is that he is a part of 'the administration.' This means he is an integral part of the Executive Branch of government. He is held accountable indirectly through the President of the United States rather than directly by the voters.

"As a consequence, he is subject to all the pressures that come to focus on the Execu-

tive Branch of government. And, because the President is the unquestioned captain of the Executive team—and each Cabinet member serves at the will and pleasure of the President—the eventual impact of these pressures on a Cabinet officer is essentially the same in their effect as they are on the President himself.

"This is in sharp contrast to the function of Congress—and the role of the individual members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

"With the exception of the conduct of foreign affairs, the Congress has the primary policy-making function in our government. You have no doubt heard the expression, 'The President proposes—the Congress disposes.' The drafters of the Constitution wisely provided that it be this way.

"Initially, members of the Congress get permission of the voters in their respective districts, or states, to represent them. Then each member of Congress is held personally accountable at each subsequent election for his acts of commission or omission.

"All citizens should understand that the Secretary of Agriculture is primarily an 'administrative officer' in the Executive Branch of government. I'm afraid there is widespread confusion on this point. I sincerely hope the appearance on this program of five former administrative heads of this particular government agency—the U.S. Department of Agriculture—doesn't divert attention from where the primary responsibility for government farm policy determination really rests—namely, with the Congress and the farmers' own organization.

"In 1949 I stated my attitude on the role of farm organizations in farm policy formulation as follows:

"I want to see farm legislation developed by farmers through their own farm organizations in cooperation with the members of Congress who are sincerely interested in the long-time interests of farmers and who are determined to fit a sound farm program into our free enterprise system."

"In preparation for my participation in today's program, I reread the hearings conducted in 1947-48 by the Senate and House committees on agriculture.

"In retrospect I'm glad that my testimony, and that of my associates in the USDA, reflected our clear realization that, although the Department could and should make recommendations, the responsibility for making policy rests squarely on the Legislative Branch of the government—the Congress.

"I sincerely believe that our clear-cut recognition of this important concept was one of the main reasons that the testimony of the general farm organizations in 1947-48 reflected substantial agreement on post-war price support policy. Instead of coming forth with a specific plan, I insisted that the Congress and the general farm organizations shoulder their rightful responsibility in policy formulation. This they did. The Agricultural Act of 1948—that part which was not a plain one-year extension of existing law—providing for price supports related to the supply-demand situation and a modernized parity formula, was the direct outgrowth of these efforts. It is a shame that this legislation wasn't allowed to become operative at the time of its passage. Many subsequent surplus problems would have been avoided—or substantially reduced."

Senator Anderson's good judgment caused the people of New Mexico to send him to the United States Senate in 1949. As a member of that body he took leadership in developing the Agricultural Act of 1949, known as the Alken-Anderson Act.

His successors in office have not always followed his example in seeking to keep "the responsibility for making policy" squarely on the Legislative Branch of government. This

may be why none of them has been elected to Congress and why no major farm law is named for any of them.

State and Country Farm Bureaus seeking to improve and expand their activities have been well advised to "Copy Success." The results are gratifying.

Senator Anderson is too modest a man to advise Secretary Hardin to "Copy Success." But if he did, the advice would be excellent. And if this advice were followed the results likely would be gratifying.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in recent months, a number of important investigations of inefficiency and waste in the Federal Government have been published. A study by the independent Congressional Quarterly, June 28, 1968 for example, estimated that \$10.8 billion could be eliminated from the Department of Defense budget with no lowering of the level of national security. A report by Richard Stubbings, of the Bureau of the Budget, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1969, pages 3171-3176, presented hard evidence that many of our most costly weapons systems perform at a level substantially below expectation. It also indicated that those systems whose production generated the greatest profits displayed the largest performance shortfall. A paper by Robert Benson, Washington Monthly, March 1969, presented evidence that a \$9.2 billion reduction in the defense budget could be achieved without loss of military capability. Benson, a former Defense Department official, argued that over one-half of this waste is attributable to inefficient manpower management by the Pentagon.

Over the past year, the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, has encountered numerous instances of inconsistent, uneconomic practices in Federal agencies. These have dealt with both military procurement matters and the application of discounting analysis to proposed investments throughout the Government. The existence of cost overruns entailing unexpected expenditures of billions of dollars and the construction of public works projects which return far less production for society than comparable private investments are now well documented.

In the past few days, yet another report giving evidence to the inefficiency of Government practices has appeared. This survey was prepared by Mr. Louis Cassels, of United Press International. On the basis of a month-long investigation, Mr. Cassels estimates that "at least \$10 billion and probably much more than that" is being wasted each year by the Federal Government. Mr. Cassels concludes that the elimination of this waste is a major responsibility of the planning-programming-Budgeting System now being developed in the executive branch. I could not agree more with this conclusion.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cassels' article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 23, 1969]

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIVE REPORT: U.S. BUDGET WASTE TAB: \$10-TO-\$30 BILLION A YEAR; SPENDING BY HUNCH, PORK BARREL AND A PRAYER

(By Louis Cassels)

The U.S. government is wasting huge sums—at least \$10 billion a year and probably much more than that—by spending money blindly.

That is the conclusion of a month-long investigation of Federal budgetary practices by United Press International.

The inquiry which ranges from the White House to Capitol Hill and into numerous departments and agencies disclosed that:

Little progress has been made in applying to civilian agencies the system introduced in the Pentagon by former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, under which program decisions are supposed to be based on objective analysis of costs and results.

Even in the Defense Department, systematic analysis thus far has been applied mainly to new weapons systems and has had very limited impact on the bulk of military spending.

As a result, most Federal spending decisions—military and civilian—are still being made on the basis of hunches, hopes and pork barrel politics rather than hard facts.

Costly programs, once launched, are continued or expanded year after year, without sufficient effort being made to determine whether they are actually achieving their supposed objectives.

The government's left hand often doesn't know—or care—what its right hand is doing. It is not unusual to find 8 to 10 different agencies working in the same field with little or no coordination. This leads to overlapping and duplication of programs, and in some cases to such spectacles as one government agency spending money (\$30 million) to subsidize tobacco farmers while another government agency is trying (with \$8 million) to discourage cigaret smoking.

In military procurement particularly, and to a lesser extent in social programs, the government gets locked into long-term commitments running into many billions of dollars thru "foot-in-the-door" programs that cost little at first but a great deal later. In some cases, Congress legislates without demanding adequate information about ultimate costs. In others, it's misled by flagrant underestimates of what certain programs or weapons systems eventually will cost.

It is impossible for anyone to tell exactly how many of the taxpayers' dollars are being wasted—or spent ineffectively—because of haphazard spending policies.

"The horrible truth," said a high career official of the General Accounting Office, "is that neither the President nor Congress nor anyone else really knows enough about what the government is doing, and what results its programs are achieving to speak with certainty about how much waste there is in our \$200 billion a year Federal budget."

Pressed for an estimate, he said \$20 billion to \$30 billion a year would be a "realistic guess."

The more rational approach was supposedly introduced throughout the government in August, 1965, when President Lyndon B. Johnson announced, with considerable fanfare, that he had ordered all major Federal agencies to adopt the so-called "Programming-Planning-Budgeting" (PPB) System which Mr. McNamara pioneered at the Pentagon.

Mr. Johnson said the new approach to budgeting "will enable us to fulfill the needs of the American people without waste . . . because we will be able to make sounder decisions than ever before."

Under the PPB system, Federal agencies are supposed to follow a series of analytical

steps in determining how much money they need from Congress. Step No. 1 is to identify an objective as clearly and precisely as possible. Step No. 2 is to consider alternative ways of achieving the objective, comparing them in terms of their relative cost and effectiveness.

Step No. 3 is to choose the alternative which promises to accomplish the most for the money. Step No. 4 is to follow up a program after it is in operation, to measure its actual results and make sure it's working out as expected.

Advocates of PPB have developed some rather sophisticated techniques for analyzing the "cost-effectiveness ratio" of an existing or proposed program. However, the reliability of these techniques is a subject of dispute among economists.

Some critics, such as Prof. Frederick C. Mosher of the University of Virginia, contend the system will never work well because many government decisions entail considerations that cannot be reduced to quantitative terms.

Because PPB would bring under analytical scrutiny all Federal activities—even the sacred cow programs dearest to bureaucrats and politicians—the introduction of the system into civilian agencies has not been hailed with universal glee here.

A survey of 25 major Federal departments and agencies showed that all of them now have at least some machinery for systematic analysis.

But the survey turned up only three civilian agencies which are making more than token use of systematic analysis in planning, reviewing and revising their programs. These are the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), the Agriculture Department and the Labor Department. Even in these agencies, PPB is still in its infancy.

OVERLAP, DUPLICATION AND CONTRADICTION

The biggest cause of government waste, in the opinion of many Administration and congressional officials, is the long-standing practice on drafting appropriations bills on an agency-by-agency basis.

Until very recently, no serious attempt was made at the White House or Congress to look at government spending on a functional basis—that is, to examine simultaneously and critically all of the things that are being done by all Federal agencies in a particular field.

This lack of overview may not have been a particularly serious matter in years past, when society was simpler, the government less active, and the lines of responsibility more clearly drawn.

Today, however, there is scarcely a single major government function that does not cut across department or agency lines. A recent survey by the Senate Government Operations Committee showed that 10 agencies are involved in manpower programs; 18 agencies are conducting programs to improve the natural environment; and 20 have something to do with health.

Daniel P. Moynihan, President Nixon's chief adviser on urban affairs and a veteran of two Democratic administrations, says the government now has so many programs spread thru so many agencies it is hard for policy makers "just to keep up with what is going on," let alone achieve any kind of true co-ordination.

As a freshman member of Congress, Rep. William V. Roth Jr., R-Del., was profoundly shocked last year to discover that no one here could tell him how many Federal aid programs are currently in operation.

He set out to make his own list. After eight months of patient interrogation of individual agencies, he managed to identify 1,050 separate programs under which Federal money is given or loaned to states, cities, institutions or individuals.

Rep. Roth has neither the staff nor the authority to determine how much overlapping and duplication there is in this welter

of Federal activity. But he figures there's bound to be a lot when—to cite just one field as an example—15 agencies are dispensing funds thru 211 separate programs to support higher education.

Specific cases of overlap, duplication and even direct contradiction between Federal programs come to light often enough to indicate that Rep. Roth has sound grounds for this suspicion.

Item: The House Appropriations Committee, investigating the Government's marine science activities (on which 11 agencies spend nearly \$500 million a year), found the Coast and Geodetic Survey preparing to explore underwater manganese deposits which had only recently been extensively and expensively studied by the Geological survey.

Item: The Department of Health, Education and Welfare will spend \$8 million this year on efforts to discourage smoking, while the Agriculture Department will spend \$30 million to subsidize the growing of tobacco.

Item: The Air Force is spending about \$600 million a year on its "Manned Orbiting Laboratory" project which is strikingly similar to the spacecraft program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Critics charge that the manned orbiting laboratory was put into the budget solely to gratify the Air Force's desire for a piece of the action in space research.

One of the cardinal principles of systematic analysis is that spending decisions should be based on a careful calculation of what a program will cost over the long run, rather than during its first year or two of operation, when it is just getting under way.

Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, charged that the armed forces have persistently misled Congress about the ultimate costs of new weapons systems, such as the Antiballistic Missile (ABM) now under consideration.

Sen. Proxmire said his committee's hearings have established that the Air Force's new C15 airplane "will probably cost the American taxpayer \$2 billion more than the original contract ceiling of \$3 billion."

Sen. Proxmire said the Pentagon's "notorious" readiness to permit a military contractor to double or triple his original price tag has encouraged the practice of "buy-in bidding" which a firm deliberately enters an absurdly low bid in order to obtain a defense contract, and then puts in a whopping claim for "unexpected" extra costs.

He said the Pentagon could stop "buy-in bidding" in a hurry if it began slapping severe penalties on contractors whose costs run far higher than the original estimate.

Efforts are being made, both in the Administration and in Congress, to provide government decision makers with more of the kind of information they must have to make sound choices about spending.

The Budget Bureau has instituted an "overview" system under which activities will be grouped for bureau review by function rather than merely by agency. This means, for example, that manpower programs of all agencies eventually will be examined by one section of the bureau, all education programs by another, and so on.

The House Appropriations Committee chairman, Rep. Mahon, has introduced a resolution that would require every congressional committee, when recommending creation or expansion of any Federal program, to submit cost estimates for the first five years of its operation. This could help Congress avoid getting mousetrapped by "foot in the door" programs.

Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, wants Congress to establish a "government program evaluation commission." It would be similar to the Hoover Commission, Rep. Mills said, but would study the substance rather than just the efficiency of each Federal activity, seeking to identify redundant and inefficient programs.

All of these initiatives will encounter quiet but formidable opposition from people, in and out of government, who fear that rational analysis might lead to drastic cutbacks or even elimination of their pet programs. This opposition, being intense and focused, is likely to prevail over the rather diffuse public interest in reducing waste—unless or until the long-suffering American taxpayer really sees red.

FIRST BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CONSUMER WRITINGS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the publication of the first bibliography of consumer writings.

Published by the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, the volume for the first time pulls together in one place titles of more than 2,000 books, booklets, pamphlets, and films in the consumer area.

Its value to a cross section of the population—from individual consumer to professional consumerist—is self-evident.

The pages of my copy, I know, soon will be well worn, as I use it both as an aid to the father of eight and as an elected official.

Anyone wishing a copy may obtain it for 65 cents from the Government Printing Office. Those few pennies, I think, could lead to considerable savings for most of us.

THE SECOND DECADE FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, Prof. John L. Hazard, of Michigan State University, delivered a thoughtful and informative address at a meeting held in Washington by the Council of Lake Erie Ports. Professor Hazard, who is an expert in the field of transportation, has made an in-depth study of the utilization of the St. Lawrence Seaway during its first 10 years of operation. His analysis pointed out the major problems which have confronted this great international waterway as well as its lasting accomplishments and values.

Of special significance are Professor Hazard's comments on the emerging issues and various alternatives which must be faced, both in the next few years and during following decades, if the Seaway is to realize its full potential. In order that this excellent presentation of the current and future role of this primary transportation artery for the economic heartland of the North American Continent may be available to Members of Congress and the public in general, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECOND DECADE OF THE SEAWAY

As the second decade of the Seaway approaches, three questions emerge for timely consideration and decision.

1. How well has the Seaway been utilized?
2. What issues will require decision during the second decade?
3. What major alternatives and avenues are open for positive regional response?

In this context, it will be well to clarify terms of reference and my conceptual framework. The Seaway is a deep-water dimension

to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence System—instrumental but not active or self-fulfilling. The primary purpose of the Seaway is the development of Midcontinent commerce and early self-liquidation is of secondary importance. The Midcontinent is the economic heartland of the United States and Canada and its economic growth is beneficial to both nations and not necessarily inimical to other sections. Canada and the United States are the largest trading partners and most formidably integrated economies in the world and one does not grow at the expense of the other. These conceptions may appear incredibly naive in view of recent reports, but I shall stick with them for the time being.

SEAWAY UTILIZATION

Overseas tonnage moving directly out of U.S. lake ports has increased rapidly to almost 11 million tons. Overseas cargoes averaged around 250 thousand tons in the early 1950's, doubled to 500 thousand tons in the late 1950's, and shot up to almost 4 million tons in the single year of 1959, virtually engulfing the unprepared lake ports. Subsequent growth has been rapid, averaging over 25 percent per year to 1966, then leveling off in 1967 and 1968, when strikes interrupted traffic movements. Despite the remarkable growth in lake port tonnage, the total represents only a nominal part of U.S. waterborne trade (2.5 percent) and constitutes in total less tonnage than the annual increase in U.S. waterborne trade (14 million tons) since the opening of the Seaway. It also constitutes but a small proportion of the foreign trade moving to and from the Midcontinent hinterland. Canadian lake ports contributed a balance 3.6 million tons of direct overseas commerce and a good deal more to the tonnage transhipped through eastern Canadian river ports. Canadian overseas commerce, though less than that of U.S. lake ports, has grown more rapidly. It also constitutes a larger proportion of Canada's total overseas trades and hinterland potential. In short, the lake ports overseas tonnage has grown rapidly until recently but still constitutes a minor proportion of hinterland potential.

The value of lakeport overseas trade has also expanded rapidly. Starting at around \$100 million in the early 1950's, it is now over \$1,600 million. The increase was at first slower than for tonnage as lower value bulk commodities were injected into the trade. With the opening of the Seaway in 1959, for instance, tonnage expanded six times in a single year while values only doubled. But, contrary to expectations, in the succeeding 8 years overseas trade values have increased more rapidly than tonnage (over 37 percent per year) as trade diversity has increased. It now constitutes around 5 percent of the total U.S. foreign trade. While growth has been significant, the total value of Seaway commerce is less than the average annual increase in U.S. total trade in the eight years since the opening of the Seaway. It also constitutes around 18 percent of the foreign trade of the Midcontinent hinterland. In short, lake port overseas trade values have grown rapidly but hardly constitute a major diversion of U.S. Trade or a significant proportion of hinterland potentials.¹ Lake port trade values would approximately double if the ports drew one-third of the trade of their own hinterland, triple if they drew half, and quadruple if they drew a seasonal two-thirds.

Lake ports have achieved growth and maturity as ocean ports in a remarkably short time. A large potential hinterland market awaits further development. Yet in place of an ebullient outlook as the second decade approaches one finds uneasiness in the lake ports. Traffic growth has leveled somewhat.

Competition overland has intensified. Major innovations are being made in ocean vessel dimensions and size and few are designed for lake service. Significant construction programs under way at the seaboard ports and on the inland waterways promise a more competitive environment in the immediate future. This is a healthy state of affairs for regional national trade and should be provoking a vigorous competitive response from the lake ports and the Seaway. But in place of such response, one finds uncertainty about both the interlake and overseas trades. Lake ports which have invested over \$322 million in port development over the past few decades have, evidently, modest capital commitments for the next five years.² Few innovations are planned for the interlake trades other than the super ore carriers now under construction. Overseas lines appear uneasy about making major capital commitments to replace existing tonnage with new vessel prototypes. And adding to the uncertainty of these already turbulent waters are the intermittent federal pronouncements on toll increases.

SYSTEM MODAL DYNAMICS

Before suggesting the issues facing the next decade of development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence transportation system, it may be well to contemplate the elements constituting the system and how they interact. The major direct elements of the system are the regional requirements, waterway, and shipping lines and vessels. The supporting elements are the lake ports, inland carriers, trade intermediaries, and individual shippers. The patterns of interaction among the elements are not well-known nor the dynamic process of system development. It is known that all elements must move forward on a uniform front; otherwise, appreciable lags and leads are opened, constraining all other elements and total system development. It is also known that system development is an imperfect and uneven process at this state in time and that innovative initiative therefore shifts from element to element in a somewhat circular pattern.

For instance, the Seaway constituted a major dimensional innovation in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway a decade ago. Ship lines at first made merely a routing decision, filling the water with existing ships, some unsuited to the trade. Connecting channels and harbors were adjusted to Seaway dimensions, major port development commitments were made, and regional trade and transportation requirements were geared to the new route. Then a breakthrough in tacitechnology (discovered at the University of Minnesota in 1951) revitalized the upper lake iron ore reserves and steel company investment shifted accordingly. New super ore carriers were designed at the University of Michigan and developed by a marine architecture firm in Cleveland. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers altered the Poe lock design to accommodate vessels yet to be placed for construction. Vessel construction is now under way at Erie and Manitowoc of new, economic ore ships too large for the existing St. Lawrence and Welland locks. The circle of innovation has also returned to ocean shipping where tanker, dry bulk, and general cargo vessels are under construction, many too long, deep, or wide for existing Seaway dimensions. Thus, the cycle of innovation returns to the Seaway. Decisions made at the Welland and St. Lawrence canals are difficult and uniquely long range because a waterway built to last 50 years must accommodate a third generation of ships lasting 20 years, and the ships must accommodate traffic requirements, much of which will be new at their half life. The pyramid of decisions is not based purely on waterway dimensions, but also assurances of capacity, tolls and fees,

season and continuity and efficiency, priority, and speed of through movement.

EMERGING ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES

From this admittedly simplistic model of the system, elements and dynamics, we can move to the real world problems as they can be foreseen in the future of the lake ports.

1. Lake ports have developed well as foreign trade complexes in view of the limited time horizons, early opposition, and the initiative that they have had to exercise in Seaway developmental matters. Smaller ports have had a much more varied and generally depressive experience. While generally well-established, the lake ports will face more competition ashore in the next decade with less assured access to city funds committed in a larger measure to other urban developmental concerns. Replacement of retiring port administrators, some of whom have brought about heroic changes in the lake port cities, will be extremely difficult. The major issues of continuing lake port development appear to be:

(a) Broadening the traffic base of port development, especially for the declining interlake trades that have remained largely unattended.

(b) Attaining a broader base of public support, authority, and financing, reaching beyond the immediate metropolitan area.

(c) Developing a more effective marketing program in the hinterland, governmental shipping circles, and overseas trade areas.

(d) Establishing the principle and precedents for equality of hinterland access to competition traffic.

(e) Gaining a broader cooperation between public commissions, private terminal operators, and overseas and interlake shipping interests on common regional development matters.

(f) Discovering new modes of organization and operation and administrative styles to replace retiring port leaders.

(g) Attaining a more effective and constructive regional voice in informing Seaway and waterway decisions.

Many of the alternatives in these matters lie at the state and local level, but a number are of Federal concern. Canada has provided Dominion aid in establishing basic port plants in the upper lake ports. But lake ports on both sides of the border have yet to achieve formal ocean status. The National Harbors Board in Canada provides for capital expansion in major seaboard ports but not for metropolitan areas within the lakes. Port capital expenditures in Montreal alone exceed those of all Canadian lake ports combined.

In the United States, the Department of Commerce study of ocean ports stopped short of the lakes. The Knott-Todd Agreement of 1902 covering seaboard port rate parity (and import-export rates) on Midcontinent trade has yet to be extended to lake ports. Essential trade routes have been declared by the Maritime Administration, yet the U.S. merchant marine fleet provides only modest service by the routes (less than 4 percent of the overseas service). As a consequence, tied (preference) cargoes must still move cross country in pursuit of U.S. flag service. Governmental agencies are the largest shippers in the world (\$2.5 billion freight bill) but have yet to make full use of the Seaway's potential public savings. Government investments in transportation and urban redevelopment have yet to tap the possibilities of port development. The eventual need to create multiple state port authorities, free trade zones, and even binational port and trade areas may require Federal assistance and enablement.

2. Ship lines and interlake carriers. A major cycle of vessel and marine innovation is finding expression in the ocean, offshore, and inland waterway trades. Many of these innovations have promising potential for revitalizing the interlake trades or expanding overseas options (including barges, united

¹ Unfortunately, there are no aggregate value figures for Canadian lake port or hinterland trade.

² The *Port Expenditure Survey* made by the Port of New York Authority could involve less than full disclosure of lake port plans.

vessels, ro-ro and container ships, and high speed ground effects craft as well as improved ship automation, control system, and navigation aids). Few of these major innovations have moved beyond the idea stage in the lakes. Whether this is because of the absence of research and development expenditure in the lake states and provinces, the limited part of the Federal maritime construction dollars spent in the lake states (less than 4.5 percent in 1964-66), the lack of ship construction aids or tax deferrals to the inter-lake trades, the modest U.S. merchant marine participation in the trade, or the lack of certainty and constructive forum for the overseas lines is not entirely certain. It is in all probability a combination of these factors and in that case a number of alternatives for consideration is presented:

(a) Assurance that more research and development expenditures will be directed to revitalization of the lake and overseas trades.

(b) Pilot and demonstration projects involving Federal participation on the lakes.

(c) More marine engineering, design, and construction studies within the lakes and revamping the present Federal construction program and subsidies to facilitate competitive participation by lake yards.

(d) Consideration of the merit of affording the lake lines tax deferral on ship replacement accumulations as already apply to ocean shipping.

(e) Studies of the organization of the lake maritime industry with a view to achieving the most effective, competitive and innovative structure.

(f) Selective opening of cabotage laws to facilitate a cross-border infusion of competitive innovation and integration within the lake trades.

(g) Studies of prospective integration of the lake trades with the inland waterway system.

(h) Altering the system of subsidy-preference that ties regional aid contribution to flag line decision by either:

(1) Requiring minimum line performance on trade routes certified for subsidy.

(2) Altering the operating subsidy system to reward performance rather than cost differentials.

(3) Selective removal of preference where regional trade requirements go unserved.

(i) Providing the overseas lines (primarily foreign) with assurance on tolls, fees, season, capacity, and continuity so that they may proceed with long range capital commitments with greater certainty.

3. Waterway development. Waterway development started with the Seaway at the St. Lawrence and has moved up lake and river through the Welland, connecting channels, and into the recesses of the major lake ports over the past decade. With the completion of the larger Poe lock at the "Soo" and extension of the navigation season into January this year, the initiative shifts back to the Niagara escarpment and St. Lawrence, now the weakest link in the system. The major issue, in my opinion, is when to duplicate the project and how large and deep to build it. The importance of this decision is that it is likely to set the limits to ocean access for the next 50 years. Subordinate issues appear to be who will take the initiative, where, and for how much. In this respect, Canada has taken the initiative and burden at the Welland and St. Lawrence and the United States at the connecting channels and upper lakes. The United States spends more public funds on system development than does Canada, but the pre-occupation of the Seaway entitles with tolls has sharpened Canadian awareness of her share of the burden at the St. Lawrence. As a consequence, some reluctance may be expected from Canada about further project expansion and, consequently, the United States may have to be prepared to carry more of the initiative and financial responsibilities

in those sections. While project expansion is imminent, expansion of capacity can be provided by extension of season, programmed lockages, improvements in project efficiency, enlightened pilotage rules, improved navigation aids, and removal of impediments to continuity of vessel movement.

Beyond the immediate connecting channel problems is a variety of issues that might be referred to as system integration. Selective reciprocal suspension of North American cabotage laws might permit a better integration of services to the multiple lake port networks on both sides of the border. Through lake-inland waterway commerce will require projects designed to improve the integration of the inland waterway system and the lakes. Ultimately, the imperfect natural configuration of the lakes must be dealt with and may necessitate studies of cutoff canals across upper peninsula Michigan, the Ontario peninsula, and even lower peninsula Michigan.

Instead of dealing with the multiple alternatives involved in addressing these waterway development issues, I shall simply assert that they deserve early study, consideration, and commitment if the other elements of system-wide adaptation are expected to proceed in succession.

4. Inland access of the lake ports and Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system has not proceeded especially well. Some of the upper lake ports have received equitable through service from terminal railroad systems and lower lake ports from shorter hauling truck lines. But under the influence of looser rate regulation and service innovations, railroad long haul competition has intensified. Regional shipping interests could applaud marginal cost based rates, even if selective and compelled by water competition, as well as the new service options (container trains, rental trains, unit trains, volume rates, etc.). For a time, lake ports opposed these rate reductions on selective items on a case by case basis, while chambers of commerce, the interlake trades, and shippers merely observed. With increased railroad consolidations and mergers, the pattern of selective rate reduction has spread and the interlake trades, many shippers, and whole cities are no longer immune. One question, at this point, is who will cover the burden of overhead once volume shippers needs are accommodated if competitive transport options are eliminated.

More germane to the lake port situation is the issue of equality of inland access. Instead of opposing rate reductions and progress in service innovations to other gateways and markets, the lake ports are merely asking for equal applications in analogous situations. It no longer appears financially feasible or effective for the lake ports to approach rate discrimination on a case by case basis. The lake ports appear to be searching for precedent setting cases and a declaration of principle. The recent reductions on soybeans to Gulf ports, making the rates from central Illinois higher to Chicago, and on coal from southern Ohio and to Essexville, Michigan lower than to by-passed Toledo (less than half the distance and en route) offer the possibility of precedents involving both the interlake and overseas trades. The search for principle on inland equality will continue, for without equal access to inland traffic controlled by a potential competitor, the lake ports' location and any waterborne trade are in jeopardy.

The issue of inland access is not limited to equitable rates, even if rates are attained, there is no assurance of extension of service, transshipment privileges, or cost absorptions. Access to governmental shipments remains uncertain as long as preferences obtain and flag lines limit service. Reduced rates to government agencies (Section 22 rates) and agreed rates in Canada have yet to be applied in equal measure to lake ports. The whole complex system of distance scales, class rat-

ings and exceptions, and import-export rates applies differently to seaboard and lake ports.

Alternative approaches to achieving equal access for the lake ports are many.

(a) A Knott-Todd type of agreement ruling from the I.C.C., offering lake ports parity access to Midcontinent imports and exports with seaboard ports already covered.

(b) Designation of the major lake ports as ocean ports under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, according similar treatment and service alternatives.

(c) Applications for relief under the Interstate Commerce Act (Sec. I(8)) prohibition of unjust discrimination, (Sec. 500 and Sec. 142) to promote and develop water transportation, and (Sec. 15) which requires the establishment of through routes and reasonable joint rates with water carriers.

(d) Amend the minimum rule of rate making (Sec. 15a, Transportation Act of 1958) to require Commission consideration of the effect of rates "lower than a reasonable minimum" on other modes of transportation.

(e) Alter the subsidy system to provide incentives for U.S. flag service to the route or elimination of preferences if they do not.

(f) Require closer scrutiny of government agency use of circuitous or uneconomic routes.

(g) Consider removal of Section 22 rates and agreed rates to governmental agencies.

(h) Institute a Midwestern Governor's request for examination of the import-export class rate structure before the I.C.C., as the southern governors did in the 1930's, with a view to evidencing the degree of lake port discrimination and seeking a uniform application of distance scales, class and exception ratings, and rates to all ports.

OPENING AVENUES OF REGIONAL RESPONSE

A good deal of progress has been made toward regional organization and unity since the advent of Seaway construction. No single organization represented all Midcontinent states and provinces and now the Council of Lake Erie Ports, the International Association of Great Lakes Ports, the Great Lakes Task Force, the Great Lakes Commission, the Great Lakes Basin Commission, the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission and other private groups have formed working organizations with broad and varied developmental mandates. Moreover, the International Association of Great Lakes Ports, the Lake Carriers Association, Dominion Marine Association, and International Joint Commission reach across the border that divides the lakes and the Midcontinent. This may well be the pattern of the future as common lake, resource, and economic developmental problems emerge. The problem is no longer lack of regional organization but how to harness the resources and concert the purposes of multiple organizations. At the Federal level, the question is what avenues should be opened and support provided for a responsible expression of regional initiatives. So far, the concern of governmental decentralization has been with cities and states, but most of the problems of the lakes and Seaway are of a regional nature involving the North American Midcontinent.

Any program for responsibly harnessing regional potentials must start with a clear definition of projects and priorities, and that will require some research and development close to the scene. Former Secretary of Defense McNamara's assertion to Midwestern congressmen questioning the regional imbalance of research and development funds was, "We seek the best brains and go where they are. And, generally speaking, they are not in the Midwest." Midcontinent universities grant more than 30 percent of all advanced degrees in science and engineering and even higher proportions in other fields. Three of the Midcontinent universities rank among the top 10 in the nation in educational evaluations. It is more likely, as President Harrington of the University of

Wisconsin put the case.³ "Does this show that the contracts go 'where the brains are?' No, it means that the brains go where the contracts are." In short, is the Midwest experiencing a brain drain for lack of research and development investment? Very little of the basic research on the Seaway or the interlake trades has been done in the Midcontinent.⁴ Most of the issues that I have raised on waterway development, measuring regional requirements, design of new vessel prototypes, inland access, port and urban development, and access to traffic decision centers are amenable to objective research. Some of the research should be done close to the scene by qualified researchers familiar with the variables and circumstances unique to the lakes. Otherwise, development and implementation is apt to run headlong into realities and constraints not properly envisaged. Decisions by Federal agencies would then be based on sound premise and adequate information about regional objectives and capabilities. Otherwise, responsible regional initiatives may give way to frustrated sectionalism and the growth and development of the nation and North America impaired.

I am attempting to examine the major issues and potentials for renewal of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system in a project initiated by Joe Cook and supported by the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission. The issues and potentials are to be translated into researchable proposition. Then we will attempt to suggest ways and means of implementing the necessary research within the context and capabilities of Midcontinent universities.

WAGE GARNISHMENT SYSTEM UNDER ATTACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the wage garnishment system in the State of Wisconsin has come under legal attack through the attorneys for the NAACP legal defense fund. A case was triggered by Mrs. Christine Sniadach, who makes \$65 a week working for an instrument company in Milwaukee.

Despite the fact that this low salary barely qualifies as a living wage, a finance company was able to attach more than one-half of her weekly salary, leaving her with only \$31.59 a week on which to live.

What is even more shocking, however, was that the finance company was able to obtain this garnishment without even a judicial hearing or without serving any notice on Mrs. Sniadach.

Although Wisconsin is usually in the forefront in consumer protection legislation, I am sorry to say that it is far behind in its wage garnishment law. A total of 34 States have prohibited wage garnishments in the absence of a court judgment. However, in 16 States, including Wisconsin, it is possible for a creditor to garnish a person's wages without a formal court judgment.

This throwback to 19th century law is being challenged on constitutional grounds by the legal defense fund of the NAACP. If successful, low-income workers would at long last receive some measure of protection from some of the

more inequitable provisions of our garnishment laws.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning this suit published in the New York Times of April 28, 1969.

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

PERSONAL FINANCE: WAGE GARNISHMENT (By Robert J. Cole)

Christine Sniadach may not know it, but she will soon make legal history—all because her salary garnisheed.

Not long ago, while working for an instrument company in Milwaukee, she went to the pay window one day to pick up her salary only to discover that nearly half of her \$65-a-week pay had been withheld.

A finance company contending that she owed \$420, had filed court papers and proceeded without notice or hearing to collect \$31.59 a week from her salary.

What makes this situation of legal importance is that in Wisconsin, as well as in 16 other states, all a creditor has to do to garnishee your salary is to file court papers saying that the debt is in default. The creditor does not have to prove you owe the money or bother with a court hearing.

In addition to Wisconsin, this is also legal in Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Washington and Wyoming.

However, on the appeal of Mrs. Sniadach, the United States Supreme Court decided to look into the constitutionality of the issue. The Court is expected to decide on the case before it adjourns in June.

Her appeal was filed by lawyers for the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense Fund, a nonprofit organization that brings test cases before the courts for the poor—white or black. The fund is no longer affiliated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Philip Schrag, assistant counsel for the fund, said the other day that, if the case were won, that particular garnishment would be voided and Mrs. Sniadach would get her money back.

The principle would then apply to everyone in similar circumstances, in all 17 states, he said, and it would then be illegal to attach your salary without prior trial.

Even if this case is won however, an estimated 4 million people—many of them poor and uneducated—will continue to lose a part of their wages this year because of garnishments obtained legally through the courts.

It permits a creditor to take one-half of a debtor's pay, Alabama 25 per cent, Colorado 30 per cent if he is married or 65 if he is single. Georgia exempts \$3 a day but permits a creditor to take one-half of the remainder. New York State protects 90 per cent of a worker's wages from such practices.

Employers, according to the Department of Labor tend to think of garnishment as something as bad as drunkenness or fighting on the job. Many are so annoyed with the practice of garnishment—and the cost of handling it—that between 100,000 and 300,000 workers a year lose their job because of it.

As a result, many debt-ridden workers—hounded by creditors, threatened by lawyers and scorned by the boss—take the easy way out: They go into bankruptcy.

Milton J. Huber, director of the Center for Consumer Affairs at the University of Wisconsin, has found that one-third of 6,700 garnishments filed in Milwaukee in recent years came from just three sources: a local finance company, a credit clothier and jeweler and used car dealers.

The United Auto Workers has just published the results of a 1968 survey by the Consumer Research Advisory Council of Detroit which found that those resorting to

garnishment in the Detroit area included banks, credit clothiers and jewelers, credit furniture companies, small loan companies and used car dealers.

In California, 8,879 workers filed for bankruptcy in the first quarter of the year. In New York, where law is lenient, only 1,560 took the step. In New Jersey, labor unions have tried three times in the last five years to get a bill passed to prevent an employer's firing a worker for garnishment but have met opposition from finance companies and collection agencies.

Similar attempts by unions in other states have also been defeated.

New, more lenient provisions on garnishment in the Truth-in-Lending law are, as Prentice-Hall, Inc., the publisher put it, actually a compromise between those who favored abolishing garnishment altogether (as the original House bill would have done) and those who opposed placing any limits on it.

After July 1, 1970, under the new Federal law, at least 75 per cent of a worker's after-tax pay or the first \$48, whichever is more, will be protected from garnishment. Moreover, the boss cannot fire a worker for just one garnishment. He can, however, fire him for more than one. New York law goes even further. It prevents the boss from firing a worker for one garnishment in 12 months.

Mr. Margolius, author of "The Innocent Consumer vs. the Exploiters," a new paperback book on consumer frauds, said in an interview he believed that garnishment "in the hands of high pressured sellers becomes a main weapon of coercion and credit sellers often use the courts as collection agencies."

"I think garnishment should be abolished," he said.

Dr. Huber of the University of Wisconsin went a step further. He said, "I think we may see the end of garnishment when taxpayers recognize that the state is acting as a bill collector for the benefit of a very few operators and the taxpayer has to pay for it."

MODIFIED ABM IMPROPERLY DESIGNED

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the ABM has been plagued with pitfalls since its inception.

Most recently another glaring deficiency of the ABM was revealed by eminent scientists appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, Dr. J. P. Ruina and Dr. George Kistiakowsky all stressed a fundamental point that raises serious questions about the modified Sentinel ABM. That is, can a system designed as an area defense be adapted effectively for another purpose—as a protection to our deterrent? Can a city defense be simply converted into a hard point defense without significant changes?

We know that the administration's modified ABM proposal employs the components of the Sentinel system—last year's technology is being applied for today's mission.

In discussing the feasibility of such an approach, Panofsky, Ruina, and Kistiakowsky, respected scholars of weapon technology, made some important observations.

Dr. Panofsky said:

Defense of sites which have already been hardened to withstand impact of megaton weapons at relatively close distances requires a design greatly different from a defense of soft targets such as cities. I note the Sentinel System was originally designed to defend soft targets but now essentially the same components have been taken over for a completely different purpose.

³ Citing that only one-third of the scientists and engineers educated in Wisconsin remained in the state while California trained only 6,136 Ph.Ds in the sciences and engineering and employed 8,005 in 1963.

⁴ Including my traffic potential and toll studies done while at the University of Texas in 1954-56.

He then went on to say:

I would like to point out that a city defense and a hard point defense has completely different technical specifications and technical requirements; therefore making a policy decision which uses the same components for a very different purpose is necessarily a very poor engineering decision.

Dr. Ruina testifying before the committee prior to the announcement of Safeguard as a defense of our Minuteman missile sites, said this about hard point defense:

Sentinel, for hard point defense may be useful, . . . but I am somewhat skeptical. My skepticism comes from the fact that Sentinel was not designed for hard point defense. Its components were designed for a different purpose. We cannot say that this system is the best current technology can offer to protect Minuteman.

Dr. George Kistiakowsky also cast doubt on the effectiveness of a Sentinel-like ABM to protect our deterrent. He said:

The Sentinel system is over designed, I should perhaps say misdesigned for this application.

It seems to me that before we even consider voting \$1 for a system to protect our deterrent, we ought to know based on sound engineering evidence whether the missile complex will do the job it is supposed to do. If the ABM has to be redesigned and overhauled we should know about it now, not next year or the year after.

It makes very little sense to me to even seriously consider spending over a billion dollars on Safeguard, if it is apparent that it is the wrong kind of system for the mission.

Our experience over the past several years proves that far too much money has already been wasted on defense projects that were conceived in doubt and then later proved themselves to be monumental failures.

I ask unanimous consent that the biographies of Mr. Panofsky, Dr. Ruina, and Dr. Kistiakowsky be printed in the RECORD.

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

W. K. H. PANOFSKY, DIRECTOR, STANFORD LINEAR ACCELERATOR CENTER, PROFESSOR, SLAC

Degrees: 1938, A.B., Princeton University. 1942, Ph. D., California Institute of Technology. 1963, D. Sc. (Hon), Case Institute of Technology. 1964, D. Sc. (Hon), University of Saskatchewan.

Experience: 1942-3, Director, Office of Scientific Research and Development Project, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena. 1943-5, Consultant, Manhattan District, Los Alamos, New Mexico. 1945-6, Physicist, Radiation Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley. 1946-8, Assistant Professor of Physics, University of California at Berkeley. 1948-51, Associate Professor of Physics, University of California at Berkeley. 1951-63, Professor of Physics, Stanford University. 1953-61, Director, High-Energy Physics Laboratory, Stanford University. 1961-, Director, Professor, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University.

Special fields: X-rays and natural constants; accelerator design; nuclear research; high-energy particle physics.

Activities: 1945-60, Division of Military Application, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. 1954-58, Member, Physics Panel, National Science Foundation. 1955-57, U.S. Air Force Scientific Advisory Board. 1951, Radiation Lab-

oratory, University of California. 1958, Stanford Research Institute. 1960-64, President's Science Advisory Committee. 1959, Office of Director of Defense Research and Engineering (member, Ad Hoc Group on Detection of Nuclear Explosions). 1959, WAE Foreign Service Officer, Department of State: Chairman, U.S. Delegation (Geneva), Technical Working Group on High-Altitude Detection; Vice-Chairman, U.S. Delegation (Geneva), Technical Working Group 2. 1958-60, Member, High-Energy Commission of International Union of Pure and Applied Physics. 1958-60, Review Committee for the Particle Accelerator Division and High-Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory. 1959-61, Advisory Council, Department of Physics, Princeton University. 1958-62, Advanced Research Projects Agency. 1964-64, Advisory Committee, 200-BeV Accelerator Study, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley. 1965, Consultant, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President. 1967, Member, High-Energy Physics Advisory Panel to the Atomic Energy Commission. 1968, Advisory Committee, Brookhaven National Laboratory. 1968, Advisory Committee, Cambridge Electron Accelerator Laboratory. 1969, Advisory Committee, CalTech for Physics, Mathematics and Astronomy. 1965, Steering Committee, JASON Division, Institute for Defense Analyses.

Societies: Phi Beta Kappa; American Physical Society (Fellow and Member of Council, 1956-60); Sigma XI; National Academy of Sciences; Amer. Acad. Arts and Sciences.

Awards: Guggenheim Fellowship (1959); Ernest Orlando Lawrence Memorial Award (1961); Richtmyer Lecture (1963); California Institute of Technology—Alumni Distinguished Service Award (1966); California Scientist of the Year Award—1967.

Publications: Classical Electricity and Magnetism (with M. Phillips), Cambridge, Addison-Wesley (1955); 2nd edition, 1962; numerous scientific papers in professional journals.

Personal data: Name: Wolfgang Kurt Hermann Panofsky. Born 24 April 1919, Berlin, Germany. Entered U.S. September 1934; naturalized April 1942. Married (Adele Irene Dumond). Children: Richard Jacob, October 13, 1943; Margaret Anne, October 13, 1943; Edward Frank, April 19, 1947; Carol Eleanor, January 12, 1951; Steven Thomas, December 13, 1952.

Home address: 25671 Chapin Ave., Los Altos Hills, Calif. 94022.

JACK PHILIP RUINA

Currently maintaining a position as professor of electrical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Ruina nevertheless serves as a consultant to various government agencies: the Department of Defense, the Office of Science and Technology, the U.S. Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. As an electrical engineer, Dr. Ruina served as Deputy for Research to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (1959-1960) and subsequently as Assistant Director of Defense Research and Engineering (1960-1961) until his appointment as Director of Advanced Research Projects Agency. Due to his many contributions in this position, Dr. Ruina was awarded the Secretary of Defense meritorious civilian service award. Following this position, he was, for several years, President of the Institute for Defense Analyses (1963-1965). Dr. Ruina was the recipient of the Fleming Award in 1961. His research and specialization have been in the fields of noise and communications theory and radar systems.

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH OF GEORGE BOGDEN KISTIAKOWSKY

Born: November 18, 1900, Kiev, Russia. Education: Kiev public schools until 1918; University of Berlin, Ph. D., 1925; Harvard

University, D. Sc., 1955; Williams College, 1958; Oxford, 1959; University of Penna., 1960; University of Rochester, Carnegie Tech., 1961; Princeton University, Case Institute of Technology, 1962.

Experience: 1926-28: International Research Fellow, Princeton.

1928-30: Research associate, Princeton. 1930-33: Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University.

1933-37: Associate Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University.

1937-59, 1961—: Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University.

1959-61: Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

1961—: Chairman Science Board, Director of Itek Corporation.

1957-63: Director of the Cabot Corporation and Member of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Awards include: 1946: Medal for Merit.

1948: British Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom.

1958: Priestly award.

Memberships: Honorary Fellow of the Chemical Society (London); member of the Royal Society, National Academy of Sciences (Vice President, 1965-69), American Academy of Sciences; American Chemical Society, American Philosophical Society.

Research and Writing Activities: Contributor of numerous articles to scientific journals. Research in chemical kinetics; thermodynamics of organic molecules, shock and detonation waves; molecule spectroscopy.

Address: 12 Oxford Street, Cambridge Massachusetts.

THALIDOMIDE

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, the Washington Post of March 8 and March 13, 1969, contained articles written by Mr. Morton Mintz on a damage suit involving thalidomide, the sedative that caused the birth of thousands of armless and legless babies throughout the world. This was the first case to go to a jury in this country, so it is of particular significance. Although 2.5 million tablets of thalidomide were distributed for testing in this country, the drug was kept from the market by Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, of the Food and Drug Administration; thus the United States escaped the massive number of deformities reported in other countries.

The testimony in this case, however, brought into focus some startling revelations regarding the practices pursued by segments of the pharmaceutical industry in its promotion of drugs. Dr. Raymond C. Pogge, medical director at William S. Merrell Co. from 1950 to 1960, testified that he had written an interoffice memo on thalidomide on February 27, 1959, stating in part that "no specific human safety data" had been determined despite fairly extensive clinical experience with the drug. Yet only a few weeks later Dr. Pogge sent a brochure to private physicians testing the drug in which he described thalidomide as "very safe." Dr. Pogge further said that he was the author of an article favorable to thalidomide which was published under the name of Dr. Ray O. Nulsen, of Cincinnati, and which referred to other articles purportedly authored by various doctors throughout the country—all of which were written by the Merrell Co.'s Dr. Pogge.

In defense of what is obviously indefensible, Dr. Pogge said that drug-

company ghosting for supposedly independent physicians is a "common practice" and that he, himself, had been doing this for 20 to 30 years. Dr. Pogge was asked what he expected the public to believe as to who the author of his article was and he replied:

The public should believe it was written by Dr. Nuisen.

As this case demonstrates, the health and welfare of the American people can be put in serious jeopardy if medical doctors are willing to lend their names to articles they have not written and in many cases have not even read. What protection does the public have when segments of the pharmaceutical industry disseminate misleading information on drugs under the guise that it comes from members of the distinguished medical profession?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles by Mr. Mintz be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 8, 1969]

DRUG FIRM ON TRIAL IN BIRTH DEFECTS SUIT
(By Morton Mintz)

PHILADELPHIA, March 8.—For the first time anywhere, a jury is trying a damage suit involving thalidomide, the sedative that caused the birth of thousands of armless and legless babies throughout the world.

The suit was brought by Thomas Dixon Diamond, a consultant to an accounting firm, and his wife, Joanne, in behalf of themselves and their son, Thomas David, who was born eight years ago with flipper appendages instead of arms.

The defendants are Richardson-Merrell, Inc., a giant pharmaceutical firm, and the William S. Merrell Co., its division in Cincinnati which was the American licensee for the German patent-holder, Chemie-Grünenthal.

CLAIMS NOT SPECIFIED

The trial, which may last several weeks, began Thursday before Federal Judge E. MacTroutman. In keeping with court rules in Pennsylvania, the jury was not told of the amount of damages sought.

But the jury got sharp indications that it was in for a bruising courtroom battle when it heard the opening statement of the Diamonds' lawyer, Arthur G. Raynes, and the initial evidence—the sometimes startling testimony of Dr. Raymond C. Pogge, medical research director at William Merrell from 1950 to 1960.

Raynes promised the jury he would show that the company's conduct "was not merely careless," but "an intentional disregard, a callous disregard for the rights of human beings."

The company withheld its opening statement until after Raynes completes his case. The firm denies that thalidomide, which it tested here under the trade name of Kevadon, caused the injuries to David, as the boy is called.

Although 2.5 million tablets were distributed for testing in this country, the drug was kept from the market by Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the Food and Drug Administration and the United States escaped the massive number of deformities reported in other countries.

No damage case has gone to a jury until now, but there have been damage settlements in some countries, and in West Germany a criminal prosecution is in progress against Chemie-Grünenthal.

Pogge's testimony was in a deposition read aloud to the jury of 10 women and 2 men.

One section concerned an inter-office thalidomide memo which he wrote on Feb. 27, 1959.

"... Despite fairly extensive clinical experience we have no specific human safety data," his memo said, with the final five words capitalized and underlined.

But a few weeks later, physicians testing the drug for Merrell received a brochure describing thalidomide as "very safe." The author was Pogge.

Pogge also said in his deposition that he was the author of an article favorable to thalidomide which was published under the name of a friend, Dr. Ray O. Nuisen of Cincinnati, and which referred to other articles signed by various doctors but in fact written by Pogge.

The article—published in 1961 in the American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology—told of 81 women who took thalidomide and then had babies free of "any abnormalities or harmful effects from the medication." There "is no danger to the baby" if some of the drug "passes the placental barrier," it added.

In 1960—even before the Journal article was published, statements from it were cited in a Merrell brochure for physicians of which Pogge was a co-author.

But the brochure's test failed to say that the women got the drug in late pregnancy. Thalidomide was found later to cause deformities when taken in the crucial first three months of pregnancy.

Pogge said that drug company ghosting for supposedly independent physicians is "a common practice," and that he had engaged in it "possibly" more than 20 times, but "probably not" more than 30.

He said Nuisen was chosen "because he was very cooperative, he was competent, he was geographically convenient." And, he said, it was "irrelevant whether the man himself wrote the first draft . . ."

But Pogge conceded under questioning that the Merrell firm had added to the article "some chemical information" and "a review of the German literature."

A lawyer for the Diamonds asked, "And what would you have the public believe" as to who the author was?

"The public should believe that it was written by Dr. Nuisen," Pogge replied.

ANIMAL TRIALS

Pogge, who left Merrell to become medical director of Dorsey Laboratories in Lincoln, Neb., recalled that human trials were begun by the Cincinnati firm although no pregnant laboratory animals had been tested to find out if thalidomide had a potential to cause birth defects.

Pointing out that the drug had been widely used in Europe, Pogge said that it impressed the Merrell Company as being "of unusual safety." Human trials therefore were directed "primarily" at establishing the medical conditions in which it was useful and "in part" at demonstrating safety, he said.

Merrell recommended thalidomide to physicians—using it experimentally—for nausea and vomiting, which are common to pregnant women during the first trimester of pregnancy.

"When you tested it" for those uses, "did you take into consideration early pregnancy?" Pogge was asked.

"I don't think that I did," he answered.

The country in which most of the deformities occurred was West Germany, where the drug first was synthesized and marketed—over the counter. Other countries that let the drug go on sale and that were hard-hit included Britain, Canada, Japan and Sweden.

At the end of November, 1961, the Merrell firm notified the FDA that it had learned that thalidomide was suspected in connection with an outbreak of births of limbless babies in West Germany.

More than seven months later, in July, 1962, after The Washington Post reported how Dr.

Kelsey had resisted pressures to let Kevadon go on sale, the late FDA Commissioner George P. Larrick sounded an alarm and dispatched inspectors to retrieve remaining stocks of the drug.

The FDA was able to interview 1168 physicians. They reported that they had given thalidomide to almost 20,000 persons. Of the total 3,760 were women of child-bearing age. A reported 624 had gotten the drug during pregnancy.

According to an FDA "final figure" of uncertain accuracy, American women who had obtained thalidomide in this country gave birth to 10 deformed babies. Whether any more jury trials will result is not known.

David Diamond, whose parents live in the Philadelphia suburb of Rydal, was born in Abington, Pa., on April 5, 1961—well before the tragic news about thalidomide's deforming potential reached the United States.

In his opening argument to the jury, lawyer Raynes said that David, in addition to being armless, was born with a cluster of symptoms common among thalidomide babies.

The symptoms included red birthmarks not merely in places where they often appear, but also between the eyes, over the nose and over the upper lip; a saddle-shaped nose, and partial facial paralysis.

David had special problems with feeding. While he was still an infant, his parents took him to Children's Hospital here for special care.

Once he was able to walk, he also was able to fall—but had no arms to balance and protect him. And so, Raynes said the bright, determined boy suffered concussions and fractures of the arm stubs. One of the protections devised for him was a kind of helmet.

For the parents there was, at first, another concern—whether there was some genetic deficiency in themselves.

But tests assured that there was "nothing wrong" with them, Raynes said. And so they had a second child, a healthy boy born in June, 1962.

The next month, they learned that thalidomide had been distributed in the United States.

As Raynes reconstructed the story the couple searched their memories for the possibility that Mrs. Diamond could have gotten thalidomide—without realizing what it was—during her first trimester.

They recalled that during this sensitive period of pregnancy, Diamond had become ill and was admitted to a hospital in Cleveland, Ohio. While he was there his wife also became upset.

"Although she didn't ask for it, she was given medication, a sedative," at the Cleveland Clinic Hospital, Raynes told the jury.

Once this was remembered, Dr. Robert Kaye of Children's Hospital wrote a letter of inquiry to the Cleveland institution.

"One of the doctors wrote back and said, 'No, we did not give her thalidomide, we didn't have thalidomide. So we couldn't have. It was impossible.'"

But further search determined that a physician at the hospital "did give a sleeping pill although he couldn't remember the name because he couldn't find the records," Raynes continued.

He said that it then was ascertained that Merrell's Kevadon was in the Clinic "at the exact time when she took the sleeping pill as given by this doctor."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13,
1969]

ARMLESS BOY'S PARENTS, DRUG FIRM SETTLE SUIT

(By Morton Mintz)

The world's first jury trial involving the baby-deforming sedative, thalidomide, ended abruptly in Philadelphia yesterday when a settlement was reached between the parents of an armless boy and the manufacturer.

As is customary in such cases, the terms

of the settlement were not disclosed. However, the settlement is intended to provide economic security for the remainder of the boy's life.

The boy, who will be 8 on April 5, is Thomas David Diamond. He lives in Rydale, a Philadelphia suburb, with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Dixon Diamond.

After the settlement was announced to the jury by Federal Judge E. Mac Troutman, Mrs. Diamond, with tears in her eyes, told reporters that she was "very satisfied."

\$2.5 MILLION ASKED

The Diamonds, in a suit filed in October, 1962, had asked damages of \$2.5 million. The jury had not been told of this because court rules in Pennsylvania forbid such disclosure.

The settlement spared the manufacturer—Richardson-Merrell, Inc., and its William S. Merrell Co. division—the publicity that would have been generated by a trial expected to last four-to-six weeks.

In an opening statement last Thursday, Arthur G. Raynes, counsel for the Diamonds, promised to show the jury that the Merrell firm had told doctors testing thalidomide—it was never put on the market in the United States—that it was safe for use in pregnancy.

Actually, he said, the firm "had not run one pregnancy animal test in their laboratories." Raynes also promised to show that the firm had shown "a callous disregard for the rights of human beings." The company had intended to make its opening statement at the conclusion of Raynes' case.

The first testimony, on Friday, was that of a former medical research director at Merrell who admitted that he had authored an article praising thalidomide that appeared in a medical journal under the name of a supposedly independent physician.

More testimony was heard Monday. Then, on Tuesday, a dispute broke out in which Raynes demanded, and counsel for Merrell refused, the originals rather than copies of certain company documents.

SETTLEMENT ANNOUNCED

After Raynes continued in Judge Troutman's chambers to insist on originals, the firm began talking about a settlement, it was learned. The negotiations, encouraged by the Judge, were carried on in chambers and then announced to the jury at about 3:30 p.m. yesterday.

Last July in Toronto, an out-of-court settlement with Richardson-Merrell was announced under which undisclosed sums were placed in trust for each of eight Canadian thalidomide babies, including one set of twins. The total damages originally sought were \$10 million.

Earlier in 1968, undisclosed but reportedly "very substantial" settlements were reached in England between the British manufacturer of thalidomide and the parents of 62 deformed children. The firm, Distillers Company (Biochemicals) Ltd., agreed to pay 40 per cent of the amount to which the claimants would have been entitled had their cases been tried and won, plus legal costs.

ISRAEL AND MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this month Israel celebrates her 21st birthday as an independent nation. Those who love freedom and who honor courage cannot help but salute the gallantry of this nation and her people. I wish to add my congratulations to those that have been expressed here in the Senate and around the world.

The people of Israel deserve our highest praise for their remarkable achievements, and all men can take inspiration from Israel industry, patience, and perseverance.

Israel has been a land of immigrants,

many of whom were seeking refuge from religious persecution; Israel settlers were pioneers faced with difficulty and hardships; Israel was founded as a democracy by men of independent minds and spirits. These characteristics of early Israel parallel our own American history, and give us a common purpose: an aspiration for freedom and the pursuit of peaceful goals.

The close relationship between our Nation and Israel goes back to the very establishment of Israel. The United States was the first Nation to recognize her in 1948.

During the years that the Israelis were struggling to make their home hospitable, they were surrounded by hostile and threatening neighbors. Facing this threat, the United States made clear its support for Israel's right to live in peace and security. This support has been expressed by every President since President Truman in 1948.

The American people also sensed that Israel pioneering was akin to the experience of American settlers, and they felt a special friendship with the Israel people. Contributions and loans flowed from private American citizens to Israel amounting to \$2.5 billion. This support was instrumental in the conquest of harsh desert land by the Israelis.

Israel has sustained a growth rate of 10 percent per year, making her one of the world's leaders in economic development. In 1968, Israel attained a phenomenal growth rate of 14 percent, while keeping inflation under control. This economic surge has continued. As a result, per capita income in Israel has tripled in 20 years and reached about \$1,500 in 1968. This level compares favorably with middle European nations.

Americans and Israelis can be mutually proud: Americans for their willingness to lend a helping hand to a unique and democratic nation born in a desert, and Israelis for their endurance and ingenuity which subdued the desert and harnessed the harsh environment.

It is regrettable and tragic that the threat of conflict continues to hang heavy over the Middle East despite three wars that have been fought there in 20 years. To replace bitter enmity and rancor with candor and conversation is difficult. But, peace and prosperity are worth pursuing despite the difficulty of the task.

The nations of the Middle East must mutually recognize the right of each other to live in peace as a sovereign nation with secure boundaries.

The concern of the world over the prospects for peace in the Middle East has been expressed frequently in the United Nations, and a helpful step was taken on November 22, 1967, when the Security Council authorized the Secretary General to appoint a special representative to assist in efforts to achieve a peaceful and acceptable settlement. Ambassador Jarring of Sweden was appointed and has served in that office with high distinction. The support of the major powers for this mission makes it an important contribution to peace.

It is President Nixon's sincere desire to see peace achieved in the Middle East, and he has announced his full support for the Jarring mission.

The President is channeling our Nation's efforts through all appropriate avenues to peace, including bilateral and multilateral exchanges. To aid in the cause of peace is one of his goals, and was clearly expressed in his inaugural address. He said:

The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker. This honor now beckons America—the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil, and onto the high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization.

The Middle East conflict was discussed with European leaders during the President's recent trip to Europe, and high level exchanges have been held in Washington between our Government and Arab and Israel officials.

Exploratory talks now are being pursued among the four powers in New York. These efforts are devoted to the task of strengthening future efforts of the Jarring mission, and are not intended to be a substitute for Ambassador Jarring nor a means of imposing a peace. For a peace to be lasting, it must have the free assent and full cooperation of the parties.

As President Nixon has said:

The Four Powers . . . cannot dictate a settlement in the Middle East. The time has passed in which great nations can dictate to small nations their future where their vital interests are involved.

It would be foolish to expect an instant peace, but, in my opinion, no opportunity to achieve an equitable settlement is being ignored.

There are grounds then to hope for a realistic peace and an end to conflict in the Middle East. Sombre though the scene appears, reason may yet prevail—if all concerned nations will aid Ambassador Jarring in his task.

Mr. President, to many peoples of the world, the age of 21 signifies an arrival at maturity and a dedication to responsibility in society.

In the Jewish tradition the coming of age is at 13, quite young, but most appropriate in light of the pressures of adversity which have weighed heavily on the Jews for more than 5,000 years. And yet from this adversity has come achievement.

Before the world today, as Israel celebrates her 21st year, is a vigorous record of national growth and development matched by few in modern times. In less than a quarter of a century, Israel has become a thriving factor among the smaller nations of the world, and a vital standard of democracy in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I have great feeling for a people threatened by oppression, since my own forebears, the Czechs, as well as Slovaks, portray the tragic consequences of oppressive domination. All the free nations of the world should join with us, not only in celebrating the 21st anniversary of the State of Israel, but also in reaffirming their promise to a wandering people who have at last come home.

THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in a few weeks the Senate will complete at least the first phase of the debate over

the Nixon administration's Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system.

From all indications the authorization vote will be extremely close. I am convinced that the opposition to deployment, led most effectively by Senators HART, of Michigan, and COOPER, of Kentucky, will prevail.

Regardless of the outcome on this specific issue, however, the debate itself will have begun what I hope will be a permanent form of analysis for military items. It should influence our decisions in this area for many years to come.

It is inappropriate and inaccurate to question the motives or sincerity of those who advocate deployment of Safeguard. The military specialists who have recommended it must certainly be honest in their evaluations.

What has quite clearly been established, however, is that the country's civilian leadership has much broader responsibilities than we have exercised in the past. We cannot expect the Defense Establishment to be concerned about the domestic needs which go unmet because the military has first call on our resources. We should not look to the Pentagon for enlightenment on political issues. We are entirely unrealistic if we think we will find enthusiasm for arms control in institutions whose very being is based on arms expansion.

Yet all of these factors must have a tremendous bearing on our decisions. Perhaps it is because we have been so sparing in their application that after the expenditure of a trillion dollars for arms we are no more secure than we were at the close of World War II.

For too long, I believe, we have tried to maintain that we can seek arms control and overwhelming arms superiority at the same time, that we can have both guns and butter at home, and that our military might can deal effectively with all forms of international threats to our interests or sensibilities. The ABM issue has arisen at a time when the objectives to which we aspire are in many respects mutually exclusive.

Where arms control in particular is concerned such factors as the tactic of building to meet "greater than expected threats," the long leadtimes involved in deployment of new weapons systems, and the action-reaction relationship between United States and Soviet arms buildups, can very easily combine to make the ABM and meaningful disarmament negotiations an either-or proposition. In light of our knowledge of the futility, the costs and the dangers of weapons competition, it seems inconceivable to me that we would choose the ABM.

The International Executive Board of the United Auto Workers recently adopted a statement which captures the essence of this issue. Noting that Americans believe in a strong military posture but nonetheless hope that we can place emphasis on arms control, the statement points out that:

The essential factor in this dilemma is that we do have to choose. We cannot continue to ride two horses, to be of two minds, which in the nature of things has meant until now that we have dreamed of peace and talked about its virtues, while remaining captives of the arms race. We must now de-

cide to free ourselves from its burdens and its dangers.

This statement is highly significant and deserves our careful attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

UAW INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD STATEMENT ON THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE PROGRAM

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) System, which would entail the placement of defensive nuclear missiles on sites near heavily populated centers around the country, has come under heavy attack in the U.S. Senate and from groups of concerned citizens in many communities throughout the nation.

The UAW International Executive Board associates itself with this opposition to ABM, and we commend the concerned community leaders in the Detroit area and in other cities who in protesting the acquisition of local sites by the Pentagon have drawn national attention to the dangers of this further escalation of the nuclear arms race. This citizen protest has been very largely responsible for growing opposition to the ABM system in the Congress.

We urge the President to respond to this national protest with an order cancelling the ABM program. We urge him to turn away from a useless and unnecessary arms buildup and move vigorously toward the tasks of peace.

Little purpose is served at this late date in stressing in detail the destructive power of even the smallest nuclear warhead. It requires no imagination to conceive of the degree of damage to life and property that would result in an urban center if one of the missiles slated to be installed under the ABM system accidentally exploded. A nuclear physicist told the Michigan Citizens' Coordinating Committee Concerned About Anti-Ballistic Missiles: "If there were an accident, the Detroit area certainly would not be habitable."

If the ABM system were demonstrably essential for the national security, it is conceivable that Americans might properly be asked and might well be prepared to agree to accept a degree of risk in order to place anti-ballistic missiles around our cities. No such necessity, however, can be demonstrated. On the contrary, a very strong case has been made—for the contention that development and deployment of the ABM system would actually reduce our security.

In the first place, the system is untestable except in the crisis of missile attack. By then it would be too late to determine its feasibility or effectiveness. Experts have noted that the very operation of the system may make it totally unworkable, since the atomic explosions resulting from its initial use in time of imminent crisis could make inoperable the very electronic gear essential to its effective deployment.

The advocates of the ABM system declare that it would be designed only to intercept and destroy low-grade and unsophisticated Chinese missiles. It would be totally useless against sophisticated missiles, which the Soviet Union already has and which in years to come China will develop. The ABM system would require at least 5 years for full deployment at a cost officially estimated to go as high as \$10 billion but which might well go as high as \$60 billion; and nobody, in or out of the Pentagon, has more than the vaguest notion of China's probable nuclear capability at the end of the five-year period. Given this inability to accurately assess what the Chinese will be able to produce five years from now, it is quite possible that the ABM system would be as useless against China as it would be against the Soviet Union.

Even if we could predict the Chinese capability five years hence, it does not follow

that we should spend up to \$60 billion to ring our cities with megaton bombs in order to protect ourselves against a potential Chinese attack. For it should always be kept in mind that we already have the most formidable system of deterrence in the world. It lies in our capability of totally destroying any adversary, even if most of our offensive missile sites were destroyed. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have long since possessed this power of overkill. It provides a precarious equilibrium or balance of terror which has thus far prevented limited wars from escalating into an all-out military confrontation between the great powers.

This precarious balance would be disturbed by any venture into anti-ballistics systems, either the 'thin' Sentinel system or a much more expensive and destructive ABM system, which many see as the ultimate objective of some in the military. According to Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Provost of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who was President Kennedy's scientific adviser, any drastic change in the strategic balance of power takes about 10 years. The very length of time required to move to a new strategic balance after the introduction of new weapons systems, according to Dr. Wiesner, gives a kind of stability to the arms race. The new equilibrium arrived at, after a decade or so of transition, however, will be just as precarious as the old as long as we consent to remain captives of the arms race. We shall have no more essential security than we had 10 years earlier, and shall have squandered scores of billions of dollars that could have been better invested in building a more just and livable society. In fact, according to Wiesner, we may well have less security. He writes:

I believe that the situation will be made more, not less, dangerous. We always underestimate our own capabilities and overestimate that of the other fellow. I think this is true of both sides. . . . That is, if the Russians build a defensive system, we think it is better than it is, so we overbuild in order to penetrate it, and vice versa.

"Thus there is the real possibility that when everything is stabilized at some higher level and we are all relaxed because we have become used to it, the potential for destruction will have gone up instead of down."

And Wiesner asks:

"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."

That is also the answer of the UAW; and we believe it is the answer of an increasing number of Americans. According to a recent Harris poll, Americans are still firm believers in a strong military defense, but a clear majority balks at paying increased taxes to beef up the military establishment. More significant is the response to the following question:

"If you had to choose, would you prefer that our government put greater emphasis on building on U.S. military power or in trying to come to arms control agreements with the Russians?"

Of a cross-section of adults asked that question, 62 percent would put "emphasis on arms control," 29 percent would put "emphasis on military build-up," and 9 percent were not sure.

The essential factor in this dilemma is that we do have to choose. We cannot continue to ride two horses, to be of two minds, which in the nature of things has meant until now that we have dreamed of peace and talked about its virtues, while remaining captives of the arms race. We must now decide to free ourselves from its burdens and its dangers. The growing bipartisan opposition to the ABM system in the U.S. Senate reflects a growing realization on the part of the American people that the only real security lies in controlling rather than escalating our armaments, in

working for agreements that can reduce the level of conflict and tension in the world and help to strengthen the constructive efforts of the peacemakers rather than the negative fears of the military.

The President has urged prompt ratification of the anti-proliferation treaty in order to "advance this Administration's policy of negotiation rather than confrontation with the Soviet Union."

We endorse that appeal. But the Administration must clear away ambiguities that presently confuse its policies. The anti-proliferation treaty, even when ratified, will remain a scrap of paper if the United States and the Soviet Union merely utter the catchwords of peace while escalating the arms race. It is hypocritical, at the very least, to pledge other nations to nuclear abstinence while flaunting our own lack of restraint by preparing to spend additional billions of dollars for a new, untested and untestable ABM system. What the Administration does about the ABM system will reflect more eloquently than any words its real intentions in its search for peace in the world.

The UAW International Executive Board respectfully urged the President to let our "yes" be an unequivocal "yes" in favor of negotiation, and our "no" a clear "no" of opposition to any further development of the ABM program. We cannot have it both ways forever; if we really want to strengthen the structure of peace, we must act with courage and conscience to stop the escalation of the nuclear arms race before it ends the human race. If we really want to bring ourselves together—and hold ourselves together—at home, we must stop tearing ourselves asunder throughout the world community. Whatever the theoretical possibilities inherent in dynamic economic growth, it has been amply demonstrated that we cannot indefinitely concentrate on war and preparations for war and at the same time have enough time and energy and resources left over to accomplish the essential tasks of peace, foremost of which must be the improvement of the quality of American life and a helping hand to the less fortunate people at home and in the world; in their struggle against poverty, hunger, ignorance and disease.

THE 1968-69 GREAT LAKES TASK FORCE REPORT TO THE GREAT LAKES CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Great Lakes task force is a group composed of representatives of the Great Lakes Commission, the Council of Lake Erie Ports, the International Association of Great Lakes Ports, the Great Lakes Terminals Association, the Great Lakes District-International Longshoremen's Association, and the U.S. Great Lakes Shipping Association. The task force recently submitted its third report on shipping conditions in the Great Lakes to the Great Lakes congressional delegation. This 1968-69 report updates and supplements the reports of 1966 and 1967.

The report outlines many of the areas which the task force is working on to improve shipping operations on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. These include refinancing of the Seaway's debt structure, extension of the shipping season, discriminatory inland transportation rates, lack of Government cargo, and the continued lack of U.S.-flag shipping to any significant degree. The report also details the importance of joint United States and Canadian

planning for the Seaway and the Great Lakes waterway system.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Great Lakes Conference of Senators, I commend this task force report to the Senate so that Senators may get some idea of the magnitude of—and possible answers to—these problems.

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

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

GREAT LAKES TASK FORCE: 1968-69 REPORT TO THE GREAT LAKES CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ON SHIPPING CONDITIONS IN THE GREAT LAKES WATERBORNE FOREIGN COMMERCE

This is the third report prepared by the Great Lakes Task Force for the use of Great Lakes Senators and Congressmen, and in the main updates and supplements the reports of 1966 and 1967. The first two reports were specifically addressed to the Great Lakes Conference of Senators, but as the Task Force expands and the maritime affairs of the Great Lakes receive greater attention it is clear that this and future reports should be addressed to the entire Great Lakes Congressional delegation on both sides of Capitol Hill.

INTRODUCTION

The Great Lakes Task Force is a coalition of Great Lakes maritime groups whose sole aim is to promote the waterborne commerce on the Great Lakes and through the St. Lawrence Seaway system and thus further the economic growth of the Great Lakes area. The present membership of the Task Force includes virtually every group of persons whose economic livelihood depends upon the full and rational use of the St. Lawrence Seaway. These groups are:

1. The Great Lakes Commission: An organization of eight Great Lakes States established by interstate compact in 1955 and approved by Congress.

2. Council of Lake Erie Ports: An association of all Lake Erie maritime interests which also includes banks, chambers of commerce, etc., in addition to traditional maritime enterprises.

3. Great Lakes Terminals Association: An association of 26 public and private marine terminal owners and/or operators doing business in six states.

4. U.S. Great Lakes Shipping Association: An association of over 30 foreign and American regular steamship lines and agents serving Great Lakes and all major world ports.

5. Great Lakes District-International Longshoremen's Association: The major longshore union representing a majority of the 7,500 shoreside laborers in Great Lakes ports.

6. International Association of Great Lakes Ports: An association of 15 American public port authorities in the Great Lakes.

A. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway System is the life line of the Great Lakes overseas waterborne commerce. Therefore, it is imperative that the Seaway facilities be as efficient and modern as possible in order to accommodate changing traffic and technological developments. Every Great Lakes port authority, the terminals and ocean carriers are prepared to meet the demands of the future, but their efforts must be matched by the Seaway system if the Great Lakes area is to provide a modern transportation network.

1. Repair of the existing facility

For the past two years during the off-season the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and the Corps of Engineers have been repairing damage to Seaway locks caused by faulty or deficient initial construction.

In 1968 the Administration had legislation introduced in Congress which would place the cost of those repairs, then estimated at \$13.1 million, on the general Treasury. The legislation did not pass, and consequently the cost of those repairs must now be paid from Seaway toll income. This type of emergency expenditure was not envisaged when Congress required that toll income pay for the initial construction and subsequent routine maintenance and operation of the Seaway.

We strongly urge the Great Lakes Congressional delegation to correct this unfair obligation, and introduce and support legislation similar to S. 2131 of the 90th Congress, to place the cost of the extraordinary repairs on the General Treasury and not on user toll income.

2. Refinancing of debt structure

The Seaway is the only federally supported waterway that is required to be self-sustaining and fully amortized from commercial earnings. In the 89th Congress and again in the 90th, legislation was introduced to reorganize the financial burdens of the Seaway. We strongly urge that these efforts be continued and legislation enacted not only to prevent future toll increase, but to place the Seaway Development Corporation in a position to eliminate all tolls as soon as possible.

3. Extension of the Seaway navigation season

The present Seaway navigation season extends from a variable date in April each year to a variable date in December. Theoretically, the closing date is dependent upon whether and ice conditions, and accordingly is not a firm date. Variable closing dates do not permit maximum use of the Seaway and do not permit proper advance scheduling by ship lines. It is therefore meaningless to have variable dates except for ships already in the Great Lakes at the uncertain end of the season.

We also understand that under present circumstances the Seaway physically can be kept open substantially beyond the historic closing date of early December. However, for the immediate future we strongly urge that every effort be made to establish a set closing date of December 30 until experience proves the season can be further extended. The date of December 30, if announced in advance, will permit ship operators to definitely plan additional sailings resulting in increased shoreside labor employment and increased revenue to the Seaway Development authorities. Obviously, it will also permit shippers and receivers of goods to plan for increased traffic via the Seaway to the economic benefit of all concerned.

Ultimately, at the very minimum, the Seaway should be kept open to navigation for a period of no less than ten months a year, from early April to late January. New technology in the handling of ice and all weather navigational aids make this goal attainable, and all efforts must be expended to do so. Congress should appropriate sufficient funds to conduct the requisite de-icing studies and to enable implementation of reasonable de-icing programs.

Recent difficulties on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts clearly indicate that the United States needs another all weather avenue of exporting its commerce in the national interest. In addition, as our world commerce grows and the Great Lakes based industries expand their activities in world trade additional transportation facilities located near the source of supply are required. The Great Lakes trade routes are needed to keep transportation costs at fair levels by providing competitive rates to ports which might otherwise monopolize U.S. commerce.

In this regard, we should point out that both the U.S. and Canadian Seaway Authorities recognize the competitive nature of world commerce, and have taken affirmative steps to bring Seaway container traffic

costs more in line with the Atlantic and Gulf competition.

4. St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation activities

As long as the Seaway Development Corporation is required to repay to the Treasury the cost of construction of the Seaway plus interest the Corporation must be free to take all reasonable steps to encourage the maximum use of the facility. It is unrealistic and unreasonable to require the Corporation to repay its indebtedness and at the same time prevent it from taking the steps any private corporation would take to increase the use of its corporate facilities to meet its financial obligations.

Therefore, in our collective opinion, the Corporation and its Administrator should be directed and encouraged to develop, promote, and foster traffic via the Seaway as provided in the organic Seaway Act, 33 U.S. Code 982, and its offices should be located in such places to most effectively accomplish this mission. The Administration should be directed and encouraged to maintain close liaison with existing and potential Seaway users, and should aggressively work within the government to achieve the maximum use of the Seaway.

B. U.S./CANADIAN JOINT PLANNING

The Welland Canal which connects Lakes Ontario and Erie lies wholly within Canada and the U.S. has no voice in its operation. The Canadian Seaway Authority announced lockage charges assessed against ships transiting the Welland which, effective April 1, 1967, impose \$10 per lock and by 1971 the charge will be \$100 per lock. Although the original lockage charge was assessed against each ship transiting the Welland Canal system, the Canadian government now permits two ships to transit the locks in tandem with each paying one half of the lockage charge. It has also reduced the charge for ships in ballast to one half of the full charge. Theoretically, each of two ships in tandem and in ballast would be assessed 12.5% of the total lockage charge.

The lockage charge schedule also makes special allowances for small craft and pleasure vessels. We believe that it would be fairer to all concerned if some form of graduated lockage charge were to be instituted for cargo vessels based upon their earning capacity. We are very thankful that the Canadian government has already made some changes in the lockage charges, and are hopeful that future changes will be forthcoming.

Nevertheless, we are faced with an additional transportation cost that not only harms the Great Lakes but discriminates unjustly against the smaller sized general cargo ships upon which all of us depend. This increased cost into and out of the Great Lakes, coupled with reduced container charges out of U.E. East and Gulf Coast ports, could well spell disaster to all Great Lakes Commerce other than bulk shipments on large ships.

This problem, and others, requires meaningful negotiation by the U.S. Departments of State and Transportation with the government of Canada. We urge the Conference of Senators to request those Executive Agencies to support our individual efforts to persuade the government of Canada to reconsider the subject of the Welland Canal lockage charges.

At the same time, we urge the Executive Agencies to discuss with Canada the entire subject of the St. Lawrence Seaway System and its future development. Ship operators, port interests, and the states involved must know what future the Seaway holds in order to plan capital investment and future trade practices. If the two governments plan to help the Seaway reach its rightful place in world commerce we must know now to be better prepared to render the services world commerce requires. The uncertainty of the future is a depressant to economic growth and no one, be he a private citizen or state legislature, can honestly commit time,

energy, and capital to a facility which might not be fully employed in a very short time.

We also suggest that in order to fully explore the future of the Seaway and the Great Lakes region that the study of an alternative or additional connection to Lakes Ontario and Erie be continued to completion.

C. DISCRIMINATORY INLAND TRANSPORTATION RATES AND PRACTICES

1. Proportional rates

Great Lakes ports and shipping are victimized by the rate practices of certain inland rail carriers. The major cause is the ageless preference of railroads for long-haul rather than short-haul traffic. The vast majority of the industrial production of this country is closer to Great Lakes than it is to coastal ports on the Atlantic, Gulf or Pacific. However, in many instances it costs more to move the goods to the closer Great Lakes port than it does to the distant coastal port. In other cases, the Great Lakes route may be lower in absolute dollars, but the cost differential is disproportionate to the mileage differential. In almost every instance, a shipper must pay more dollars per mile to ship his goods to a Great Lakes port than to a coastal port.

2. Export-import rates

This disparity in inland rates or lack of fair proportional rates is further compounded by the practice of most railroads by which they absorb certain coastal port charges on export-import cargo. The line haul rate to all coastal ports includes certain port handling charges (which may vary) and such rates are commonly called export-import rates. Shippers which are close to the coastal port are denied these rates because they have no alternate port routing choice. In the same way, a shipper who wants to use a Great Lakes port cannot receive the special rate—not because he has no port routing choice, but rather to deny him the opportunity to make a choice.

3. Section 22 rates

Section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 USCA 22) authorizes rail and motor carriers to carry government cargo free or at reduced rates. The rates, called Section 22 quotations or agreements, need to be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and are not subject to protest by anyone. In 1957 attempts were made to restrict Section 22 authority to times of national emergency. These were defeated and the informational filing requirements were established. Until 1957, the rates were not even made public.

Section 22 quotations have been and are being used to divert traffic from the Great Lakes area to coastal ports to the disadvantage of Great Lakes ports. Very few Section 22 rates or quotations have been offered or negotiated on traffic to Great Lakes ports.

ICC-sponsored legislation to amend Section 22 was before the 90th Congress, and we urge that similar efforts be made this year.

4. Request for I.C.C. investigation

Direct corrective authority over this discrimination resides with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and peripherally where the ocean carriers participate the Federal Maritime Commission also has jurisdiction. Private parties and organizations in the Great Lakes are continuously seeking redress of this situation from the inland carriers, but their efforts are strongly resisted. We strongly urge that the Conference of Senators bring this entire matter to the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission and request the Commission to institute a formal investigation on its own motion with an eye to correcting this situation.

D. APPOINTMENTS TO FEDERAL AGENCIES

There are several agencies of the federal government including the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Great Lakes

Basin Commission, Upper Great Lakes Commission which are instrumental or concerned with transportation and natural environment as such apply to the Great Lakes area. In addition to those the Departments of Transportation, Commerce and the Maritime Administration also play key roles in the general development of Great Lakes area transportation, both water and land. We feel that it is vital to Great Lakes commerce that each of these agencies and departments be staffed at the policy level with a person, or persons, having knowledge and understanding of the Great Lakes maritime trades.

Neither the Federal Maritime Commission nor the Interstate Commerce Commission presently have Commissioners or policy level staff persons who understand or are sympathetic to the problems of Great Lakes maritime commerce. This has resulted in administrative decisions and policies by both agencies which fail to adequately accommodate several Great Lakes maritime problems or special trade conditions.

We strongly urge that the members of the Great Lakes Congressional Delegation, individually and collectively, exert all efforts to see that persons who are knowledgeable in Great Lakes shipping matters be appointed to the agencies and departments involved.

E. AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

In May 1966 the Maritime Administrator adopted the recommended decision of the Hearing Examiner following a lengthy proceeding, and in so doing found that several Great Lakes-overseas trade routes were essential to the foreign commerce of the United States. (Maritime Administration Docket S-173). Thus under section 211 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 USC sec. 1121) the Great Lakes ports were found entitled to federally subsidized American flag steamship service to and from major world ports.

Notwithstanding the finding of the Maritime Administrator no new American shipping company or service has appeared in Great Lakes commerce. On the contrary, one subsidized American-flag service has been abandoned.

One of the possible causes of the difficulty the Great Lakes faces in securing American-flag shipping service is that the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, itself discriminates against the Great Lakes. Section 809 of the Act (46 USC sec. 1213) states that subsidy "contracts under this Act shall be entered into so as to equitably serve, insofar as possible, the foreign trade requirements of the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific ports of the United States." No mention is made about the requirements of Great Lakes ports. Admittedly, the Act was written prior to the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959, but the philosophy still prevails. Both the Act and the philosophy must be changed, and we urge the Great Lakes Congressional Delegation to work to this end.

G. U.S. GOVERNMENT CARGO

The carriage of U.S. government cargo is by law directed to American flag shipping. Section 2631 of Title 10 U.S. Code requires that all military (DOD) supplies be carried on American-flag ships. The Cargo Preference Act (46 USC 1241) requires that at least 50% of all other government cargo be carried by American ships, and Public Resolution 17 (15 USC 616a) requires that all exports financed by the Export-Import Bank be carried by American ships. Except for limited service to and from parts of Africa and South America, and sometime service in the Mediterranean area there is no American-flag shipping service in the Great Lakes. Consequently, the only government cargo that moves from Great Lakes ports in any appreciable amount is that of the Department of Agriculture authorized by PL-480 which is not within the 50% reserved for American flag ships.

Virtually no cargo financed by the Export-Import Bank, A.I.D. or the General Services

Administration has moved in recent years through Great Lakes ports. The Department of Defense which alone exports over 20,000,000 tons annually ships less than one half of one percent via Great Lakes ports even though most of the cargo DOD exports is made in the Great Lakes area.

The Great Lakes ports are now provided shipping service to every major world port by over 26 foreign flag shipping companies. These companies have contributed to the economic development of Great Lakes ports, have provided work for Great Lakes labor, and have helped pay for the St. Lawrence Seaway system. But despite this service, the Great Lakes ports are in need of some American flag shipping in order to reach their full potential, because without that service a substantial amount of traffic cannot move through the Great Lakes ports. Consequently, the economy of the entire Great Lakes is adversely affected.

The Great Lakes ports and related industries are confronted, and always have been, with a version of the chicken-egg game. American flag companies indicate a willingness to serve our ports if we can arrange for a substantial volume of government cargo. The government, on the other hand, takes the position that unless we can get American ships the cargo preference laws prohibit the government from sending cargo to Great Lakes ports with the single exception of some PL-480 cargo under the 50-50 rule. The Great Lakes Task Force has done everything in its power, including meeting with the Comptroller General of the United States, in hopes of securing government cargo without violating the Cargo Preference laws and implementing agency regulations. We earnestly solicit the support of the Great Lakes Congressional Delegation in this matter which is so vitally important to the economic future of all members of the Task Force.

H. WATER POLLUTION

All of us are concerned with water pollution control generally, and specifically in the many harbor areas of the Great Lakes. In the maritime field any water pollution control efforts immediately affect the operators of ships, be they foreign owned, U.S. owned, bulkers, ore boats, or any other type of water craft. No one seriously opposes reasonable efforts to control and, hopefully, do away with water pollution, but we do urge a reasonable approach.

1. Uniform regulations

There are eight states bordering the Great Lakes, each of which has more than one municipality providing some type of port facility. If each municipality were to impose different water pollution regulations, a ship operator would have to be prepared to meet 16 different standards. If each state imposed different regulations state-wide there would be a minimum of 8 standards, if the state superseded local regulations. Such a situation would be intolerable and would cause ships to leave the Great Lakes or limit calls to those ports having the least strict regulation.

Therefore, we strongly urge that there be a single set of water pollution standards of Great Lakes-wide implication, published and enforced by a single federal agency such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. We also urge that insofar as possible any Great Lakes regulation be no more strict than those applicable to the other seaports, lest this type of regulation become a competitive device among competing seaports.

2. Reasonable compliance

Since it could cost a shipowner anywhere from \$50,000 to \$150,000 to install water pollution control devices and equipment on each ship, reasonable time within which to do so is essential. Regulations which are too stringent could very well force ships to leave the Great Lakes permanently, and immediate compliance would require a curtailment in

service until the shipowner could place his ship in compliance. We strongly urge your careful study of any water pollution control legislation with an eye to preventing such legislation from unduly prejudicing St. Lawrence Seaway and domestic Great Lakes waterborne commerce.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—III

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the persistent, toxic pesticide DDT, which only 25 years ago was considered a new miracle insect killer, is now the center of controversy among scientists, biologists, conservationists, the chemical industry, farmers, and concerned citizens.

This pesticide which has made great strides in controlling such diseases as malaria is now suspected of endangering fish and wildlife and potentially threatening human health. The once quiet warnings of coming disaster gathered new strength 7 years ago when Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring," "painted a picture of a world despoiled by pesticides that persist and accumulate in the environment," according to the New York Times.

Last year a citizens group filed a suit with the Wisconsin State Department of Natural Resources against the sale and use of DDT. The hearings which began last December have resumed this week.

Recently Sweden became the first country to ban the use of DDT and related pesticides. In March, after the Food and Drug Administration seized 28,150 pounds of Lake Michigan coho salmon contaminated with excessive amounts of DDT, the Michigan Agricultural Commission indefinitely banned the use of DDT in that State. Arizona had previously taken similar action.

In the growing pesticide controversy, DDT and six other chlorinated hydrocarbons have been singled out for attack. The major thrust is being made against DDT since it is considered to be the most expendable of the most persistent pesticides and results in the biggest pollution problem.

Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Jr., biologist at the State University of New York at Stony Brook says:

We have indisputable evidence that DDT accumulation has already reached a point where it is seriously threatening the survival of some species, among them the American bald eagle, our national bird.

In 1945 there were 44 bald eagles' nests around Lake Michigan. Now there is only one, and the pair of eagles that occupy it have produced no young since 1964.

While sufficient research results are not available to determine the exact effect that these persistent pesticides have on human health, research investigators are compiling data that may link pesticides to cancer, adverse enzyme production, and disturbances of the stomach and liver functions.

The chemical industry argues that DDT is the cheapest, safest, and most effective weapon against the malaria mosquito and other dangerous insects. However, the pesticide makes no distinction between harmful insects and beneficial insects, and its accumulation in the soil can result in pesticide residues on the farmer's harvested crop which make the crop unacceptable by FDA regulations.

The one characteristic that makes DDT and other persistent pesticides so harmful is biological magnification, which results in an increasing concentration of the pesticide progressively along the food chains until it reaches a serious and often lethal level. Living creatures around the world have been reached by the drift of pesticide residues through the air, soil, and water. The petrel of Bermuda, the bald eagle and peregrine falcon of America, and the blue shell crab of the sea are each being pushed to the brink of extinction by the spread of pesticides through our environment.

The question we must ultimately resolve is what is the price tag on our environment. We must concentrate our efforts on finding alternative methods of controlling undesirable pests through genetic and biological means.

An article by Jane Brody, published in yesterday's New York Times, gives an excellent account of the current controversy over DDT. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1969]
ATTACKS ON USE OF DDT INCREASING—"MIRACLE" KILLER OF INSECTS IS ASSAILED AS PERIL TO MAN

(By Jane E. Brody)

Twenty-five years ago, DDT, then a new "miracle" insect killer, brought its developer the Nobel Prize for medicine. Today it is under increasingly sharp attacks as a potential threat to mankind.

The quiet controversy that surrounded DDT for two decades became louder seven years ago when Rachel Carson, in "Silent Spring," painted her picture of a world despoiled by pesticides that persist and accumulate in the environment.

Still, DDT survived the scathing indictment of Miss Carson's best-seller. And the noisy opposition to it stimulated by the book soon faded to little more than the lonely cries of conservationists.

In recent years, the nation's agricultural chemical industry has been producing several hundred million pounds of persistent pesticides a year. And DDT remains the leading pesticide produced in the United States.

But suddenly in the last few weeks the anti-DDT battle—which heretofore had been fought with a lot of words and a little action—has taken on a new direction that now threatens the life of this deadly chemical.

SWEDEN AND MICHIGAN ACT

Two weeks ago, Sweden became the first nation to declare a moratorium on the use of DDT, which was developed by a Swiss chemist, Paul H. Müller. The Swedish action also involved the chemical cousins of DDT, aldrin, dieldrin and lindane.

The Michigan Agricultural Commission, following a government seizure of 4,000 pounds of Michigan Coho salmon contaminated with excessive amounts of this pesticide, banned indefinitely the sale of DDT in a desperate effort to save its fishing industry.

A migrant laborer, frightened by sketchy reports linking DDT to the possibility of cancer, filed a suit to halt the use of it in California and to confiscate all crops sprayed with it.

And currently a hearing on a citizens' petition to outlaw DDT in Wisconsin is serving as a national public forum. Science and industry are presently arguments that may ultimately decide whether the issue will be settled once and for all with DDT bans instituted across the country.

Already, more than half a dozen states—including Wisconsin—are considering legislation to ban DDT. In Illinois, a bill banning the pesticide has been passed by the House and is now before the Senate. Arizona, faced with growing quantities of unsalable milk containing excessive DDT residues, has declared a one-year moratorium on the use of DDT to see if residues will be reduced.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat, has reintroduced his bill calling for a nationwide halt to the use of DDT. In the past the bill has died in the Senate Agriculture Committee.

THE BIGGEST PROBLEM

Although no one is quite ready to say that DDT is doomed, some of the pesticide's foes say they hear in the distance the death knell not only for DDT but also for the other members of what conservationists call the "dirty seven"—a group of pesticides known chemically as chlorinated hydrocarbons.

These pesticides are singled out because they leave an insidious environmental legacy, accumulating in the soil and water and in the fatty tissues of animals, including man. Unlike most other insecticides, the chlorinated hydrocarbons are not readily broken down into harmless chemicals.

Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Jr., biologist at the State University of New York at Stony Brook and a leader in the fight against persistent pesticides, says, "We're starting with DDT because it is by far the biggest pollution problem and we've got the strongest case against it."

He says, for example, "We have indisputable evidence that DDT accumulation has already reached a point where it is seriously threatening the survival of some species, among them the American bald eagle, our national bird."

Last year the five American manufacturers of DDT produced more than 125 million pounds at a value of more than \$20-million. This represents about a 20 per cent decline in production since 1960.

According to Samuel Rotrosen, president of the Montrose Chemical Corporation and chairman of the DDT industry task force, some 90 million pounds a year is exported for use in world health programs to control disease-carrying insects.

"DDT is the cheapest, safest, most effective weapon we have against the malaria mosquito, Mr. Rotrosen maintains. "In India, for example, before DDT there were 100-million cases of malaria with 750,000 dying each year. Today there are only 15,000 cases with 1,500 dying a year."

"To use an insecticide with less persistence than DDT," Mr. Rotrosen adds, "means you would have to spray every few weeks instead of twice a year—a task that is economically and practically unfeasible."

For the farmer, however, this persistence is something of a two-edged sword. He does not have to apply DDT to his crop as often as he would apply a pesticide that was readily broken down.

But it may persist in the soil and kill those insects considered beneficial, and it may result in pesticide residues on his harvested crop that are forbidden by the Food and Drug Administration regulations.

As a result, agricultural uses of DDT have fallen off in recent years.

Very little is known about the danger, if any, of the DDT stored in the average person.

Dr. William B. Deichmann of the University of Miami School of Medicine has found that persons who had liver cancer, leukemia, high blood pressure and carcinoma (an early form of cancer) at the time of death had two to three times more residues of DDT and related pesticides stored in their body tissues than did persons who died accidental deaths.

Soviet scientists reported recently that workers who are occupationally exposed to

large quantities of DDT and accumulate considerably more of the pesticide than the average person show disturbances of stomach and liver functions after 10 years of contact.

The American chemical industry, which maintains that no harmful effects related to DDT have been found in industrial workers, cites a United States Public Health Service study of 35 employees of the Montrose Corporation who had been industrially exposed to DDT for 11 to 19 years.

The men, whose fatty stores of DDT ranged from 38 to 647 parts in a million, were found to have no ill effects attributable to DDT exposure.

HARM IN FOOD CHAIN

The DDT problem responsible for most of the current ferment involves not man but fish and birds.

Through a process known as "biological magnification" through the food chain, minute traces of DDT in algae can end up as poisonous doses in food fish, which feed on little fish, which feed on still smaller water organisms, which feed on algae.

For birds of prey, such as the bald eagle, which feed on fish, the food chain effect is carried one step further.

Mrs. Owen Otto of Milwaukee, a conservationist who was largely responsible for the citizens' petition in Wisconsin points out that in 1945 there were 44 bald eagles' nests around Lake Michigan.

"Now," she says, "there is only one nest left, and the pair of eagles that occupy it have produced no young since 1964."

The injury done by DDT to these birds apparently involves a disturbance in calcium metabolism that results in "the thin eggshell phenomenon"—a shell too thin to adequately protect the developing embryo.

Industry is working hard at developing new selective chemical insecticides—ones that will affect only insects and only certain insects at that.

Among the many approaches under study outside the chemical industry are the development of synthetic hormones that prevent reproduction of certain insects, the use of sterilized male insects to reduce the reproductive potential of a species and the introduction of bacteria or viruses that infect certain target insects.

Industry and conservation forces seem to agree on at least one point—that the complexion of the pesticide picture will change. How fast and how much it will change will depend largely on the outcome of the current groundswell of challenges to the survival of DDT and its fellow persistent pesticides.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I think it should be of deep concern to all of us, whether we support or oppose the Safeguard ABM system, that there is a danger of public discussion on the issue being side-tracked by larger and symbolic purposes. As rational men it is imperative that we seek to tame our biases and examine this issue on its merits. If the ABM becomes a cause celebre for those who find a curious emotional and moral satisfaction in opposing defense because it is defense, the public interest and the policymaking process itself will suffer.

Mr. President, on April 25 in New York City, the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson) participated in a program on the ABM sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association at the Americana Hotel. In his opening statement, Senator Jackson spoke with the kind of measured rationality and full knowledge of the facts that we have come to expect of him. The quiet

certainly that Senator Jackson feels in his position is manifest in the fact that he finds no need to resort to the sort of sophistry that has characterized some other statements on this issue.

Although I find Senator Jackson's statement superb from beginning to end, I am particularly impressed by his discussion of the paradoxical position of those who oppose Safeguard on the grounds that it is immoral. As Senator Jackson notes, there is no great morality to be found in a nation whose only available response to nuclear attack is destruction of the civilian population of that nation presumed to be the aggressor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Jackson's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 25, 1969

The intransigence of the Soviet Union in the period after World War II left this country no alternative to the development of a strong nuclear deterrent. As we all know, the Soviets rejected our offer in the Baruch Plan to share the hopeful potentials of the nuclear age, and they proceeded with a hard-driving nuclear weapons program of their own.

I believe our policy of nuclear deterrence by maintaining a second-strike retaliatory force has served us well. But there are two current Soviet developments that threaten the credibility of our deterrent in the time period of 1974-75-76—the Soviets' ballistic missile defense systems, and their steady deployment of the big SS-9 missile with a capacity of 20 to 25 megatons, on which they are testing multiple warheads.

The Soviets have been hard at work on their ABM for many years. Their first system, partially deployed around Leningrad, was apparently abandoned; the second, deployed around Moscow is now approaching operational status; and the Tallinn system, very extensively deployed throughout the Soviet Union, is believed by many in the intelligence community to be subject to upgrading so as to give it an ABM capability.

The huge Soviet SS-9 carrying multiple warheads each aimed precisely at a different target could be used against the U.S. land-based Minuteman system. The hard truth is that, by the mid-1970's, unless we continue to make appropriate decisions to meet technological change, the viability of a large part of our second strike force will be put in question.

Faced with this problem, President Nixon has recommended a modified ABM Safeguard system designed primarily to provide a protection for the national command authority and vital elements of our bomber and Minuteman retaliatory forces to help assure the maintenance of the Western nuclear deterrent in the period of the mid-1970's and beyond. Also, the program has a useful function in providing an area defense against attacks involving modest numbers of apparent incoming missiles. The Safeguard system is designed and planned to meet the threats as they may develop, without overreacting, and is subject to annual review. Under phase one of the program two sites will be constructed.

Given the lead-time factor for the ABM system of five to seven years, continuing research and development only, without any start now on deployment, would leave us with no option to provide defense for our

deterrent on the schedule that may be essential if we do not reach an agreement with the Soviets on limiting or reducing strategic forces. If the Soviets should slam the door on a strategic arms limitation agreement, the Safeguard ABM program would permit us to continue orderly steps toward protection of vital elements of our retaliatory forces.

Let me also emphasize that the average annual cost of the completed Safeguard program, on a five year basis, is less than one-fifth of what we were spending for active defense against manned bombers at the end of the 1950's. Nor is this defensive weapon at all likely to spark a quantitative arms build-up. Indeed, contrary to the propaganda, there has been no long-term quantitative increase in our strategic offense and defense budget. The U.S. budget for strategic offense and defense forces in fiscal year 1962 was 11.3 billion dollars. The proposed fiscal 1970 budget comes to about 8.3 billion dollars. Adjusted for price changes, the 1970 budget figure is more than 50% lower than that for 1962.

I must say it was strange at our Armed Services hearings this week to find anti-ABM witnesses opposing deployment of a *defensive system* because of the risk of escalating the arms race and, at the same time, advocating, as preferable, the proliferation of our Minuteman and Poseidon *offensive forces*. Adding quantitatively to our Minuteman forces, and to our MIRVed Poseidon forces would enable the Russians to charge that we were acting in a provocative manner. Moreover, any significant expansion of our offensive nuclear weapons is far more costly than the Safeguard program.

Indeed it may shock you to hear that some people opposing the ABM have revived the old, discredited suggestion that, rather than provide a protective defense for our ICBM's, we should launch the Minuteman force against Russian cities simply on the basis of radar indications. This, of course, would vastly increase the nightmare possibility of nuclear war by mistake. The decision to launch ICBM's against Russian cities would be perhaps the most momentous choice ever made in all of history. It would be the decision for World War III. If this awful decision is ever made it should be based on as much information as we can get and it should be made by the highest possible political authority. It is the last decision we should think of delegating to a computer.

People who most tout themselves as doves of peace are turning out to be the irresponsible hawks.

The major components of the Safeguard system have received elaborate study and testing. Ideas for brand new ABM systems to defend hard points are not serious competitors in the time period we are talking about. Moreover, to terminate the ABM program now and restart it again at a later time would involve a delay of one or two years from the date it was decided to resume and an extra expenditure of several billion dollars.

I believe we should go forward with deploying the Safeguard system now. We can expect, as in the case of every other offense and defense system, that we shall learn a great deal from operational experience, and we should expect to make some changes and improvements as we go along. As Dean Acheson recently said in his speech supporting President Nixon's ABM decision: "... all of us can think of many reasons for not abandoning the ABM field to development by the Soviet Union."

The idea that we should not be hard at work in this very important defensive area of nuclear weaponry, while the potential opponent—who is already coming at least equal to us in offensive nuclear weaponry—has been hard at work in the defensive field for many years, is to me wholly imprudent.

As Dr. William McMillan told the Armed Services Committee this week: "We can ill afford to allow an important gap to develop in the learning process concerning such an important capability."

I believe that the great majority of Americans, with their down-to-earth common sense, will not be taken in by the sophisticated arguments that it is somehow bad to defend ourselves.

I must confess to a strong predisposition in favor of prudence in providing for our national security—given the nature of the Soviet adversary. I do not know how to assess the Soviet Union except as an opportunistic, unpredictable, dangerous opponent.

There are increasing signs in Russia of a move to the reactionary right and to a Stalin-like suppression of dissent in the name of communist orthodoxy. Scholars, writers, Jewish poets and novelists are being subjected to vicious denunciation and censorship. There are more intellectuals in Soviet prisons now than at any time since Stalin's terror. As to the outlook in Moscow which prompted the policy of ruthlessly slugging Czechoslovakia to its knees, such actions are not undertaken by rulers confident of the stability of their so-called "commonwealth" in East Europe or of their regime at home. The Russian rulers have a bear by the tail. We cannot discount the danger that an harassed and nervous Soviet leadership will take undue risks and make gross errors of judgment in its conduct of foreign affairs.

A President and a Congress are charged under the Constitution with the most solemn responsibilities as protectors of the Republic and as guardians of the peace. President Nixon has asked the Congress not to abandon work on the deployment of an ABM system, but to proceed with it. He said:

"I believe it is essential for the national security, and it is essential to avoid putting an American President, either this President or the next President, in the position where the United States would be second rather than first, or at least equal to any potential enemy."

Moreover, President Nixon believes he would be in a much stronger position in any negotiations with the Soviet Union on limitation of offensive and defensive nuclear systems if he had the backing of the Congress on his Safeguard program. I agree with that analysis. Negotiations with the Soviet Union are always difficult, long drawn out, and can involve the most rigorous bargaining by Moscow for relative advantage. If American negotiators are confronted with a situation where the Soviet negotiators believe time is running on the Soviet side, our negotiators will be up against very adverse odds.

To arrive at successful, reciprocal, and mutually acceptable agreement involving both offensive and defensive nuclear systems will, in any event, be enormously difficult. Under our Constitution the President is charged with the conduct of foreign affairs. I want to help put him in the position he believes to be best to conduct those very important negotiations.

I am a Democrat. But I am proud that over the years I have supported our President—whether he was a Democrat or a Republican—in the critical decisions to promote the security of our country and to try to halt the further evolution of strategic armaments by mutual agreement with the Soviet Union.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS— TOUCHSTONE OF OUR COMMITMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968 was established by Executive Order No. 11394

on January 30, 1968. It was established in response to a request by the General Assembly of the United Nations that all member states commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was directed to "enlarge our people's understanding of the principles of human rights, as expressed in the Universal Declaration and the Constitution and in the laws of the United States."

In keeping with this directive, Mr. President, yesterday the final report of the President's Commission was transmitted. This report is fittingly titled "To Continue Action for Human Rights." I quote from the letter of transmittal from W. Averell Harriman, the Chairman of the Commission:

The whole of government must recognize its commitment to human rights and thereby seek to articulate its policies and programs in human rights terms. A touchstone of our commitment will be the ratification of additional human rights conventions through action by the Administration and the Senate. In this manner, our moral position in the world will reflect our historic devotion to these principles of human rights.

I repeat that these conventions are the "touchstone" of our human rights commitment. If this is our test, then the Senate has failed to meet the challenge. Let us ratify the Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Genocide now.

PHYSICISTS REJECT ABM AFTER DEBATE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, physicists polled Tuesday night at a debate on the antiballistic missile—ABM—opposed deployment of the Safeguard ABM, the system backed by the administration by a margin of almost four to one.

The debate was sponsored by the American Physical Society, meeting in Washington this week. The poll was conducted by Scientists for Social and Political Action, an informal political organization of scientists—1,216 physicists in the audience marked ballots distributed by SSPA, as follows:

Poll on the anti-ballistic-missile system	
	Percent
I support deployment of the present Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system	21
I am opposed to deployment of the present Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system	76
I have no opinion on this matter.....	3
Deployment of Safeguard is likely to lead to an increase in the arms race.....	70
Deployment of Safeguard is likely to have little effect on the arms race.....	25
Deployment of Safeguard is likely to lead to a reduction in the arms race.....	5
I am in favor of a thicker anti-ballistic-missile system	9
I am opposed to any deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system	51
I am undecided about future anti-ballistic-missile systems	40

The debate that preceded the balloting was the best attended session of the current physics meetings. Speaking for the ABM were Eugene Wigner, a theoretical physicist from Princeton, and Donald Brennen, a weapons analyst for

the Hudson Institute. The ABM was opposed by Cornell physicist Hans Bethe and political scientist G. W. Rathjens of M.I.T., both of whom have been involved in weapons system design.

The poll clearly shows strong opposition to the ABM from the scientific community.

THE DEAN OF THE WISCONSIN DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial published recently in the Milwaukee Journal regarding the dean of the Wisconsin Democratic congressional delegation, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

The editorial commends the outstanding work of the Representative from Milwaukee's Fourth Congressional District. He has made a distinguished record in the U.S. Congress during the last 20 years. CLEM ZABLOCKI's interests and talents are many and varied, and he continues to serve his constituents and their needs tirelessly.

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

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

ABOUT CLEM ZABLOCKI

What makes a good congressman? In today's Picture Journal Don Oleson writes about Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat from Milwaukee's 4th congressional district. It is good reading and accompanying pictures reinforce the story.

Clem Zablocki has served almost three decades as a legislator, state and national. For 20 years his south side constituents have been sending him to Washington—with such strong support that when he doesn't get over 70% of the vote he worries.

It is a matter of pride to longtime friends that "this church organist" has done so well. But that misses the point. Zablocki has gone far because he is intelligent, works hard, usually rejects "exercises in futility," knows the ropes.

Zablocki knows his constituents and their needs and works constantly for them. He is a wise politician. He is something of an expert in foreign affairs, too. He knows and has known presidents, top diplomats, high officials in this country and abroad. They respect him and his position and abilities. He is a kielbasa man, but a caviar man, too. He is worth reading about.

THE JOB CORPS IN MARYLAND AND THE NATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Nixon administration's decision to close Catoctin Job Corps Center in Maryland is indefensible. It is wrong. It is arbitrary. It cannot be justified.

The administration's decision to emasculate this effective antipoverty program comes just a month after its decision to spend upward of \$7 billion to deploy a dubious, obsolete, ineffective missile defense system. The destruction of the Jobs Corps to help pay for useless military hardware demonstrates a cynical disregard for the real needs of the American people. It indicates, once again, that the administration has seen fit to make the poor people foot the bill for its courtship with the military-industrial complex.

The administration's ABM and Job Corps decisions turn logic upside down and national priorities inside out. The ABM will be deployed even if it is worthless. The Job Corps will be destroyed whatever its value.

The principal victims of the administration's meat ax are the conservation centers—the Job Corps camps which have served the most destitute poor. Fifty of the 82 conservation centers have been ordered shut down, including Catoctin Job Corps Center in my home State of Maryland.

In all, nearly 17,000 of the 36,000 Job Corps enrollees will be sent back to the streets by July 1 as a result of the administration's action.

For the past 4½ years, the Job Corps, particularly through its conservation centers, has provided a ray of hope for the most disadvantaged of this Nation's young people.

Ninety percent of the corpsmen have been school dropouts.

Two-thirds, including more than 90 percent at the conservation centers, have entered the Jobs Corps as functional illiterates.

Sixty percent entered unskilled.

Fifty-six percent were unemployed.

Sixty percent came from broken homes; 27 percent from families on relief.

Sixty-eight percent of the corpsmen entered Job Corps from families where the head of the household was unemployed.

The Job Corps was their only hope. It is a cruel blow to extinguish that hope. It may, however, be an even crueler blow to our cities this summer. Turning 17,000 disillusioned corpsmen loose to roam the streets this summer is an open invitation to violence. According to the Kerner Commission report, the corpsmen are, by and large, the same kind of youths who did the burning and looting in more than 50 American cities during the 1967 riots.

It would also be interesting to know why in its eagerness to condemn the Job Corps for its high operating costs, the administration neglected to consider the constructive contributions corpsmen have made to this country.

Since the inception of the Job Corps in 1965, corpsmen have completed conservation work projects valued at more than \$70 million. In the last 8 months alone, they have completed more than \$14 million worth of work in our national parks and forests. In addition, during fiscal year 1968 more than 4,000 corpsmen voluntarily contributed more than 400,000 hours in emergency services to this Nation, including more than 330,000 hours fighting fires. That is no small contribution from a group of youths who, without the Job Corps, likely would have contributed nothing at all.

Unfortunately, the administration chose not to use such rational criteria in its rush to close Job Corps centers. If it had, it would have found it difficult to justify the closing of Catoctin, which Job Corps officials assure me is one of their best centers.

But, even under the nebulous criteria the administration used, it cannot justify the closing of Catoctin.

Had the most current statistics been used to measure Catoctin's performance, they would show Catoctin ranking favor-

ably with the centers which the administration apparently is going to let remain open. The administration, for example, listed the operating cost at Catoctin at \$4,482 per corpsman per year, though the current actual cost according to the most recent Job Corps statistics is only \$4,051 per year.

Similarly, the administration used 5.76 months as the figure for the average length of stay of Catoctin corpsmen. The most recent Job Corps figure is 6.3 months. Had the current figures been used, Catoctin would have come out with 46 points on the tally sheet. That is a high enough score to keep it from closing, since all centers scoring 44 or better are to be kept open. In light of this error, I have written the Secretary of Labor asking him to reconsider his decision to close the Catoctin center.

Catoctin was the Nation's first Job Corps center. It is located less than a mile from Camp David, where President Nixon spends many of his weekends.

If he had, he would have seen what I saw earlier this week during my most recent visit there. He would have seen Catoctin's excellent vocational education program training corpsmen to be carpenters, masons, electricians, auto mechanics, heavy equipment operators and welders. He would have seen some of the many work projects corpsmen have completed, such as the building of the access road to an American Legion campsite in the Catoctin Mountains.

Catoctin's achievements have been impressive in its 4½ years. Its corpsmen have completed work projects valued at \$1,250,000. Of the corpsmen who entered Catoctin, 57.8 percent are now employed across the Nation. Another 11.8 percent are back in school furthering their education. Some 2.6 percent are in the military service. And, Catoctin's annual cost per corpsman is more than \$500 below the national average for conservation centers.

In accepting President Nixon's appointment as director of OEO, Congressman DONALD RUMSFELD alluded to "the voices we have lost amid the shouting—the voices of quiet anguish; the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart."

"We are all poor, regardless of where we live," he said, "when we fail to heed these voices."

In this Job Corps decision the administration, it is quite obvious, has failed to heed these voices.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE DARTMOUTH COLLEGE CASE

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, on April 9, a ceremony was held in Washington to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the decision of the Supreme Court in Woodward against Trustees of Dartmouth College, the famous "Dartmouth College Case." That case, argued on behalf of the college by a great predecessor of ours, Senator Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, is a landmark in American jurisprudence.

Many of the remarks made at the ceremony hold significant relevance to the world of 1969. I ask unanimous consent that the introductory statement of Judge Carl McGowan, the speech by

Dartmouth President John Sloan Dickey, my own remarks, and the address by Chief Justice Warren be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that we of Dartmouth may share them with the Senate.

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

REMARKS BY JUDGE CARL MCGOWAN, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DARTMOUTH COLLEGE CASE AND DANIEL WEBSTER, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 9, 1969

In this 200th year of its life under a charter granted by the British crown, Dartmouth College today celebrates the 150th anniversary of the preservation of that Charter by the judicial power of the federal republic. Now it has long been the fashion of some Ivy League alumni to be amused at the way the eyes of Dartmouth men light up and their pulses quicken when mention is made of the Dartmouth College Case and Daniel Webster, but they don't have the same sensitivity that we have to the grim prospect that troubled Dartmouth undergraduates at the time of the crisis back in the 1800's. Rufus Choate was a freshman at Dartmouth when those dark clouds gathered, and in a letter to his brother at that anxious moment, he wrote, "You are aware no doubt that this is a critical moment for Dartmouth College, the storm so long gathering seems about to burst, the stroke may be fatal, the seat of science may fall, and I may have to go to Harvard or Yale College!"

For more than 20 years now the Dartmouth students of today who have been spared that same alternative have had good reason to be grateful not only to Daniel Webster and the Supreme Court but also to the man who has led the College during these exciting and eventful years. The skill and vision and great good sense he has brought to that past have already become a part of the Dartmouth legend. I present to you the resident of Dartmouth College, John Sloan Dickey.

REMARKS BY MR. JOHN SLOAN DICKEY, PRESIDENT, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, AT CEREMONIES COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DARTMOUTH COLLEGE CASE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 9, 1969

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, Judge McGowan, Senator McIntyre and all others gathered here who grace this occasion by your presence—I even might be permitted to say Brethren of the Bar, because there are a great many of you here, and I, at least at one time, was one of you.

My remarks are not only brief but they are exceedingly informal. Perhaps the most important thing that I have to say is "thank you." I am always amazed at the number of people to whom we are indebted for an occasion of this sort. Mr. Chief Justice Warren, on behalf of the Trustees of Dartmouth and of all Dartmouth men I thank you for your presence, for the words which you will bring to us, and—if I may say a personal word of gratitude—I thank you for what you have meant to the American nation during these years.

Senator McIntyre, we thank you for being one of, I believe, two members of the legislative branch who have resisted the temptation to be on vacation. We thank you not only for your presence and for what you will say to us of Webster as a New Hampshire man and legislator, but we also thank you for the fact that the Dartmouth College Case will be remembered through its recognition for one of those exceedingly high privileges of being commemorated on a United States stamp. I shall not take time to relate the vicissitudes of that affair and the tenacity on your part that was necessary for that small miracle to happen, but we are thankful to you, Senator, for bringing that miracle to pass.

Judge McGowan and the members of your Committee, we thank you for the fact that it is possible for this occasion to take place and for your presiding over it. Chief Justice Cowan and his associates of the Court of Claims, Chief Justice Worley of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeal, we thank you for hospitality such as I never imagined a court would be able to extend to anyone.

And Mr. Justice Clark, we thank you for the interest and assistance you have brought to this occasion and for the assistance of the Federal Judicial Center.

May I mention just two gentlemen from the College to whom we are also indebted, both for this occasion and for a very major contribution to American history in the enduring sense—Mr. Richard Morin, Librarian Emeritus of Dartmouth, who has done the most recent study of the Dartmouth College Case, its history and legal aspects, and its impact. Each of you will receive a copy of that booklet in a very short time. And Professor Charles Wiltse, of whom I will speak later, who is in charge of the Webster project.

Dick Morin has managed today's affair for us and I think it entirely in order that you all know who he is. Dick, would you please stand up?

Now, with that important aspect of my assignment done, may I say to you that I of course welcome on behalf of the Trustees of Dartmouth—and you are their guests in a material sort of way—but I make bold to welcome you on behalf, more significantly, of the late Mr. Chief Justice Marshall and Daniel Webster, because except for them, ladies and gentlemen, there would be no party.

Many things make the occasion significant to the nation, to the College, to the Bar. As Judge McGowan said it is the 200th anniversary of the Dartmouth Charter, the last Charter to be granted by George the Third. He thereafter very shortly became somewhat disillusioned about any further grants. It is also fortunate that history has so arranged things that the 150th anniversary of that Lazarus-like miracle performed for the Charter by the court of Mr. Chief Justice Marshall should be celebrated just 150 years ago. The New Hampshire Courts, as I trust all of you know, had assumed that that Charter was dead and buried. Mr. Chief Justice Marshall resurrected it in very, very lively fashion.

Now, in my view we ought to celebrate our great cases more, and if I have any message for the future it is that. What really has been more ignored in American history than the great turning points of history which are represented by such historic judicial decisions? We as lawyers tend to focus on the decision and the impact the decision has upon the law. Yet as one looks back over the history of our particular institution of higher education, Dartmouth, and the way that institution has been fashioned, its character and its personality, over a hundred and fifty years, by what it thought that decision meant, whether it meant that or not, one can see that the decision was of the greatest significance to American private higher education, and, indeed, to many things beyond the community of private higher education. Let's take just a small vow, that we will be a little more sensitive to the possibility that there are some great judicial landmarks that ought to be celebrated. And I make bold to say to you that 90 to 100 years from now the truth of that statement will be even more self-evident.

Dick Morin, in his book on the Dartmouth College Case, reminds us that it was Dartmouth College and not the world that was saved by that decision. And without relying too heavily on the dictum of Charles Wilson in G.M. versus the United States, I still like to think that no good thing is saved without contributing to the salvation of all good things. Marshall in that opinion spoke of the fact that the Charter assured Dartmouth of

individuality and immortality. A really remarkable combination. And that concept and Dartmouth's understanding of the case, not a legal one, an emotional one, a human one, has led to the development of a feeling about institutions which very possibly is unique in American life. And it has spread to the institutions of higher education and to other institutions. I am inclined to think that feeling can be traced very directly to that sense of heightened independence and pride of having bested the State that came out of the Dartmouth College Case when Webster persuaded the court of Mr. Chief Justice Marshall to reverse the New Hampshire courts and the New Hampshire legislature.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, the occasion here is important to the nation in connection with the project to gather together and make available to scholars and to the American nation the Webster Papers. It has been said by one good friend, who had hoped to be here today but is not, that he understood this to be an occasion for the "rehabilitation" of Daniel Webster. Well, more importantly, we are engaged in a project in cooperation with quite a few people and institutions to make sure that the great role that Webster played in American history is preserved and made available. I am going to conclude this portion of my remarks by drawing on a memorandum prepared by Professor Charles Wiltse who is in charge of this project.

"Over the past three years manuscripts have streamed in from the far corners of the land, from Canada, from England, from continental Europe, through friends, libraries, collectors, alumni and others. In time, thanks to the co-sponsor with Dartmouth of this project, the National Historical Publications Commission, all of these Webster items will be gathered together and published in appropriate forms." As Wiltse says, "We shall know this farmer, this small town lawyer, this congressman, this senator, this Secretary of State, an advocate without peer before the highest court, as well as we know his great contemporaries, the Adamases, Jefferson, Madison, Marshall, Clay, Calhoun, whose papers are also in the process of editing."

I shall not go into the detail of the process whereby these papers are being gathered and will be reproduced, but when it is over, there will be some 30 volumes of Webster material made available to scholars and the American nation. "This material," Wiltse goes on to say, "enlarges our understanding of the man, gives us fresh insight into the turbulent times in which he lived. In his correspondence, his legal briefs, his speeches we may see more clearly than any secondary account could tell us Webster's influence on his times and on our own times. He helped to shape the Supreme Court as we know it today. He anticipated the direction of American diplomacy as we have seen it for the past hundred years. He gave powerful stimulus and invaluable tools to the growth of corporate enterprise and the growth of institutions. And above all, by example, by force of argument and by matchless eloquence he convinced the American people that they were indeed one nation indivisible." Thank you very much.

THE UNION AND DANIEL WEBSTER

(Address by Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, New Hampshire, at the 150th anniversary observance of the Dartmouth Case, U.S. Court of Claims Building, Washington, D.C., Apr. 9, 1969)

When we recount the grim litany of events that assaulted our sensibilities, racked our consciences and shook our national confidence in just the past 12 months, we are moved to ask once again:

How do we survive? What keeps this Nation intact?

Two assassinations only months apart. One mocking the gospel of the black apostle

of non-violence. The other snuffing out the life of a gifted young man as he pursued the goals and the office of his martyred brother.

Both followed by disbelief . . . then shock . . . then overwhelming grief. And in the case of the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, more than shock, more than grief. Ghetto explosions in a score of cities.

Smoke rose but ten blocks from the White House. Ten blocks from the heart of our Government.

There were other shocks.

In the midst of unprecedented national prosperity, a mule train moved into Washington to dramatize that there were still poor and hungry Americans whose voices were not being heard.

And then there was the war. Now the fourth most costly in American lives. As hotly debated as ill-defined. And stubbornly resisting resolution.

As one consequence of the war—the revolt of the young and the spreading generation gap.

Six to nine thousand young men of draft age moved to Canada or Europe. Others simply dropped out of society and fell into a milieu as incomprehensible to some as it is offensive to others. Still others captured the headlines by assaulting from within the bastions of higher education.

Early in the year, the political activation of the young. The New Politics. The New Left. And then there was Chicago.

For every action, a reaction. The revolt of the older generation against the alleged excesses of the young. The white backlash. A new Know-Nothing movement tried to make political capital from these reactions . . . not by winning the White House, but by trying to deadlock the election process in order to exact concessions.

And so it went.

Everywhere we looked, we saw exploding evidence of a fragmented society.

And yet—somehow—the Nation survived intact.

The crises are not past. Madmen are still loose with guns, a continuing threat to our national leaders. The black and white and the generation schisms have not closed. Student restiveness is peaking again. And the war goes on.

This is no time to be sanguine.

But we are still intact, still one Nation. Strained, torn, shocked and distressed . . . but still one Nation.

And the question is: How? Why?

One hundred and twenty-six years ago Daniel Webster attempted an answer. On June 17, 1843, he delivered his Second Bunker Hill address. In it, he defined as precisely as he could what made a nation a nation—what made this Nation a nation that would survive for years and years to come.

As was so often the case with Webster, his answer was both simple and complex. Simple in its directness. Complex in its nuances.

On that day, the Nation was less than 70 years removed from its founding. It had survived a Revolutionary War that was not universally popular, and now it was strained by conflicting class and sectional interests, local customs, local pride and prejudice.

Time will not permit me to detail these conflicts. But let it be said that many are as familiar to us as they were to our ancestors.

One example:

Alexis de Toqueville, examining the agony of American cities as early as 1830, wrote a prelude to the works of Daniel Moynihan—or the Kerner Report. This is what he said:

"The lower classes which inhabit these cities . . . consist of freed blacks who are condemned by the laws and by public opinion to a hereditary state of misery and degradation . . . As inhabitants of a country where they have no civil rights, they are ready to turn all the passions which agitate the community to their own advantage; thus within

the last few months, serious riots have broken out in Philadelphia and New York."

Webster was keenly aware of all the stresses and strains on national unity as he stood before the Bunker Hill Monument, yet it was there he defined his concept of nationalism and there that he called for union.

The purpose and the essential quality of the Nation was balance, Webster said. The force at the center of the Nation had to stay in balance or chaos would result.

As long as this fundamental balance was maintained, the Nation could accommodate virtually every form of diversity—and, indeed, serve as its principal guarantor.

Thus Webster's call for union did not imply a need for leveling, a need to do away with the endless and cherished variety of this country and its people. Instead, it left Americans free to go their separate ways and still consider themselves good Americans.

But if Webster's nationalism was defined as balance—what maintained that balance?

Three things, he said: A shared common culture, a uniquely American set of political institutions . . . and character.

Of the first, Webster said: "The arts, sciences, and literature of England came over with the settlers. That great portion of the common law which regulates the social and personal relations and conduct of men came also. The jury came; the habeas corpus came; the testamentary power came; and the law of inheritance and descent came also, except that part of it which recognizes the rights of primogeniture, which either did not come at all, or soon gave way to the rule of equal partition of estates among children."

Thus the settlers kept what was good, discarded what no longer applied, and augmented that long heritage of English culture with that unique set of free, republican institutions growing logically from their new environment.

The Revolution was important, Webster said, because it insured the continued existence of the first two factors and added the third.

"The truth is," he said, "that the American Revolution was not caused by the instantaneous discovery of principles of government before unheard of, or the practical adoption of political ideas such as had never before entered into the minds of men. It was but the full development of principles of government forms of society, and political sentiments, the origins of all of which lay back two centuries in English and American history."

It was Washington, he said, who was the apotheosis of those factors that created the American national character—liberty, union, mission, and balance.

It was this, he implied, that created a nation greater than the sum of its parts—a synergism that defied destruction, defied dissolution . . . remained intact.

There are few things new in this world. All of the events that shook us in the year nineteen hundred and sixty eight we or our forebears have experienced before. And survived before.

Did we survive because our character is indeed what Daniel Webster said it is? Did we survive because our union is elastic enough to accommodate diversity . . . our love of liberty so strong it protects diversity . . . our mission so clear that our development proceeds up the steps of little "revolutions" . . . yet our balance so firm it defies conquest, overthrow or despair?

I believe it. I believe it. But I also believe that we shall survive only so long as we remain true to our National character.

And Daniel Webster set that standard when he said: "Let us hold fast to the great truth, that communities are responsible, as well as individuals; that no government is respectable which is not just; that

without unspotted purity of public faith, without sacred public principle, fidelity, and honor, no mere forms of government, no machinery of laws, can give dignity to political society."

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY HONORABLE EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT CEREMONIES COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DARTMOUTH COLLEGE CASE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 9, 1969

It is a great pleasure for me to be present with you today, and to join you in memorializing two significant years that have in their various ways contributed to the welfare of your College and to the Nation. In its 200 years Dartmouth College, through its thousands of graduates, has spread enlightenment to every corner of the land, and in the 150 years since the *Dartmouth College Case*, the place of Daniel Webster in American history has not only become more secure but has ranked him as perhaps the greatest advocate in the long history of the Supreme Court.

I have been interested to discover from the historical record that this is the second time in this century that a Chief Justice of the United States has, at the invitation of Dartmouth College, taken part in a ceremony honoring the College's most famous alumnus, Daniel Webster. In 1901, one of my distinguished predecessors, Melville W. Fuller, journeyed to Hanover to attend the celebration of the centennial of Webster's graduation from Dartmouth.

He spoke at the closing banquet—an affair which, again I find from the record, began at six-thirty in the evening, with the Chief Justice reached in the order of speakers at one o'clock in the morning. Today, our Court would almost certainly hold this to be in conflict with the Eighth Amendment's proscription of cruel and unusual punishments—if not for the Chief Justice, at least for his audience. I, thankfully, face you under considerably less formidable circumstances.

There were, as Chief Justice Fuller remarked on that earlier occasion, some "special considerations" which moved him to accept the College's invitation. Both of his grandfathers had been students at Dartmouth during Webster's undergraduate days. His Fuller grandfather had, indeed, been in Webster's class, and a close youthful friendship was formed which continued throughout their adult years. It was largely for this reason that Chief Justice Fuller himself had, while an undergraduate at Harvard nearly fifty years before, made the trip from Cambridge to Marshfield to pay his respects at Webster's funeral.

But as Chief Justice Fuller went on to say of his presence at Dartmouth in 1901, "there was another and weightier cause that impelled me, a sense of duty to testify by my personal attendance to the tie that binds the memory of this great minister of justice to the court, in aid of whose labors some of the most splendid manifestations of his intellectual power were exhibited." It is with that same sense of respect for a great advocate at the bar of our Court that I join in your commemoration today.

To call the roll of the great cases in which Webster appeared, and in which he prevailed, is to describe the process by which the Federal Constitution became a vital force in American life. They include such foundation stones of modern constitutional law as *McCulloch v. Maryland*, which recognized the implied powers of the new government and established their supremacy, and *Gibbons v. Ogden*, which created the conditions for the subsequent use by the Congress of the Commerce Clause to achieve a host of important public purposes. We decide cases today within the framework of the great con-

cepts of self-government born and shaped in these pioneering decisions.

As to the *Dartmouth College Case* itself, I am in the midst at the moment of many representatives of Webster's winning client, and clients are notoriously less interested in the grounds of decision than in the result. It was, after all, a small college, confronted by a very formidable state government; and, in the David and Goliath context, it is the failure of logic to command the result that brings the happy ending.

Judge Henry Friendly, in his Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise Lectures at Dartmouth last year, has noted that "one of the great contributions of the [Case] was the impetus it gave to voluntary associations as a factor in American life." The importance of that factor in the shaping of our society is surely substantial, but Judge Friendly also noted that the question of when a private educational association takes on the characteristics of a public institution for certain purposes is perhaps a more complex and difficult one than Chief Justice Marshall assumed it to be in 1819. At least that would appear to be true today, as Judge Friendly illuminates at length in his interesting exploration of the problem.

By emphasizing Dartmouth's private and voluntary aspects, Webster won the lawsuit in question.

It is interesting that, not many years later and in another lawsuit, he sought to break Stephen Girard's will because the school it endowed was directed to exclude all manifestations of organized religion, a circumstance which, so Webster argued, conflicted with public policy to such a degree as to warrant nullification by governmental authority of an owner's desires for the disposition and utilization of private property. Webster's clients did not succeed on that occasion; and, in view of the later history of the Girard will, I do not pursue the matter other than to observe that Webster might be the first to agree that the immunity of seemingly private activity from public control is not a static concept.

There has long been, as we all know, a respectable body of opinion extent that the *Dartmouth College Case* came out the right way but for the wrong reasons. In putting this viewpoint forward with great vigor at the New Hampshire celebration of the John Marshall Centennial, Professor Jeremiah Smith of the Harvard Law School, a son of one of the lawyers for the College, felt it appropriate under the circumstances to add what are, to me at any rate, these comforting words:

"That Marshall made occasional mistakes may be safely admitted without seriously detracting from his judicial reputation." And an authentic voice of the College in the current *Alumni Magazine* has usefully reminded us that what the Supreme Court undertook to save by its decision was the College, and not the world.

It was worth saving and has since thoroughly justified the emotional character given to it by Webster when he said, "It is a small college, but there are those who love it." By any measuring stick, it was a memorable case. In the first place, it was Webster's first important case in the Supreme Court of the United States. It preserved the life and independent character of one of the fine old private colleges of America, which were the progenitors of our system of higher education. In doing so, it also guaranteed the self-determination of all such small colleges and gave a sanctity to contracts generally which has greatly affected the economic as well as the academic life of the Nation.

If, as I believe with Chief Justice Fuller when he said in that earlier ceremony nearly seventy years ago, "it is impossible to overestimate the support that the court derives from the bar," how is it possible to exaggerate

the debt which John Marshall must have owed to Webster's powerful formulations of constitutional principle, or to understate his contributions to the benevolent purposes which the Federal Republic has been able to achieve because of them? If any proof were needed, surely Webster's career as a great advocate in adversary litigation demonstrates that private practitioners of large vision frequently advance great public ends in the course of their daily work.

Those ends are not invariably concerned with commercial enterprises and property interests. I have also been interested to discover that Webster's representation before the Supreme Court was not always confined to such clients as the Bank of the United States and a New Jersey operator of steamboats. In 1820, only a year after his superior legal talents bore fruit in the *Dartmouth College case*, Webster was appointed by the Court to serve without compensation as counsel for fifty unfortunate men who had been convicted of piracy in the federal courts and sentenced to death.

The prospects of success on appeal were bleak and, in the end, even Webster's skill proved unavailing for his destitute and unpopular clients.

But his unreserved and energetic response to this summons to appear in an unappealing and forlorn cause was a building block in a great edifice, and one which looms the larger on the legal horizon of today because of his example. Currently there are thousands of American lawyers who are called upon each year to follow in his footsteps, and who do so generously and without complaint, despite the inevitable disruptions of their professional practice and the misunderstanding with which laymen view at least some of their efforts.

Over the years the lawyers who have responded in this manner have enabled the courts to assure that no person seriously involved with the criminal law must stand at the bar of justice alone, no matter how humble he may be in the social and economic scale or how repellent his conduct may seem to have been. This tradition has not only added a civilized aspect to our society which is gratifying to those who live in it, but it also presents one of the more appealing facets of that society to the world at large. Moreover, the mobilization of professional talents and experience on such a wide scale, and their direction to what was for long a neglected area of the law, have resulted in many improvements, legislatively and judicially, in criminal law and procedure. We face the staggering problems of the present the better because of this past. I am especially happy on this occasion to note in that past the presence and example of Daniel Webster.

The goal of equal justice under law is, however, an ever receding one. Long steps towards its realization only reveal further steps to be taken. The progress made in the provision of counsel in the trial and appellate phases of the criminal law has been notable, but much remains to be done even in that limited area. Congress, with the passage of the Criminal Justice Act of 1965, recognized the equity of a wider sharing of the financial burdens necessarily entailed in the representation of indigents by private lawyers in the federal courts. In many cases that provision is far from fully compensatory.

Lawyers do not expect to be spared all the personal burdens of a professional tradition of public service, but they can rightly insist that there be an allocation of public resources commensurate with the scale of the problem. A lawyer who gives of his time and energy without adequate compensation is certainly entitled to claim that there be adequate facilities to guarantee speedy trial. And, when and if the prison doors clang behind the 20-year-old defendant he has

made his sacrifices for, he can demand that the correctional system be given a fighting chance to effect the rehabilitation which will not require another appointed lawyer a few years hence. That lawyer also, I suggest, has legitimate credentials to assert that the country at large get on with the job of trying to prevent more 20-year-old offenders from springing up to take the place of his late client in the prisoner's dock.

There is another aspect of Webster's legal career which has a high degree of contemporary relevance. This was his persisting interest in the continuous improvement of the machinery by which justice is administered. This interest, already evident in his early years at the bar, was happily given opportunity for expression upon his first accession to public office. Throughout his service in the lower house of Congress—four years as a representative from New Hampshire and four from Massachusetts—he was on the House Judiciary Committee, serving as its chairman during the latter period.

Webster's maximum efforts in this capacity were pointed toward the rationalization of the structure of the federal judicial system so that it might function more efficiently. He labored at legislation to deal with the growing needs of the western states for more federal courts, and with the heavy burdens, and consequent backlogs, of the Supreme Court. Although close to success in this effort on at least two occasions, he was eventually frustrated by political partisanship, liberally compounded by dislike in some quarters for certain of the Court's decisions and some of its members.

Webster, as a lawyer and legislator, never made the mistake of projecting disagreement as to particular decisions into the area of institutional design.

He wanted the Court always to have the jurisdiction, structure, and resources best enabling it to function fairly and efficiently, and he vigorously opposed the resolution of those questions by reference to the nature of its current rulings. On the floor of the House he once had occasion to respond to a fellow member who opposed his judicial reform bill because of an allegedly misconceived ruling by the Supreme Court. Webster's words were:

"It would be unworthy, indeed, of the magnitude of this occasion, to bend our course a hair's breadth on the one side or the other, either to favor or to oppose what we might like, or dislike, in regard to particular questions. Surely we are not fit for this great work, if motives of that sort can possibly come near us."

Webster's years on the House Judiciary Committee also included pioneering work by him in the drafting of legislation implementing the national bankruptcy power but, as in the case of his proposals for structural reform, others were to reap at a later date the benefits of his efforts. As early as 1816, he proposed to confer upon the federal courts what we lawyers call "federal question" jurisdiction, that is to say, claims arising under the Constitution, and the laws and treaties of the United States. This did not commend itself to his Congressional colleagues, but 60 years later another Congress enacted this provision with virtually no dissent in the swelling stream of national sentiment which characterized post-Civil War America.

Today that jurisdiction is widely regarded as the critical justification for the existence of the lower federal courts.

In another area of law reform, Webster had more immediately visible success. Upon the urging of Justice Story, he undertook the preparation of a comprehensive Federal Criminal Code, with the purpose of bringing some precision and certainty into an area which was characterized by a vast amount of

confusion during the early years of the federal courts. Webster had the satisfaction of seeing that Code become law in 1825 before he left the House Judiciary Committee behind upon his election to the Senate.

I referred earlier to the present relevance of this aspect of Webster's life in the law. It is also especially appropriate for us to take note of it in this place—the new complex of buildings on Lafayette Square devoted to the interests and improvement of the federal judicial system. The handsome new building we are now in is indicative of the scale of commitment required to meet the physical needs of two units of that system which exercise a nation-wide jurisdiction over important subjects. The equally handsome but older adjoining buildings house old and new activities of critical importance to the future of all our federal courts.

The Administrative Office of the United States Courts, under Mr. Frieson, has for some years been in charge of budgetary, housekeeping, and statistical functions, although its responsibilities inevitably embrace a broader concern with judicial administration.

Congress has recently and wisely recognized, however, that there is a need for continuous planning, research, and education in respect of judicial administration. The restored Dolley Madison House was dedicated only last November to the use of the new Federal Judicial Center which Congress has brought into being to perform these tasks. The promise of this new entity is the more likely to be realized because of the happy circumstance of the willingness and availability of my friend and colleague, Mr. Justice Clark, to serve as its first Director. The litigation explosion, which threatens the engulfment of many of our courts, state and federal, is an urgent object of concern, and the quality of justice in this country will be closely affected by what goes on in these immediate environs. Since that quality was so much a concern of Webster's in his own time, it is particularly fitting that this meeting be held in this nerve center of the federal judicial system.

There is a third aspect of Webster's career which no one in my position can fail to appreciate.

In both the private and the public phases of that career, he was tireless in his efforts to sustain and protect the independence and the integrity of the federal courts, and their authority to give meaning to the language of the Constitution. His was a lifelong vision of the Federal Union as the essential instrument of our national strength and well-being. Although a New England Federalist in his early political affiliation, he would have no part of the Hartford Convention, where Yankees flirted with the idea of secession. The idea was equally abominable to him when it found expression in the South, and the last great cause of his life was the damping down, by means of the Compromise of 1850, of the threat of the breakup of the Union.

What was clear to him throughout, however, was that the preservation of the federal government, and of the Constitution creating it, was dependent upon respect for the authority of the Supreme Court and the inferior federal courts—and respect which did not ebb and flow with tides of feeling towards particular decisions. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, Webster was periodically confronted with legislative proposals generated by current dissatisfactions with the Supreme Court. Those proposals included abolition of the Court's appellate jurisdiction in state cases, transfer of that jurisdiction to the Senate, requirement of a two-thirds vote, and so on.

Although Webster lost his full share of cases in the Supreme Court, and had his moods of unhappiness about its functioning, his reaction to this kind of retaliation was

stern and unswerving opposition. That opposition was a powerful factor in the failure of those proposals, thereby founding a tradition of such failure which, happily, has largely prevailed ever since.

When South Carolina first seriously asserted the power of an individual state to nullify an Act of Congress, Webster's great powers of constitutional analysis provided the intellectual foundation for Andrew Jackson's more emotional response. It is one of our historical delights that these two arch political enemies joined hands in a cause which both agreed was bigger than either one of them. It was on the floor of the Senate, and in defense of a Congressional statute against state negation, that Webster took his stand. But he always described that effort as comprehending the principle that, just as a state may not nullify a federal statute, so it may not defy a Supreme Court judgment. His famous Reply to Hayne was, in his conception, as demonstrative of federal judicial authority, as of federal legislative authority, in the respective areas defined by the Constitution.

It was a conception rooted in Webster's deep conviction that, as he once put it in a House speech in support of a judiciary bill, "the maintenance of the judicial power is essential and indispensable to the very being of this government. The Constitution without it would be no constitution; the government, no government."

It was a personal article of faith which enabled him in the same speech to say of the federal judiciary and of the Supreme Court as its head: "It may have friends more able (than myself), it has none more sincere."

The passage of time has neither obscured nor undermined his claims to that attachment. Neither has the course of our subsequent history impaired his underlying premises as to the essential elements of constitutional government. A free people, then as now, require a free judiciary.

INCREASE OF DRUG USAGE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we hear much about Vietnam, international tensions, inflation, and riots. One of the most urgent, perhaps a part of the whole moral breakdown in our society, is the use of drugs.

I have received from Mr. Howard W. Chappell, chairman of Mayor Yorty's Citizens Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Committee, a letter on the increase of drug usage. He enclosed a copy of a letter to the Federal Communications Commission seeking to enlist the Commission's assistance in a matter of utmost importance. Chairman Chappell, in this letter, expresses concern to the Commission that—

Certain jokes, on many national television programs, treat illicit drug use and addiction in a humorous manner. It is felt by the members of this committee that smirking references to "grass" or taking a "trip" which, in effect, constitute humorous treatment of drug and marijuana use or addiction, tend to minimize the true seriousness of such use or addiction.

I ask unanimous consent that Chairman Chappell's letter to me and his letter to the Commission be printed in full following my remarks.

Mr. President, on another aspect of the drug problem, 92 different cities in my State have passed resolutions urging that hearings be held in southern California to investigate the drug problem on the border. I have requested that the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) hold hear-

ings in California on this subject and I am hopeful that he will be able to comply with my request. This further indicates the seriousness of the drug problem.

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 24, 1969.
MEMBER OF THE U.S. SENATE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: One of the most serious problems facing the United States today is the tremendous increase in the use of marijuana and dangerous drugs. This problem is especially prevalent among the youth of our nation who are greatly influenced by what they see on television.

It is believed by members of the Mayor's Citizens Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Committee that certain jokes, on many national television programs, treat illicit drug use and addiction in a humorous manner. This irresponsible treatment of a grave problem promotes the idea that illegal drug use is an acceptable practice without serious consequences.

For your information, I am forwarding a copy of a letter recently sent to the Federal Communications Commission. Our committee would appreciate hearing from you regarding your opinion on the position our committee has taken.

Sincerely,
HOWARD W. CHAPPELL,
Chairman, Mayor's Citizens Narcotics
and Dangerous Drugs Committee.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 6, 1969.
Mr. ROSEL H. HYDE,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HYDE: As members of a special citizen's committee appointed by Mayor Sam Yorty to formulate an immediate action program against the sickening and unprecedented increase in illicit drug traffic, we respectfully request the assistance of the Federal Communications Commission in a matter of critical importance.

By way of background, 4.6 tons of marijuana were seized locally by the Customs Service in 1966. Just two years later, the total seized had skyrocketed to 31 tons. In 1966, some 119,500 units of illicit dangerous drugs were confiscated by the Customs Service in our area. In 1968, this total had risen to 3,548,279 units, and in just the first half of the current fiscal year (1968-69), the total confiscated is a shocking 7,654,000 units. The Los Angeles Police Department seized 179,000 units in 1964; but in 1967, the total was 26,180,000 units!

Narcotics arrests in Los Angeles are up 67 percent over last year, but the flood into our area of illicit drugs and marijuana still increases at an appalling rate. Since the use and sale of marijuana and dangerous drugs has increased on such a scale, despite every effort by law enforcement officials, one cannot escape the obvious conclusion that no true progress can be made unless the public becomes angry enough to become involved.

There are a number of steps we propose to take in order to establish an urgent awareness throughout our community. We seek your assistance with one of these steps in particular. Probably no single media influences our daily lives as much as television. It is unfortunate that various television programs with vast viewing audiences, frequently use "pot" (marijuana) or LSD jokes on their programs. (It is felt by the members of this committee that smirking references to "grass" or "taking a trip" which, in effect, constitute humorous treatment of drug and marijuana use or addiction, tend to minimize the true seriousness of such use or addiction.)

While the writers of these scripts may consider the subject hilarious, our committee is not amused, particularly when our police frequently encounter children of ten, eleven and twelve using dangerous drugs. Contrary to what these TV show writers and producers may argue, we do not feel that the use, or illicit traffic, of drugs and marihuana is a laughing matter.

Certainly, we do not propose to constitute our group as a Board of Censors. Conversely, we do not propose to sit idly by and see the subject of illegal drug use made to appear as a completely acceptable practice to be joked about. Nobody could argue that drug addiction is less serious than cancer, because both are devastating destroyers of human beings, yet nobody is calloused enough to joke about cancer.

We respectfully urge your honorable Commission to consider this problem and provide leadership in influencing TV producers to put it into its true perspective.

We would welcome public service announcements against illicit drugs and narcotics. Our committee is concerned with the failure of the normal safeguards of society to combat the spreading menace of drug abuse. We are disgusted with programs which joke about it and, by reference, tend to convey an impression to our youth that use of drugs and marihuana is not of serious consequence. So that you may evaluate the caliber of the committee making this request, a roster is attached.

Your immediate assistance is urgently requested.

Sincerely,

HOWARD W. CHAPPELL,
Chairman, Mayor's Citizens Narcotics
and Dangerous Drugs Committee.

THE 1970 CENSUS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I believe there is widespread misunderstanding about the 1970 Census of Population and Housing. A number of surveys have been conducted by the Census Bureau for other agencies of the Federal Government within recent years concerning such matters as civil defense and transportation. There has been no obligation to respond to these surveys, but those who have not responded have received repeated reminders. To many people in Maryland, and I believe this is probably true in other States, these mailings from the Census Bureau have been regarded as a nuisance. In response to inquiries about this, I have been advised by the Director of the Bureau that individuals who do not wish to participate in a survey of this sort can be excused if they will write a letter so requesting.

But now 1970 is approaching. It is time for a decennial census. This survey, similar to those which have been conducted in this country every 10 years since 1790, will provide invaluable demographic data that cannot be obtained in any other way. We need to know how large our population is, as a nation, and within States and cities. We need population figures to insure that all people are equally represented in their State legislatures and in the Congress of the United States. Local governments need population data in order to plan for adequate schools, police, and other services in the decade ahead. We need information about existing housing in order to devise ways of meeting the current housing shortage.

These are just a few of the myriad reasons why the decennial census is so important and why replies to these census questionnaires are required by law.

Of course, the law also provides that all information given to the Census Bureau must be held in strictest confidence by the Bureau, and may be used only for statistical purposes. No individual information collected during the census can be used for taxation, regulation or investigative purposes. And no one using census data is permitted to publish anything that discloses an individual's confidential information.

Nevertheless, Americans have reason to be concerned about their privacy, and a great many people now look upon the forthcoming census as an intrusion into their personal and family affairs.

For this reason, I have been pleased to receive an informative and reassuring report from the Secretary of Commerce regarding the 1970 census procedures. Because this letter answers some of the most frequently asked questions about the census and also because it explains some recently announced revisions in the 1970 questionnaires, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, along with a face sheet, which I have found exceedingly interesting, comparing kinds of information collected in each U.S. census from 1790 to 1970.

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

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

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

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have recently received from various Members of Congress a number of questions about the 1970 Decennial Census. I am sure that you have been receiving similar inquiries from your constituents.

The main purpose of this letter is to advise you of some immediate changes in census procedure which I have ordered. These changes include a substantial reduction in the number of individuals who will be asked to respond to the longer census forms. Approximately three million households previously designated to receive a 66-question form will now receive a questionnaire containing only 23 questions.

Questions relating to the adequacy of kitchen and bathroom facilities have been reworded to remove any implication that the government is interested in knowing with whom these facilities may be shared.

The Secretary of Commerce is exercising greater supervision over the general operations of the Bureau of the Census and independent experts have been retained to advise on census matters.

The questionnaire which will be mailed to households in 1970 will be accompanied by a cover letter explaining the great need for census data and emphasizing the confidentiality of all responses.

In addition to these changes which are being implemented immediately, these further steps will be implemented after the 1970 census: (1) proposed questions will be submitted to the appropriate Committee of Congress two years in advance of future censuses; (2) an increased number of representatives of the general public will be appointed to various advisory committees which contribute to the formulation of census questions; and (3) a blue-ribbon Commis-

sion will be appointed to fully examine a number of important questions regarding the Census Bureau, including whether or not the decennial census can be conducted on a voluntary or a partially voluntary basis. The Commission would also examine and offer proposals for modernizing and improving the operations of the Census Bureau.

Because the 10-year lapse of time between decennial censuses can result in unfamiliarity regarding their nature and purpose, I felt it might be helpful to provide you with some basic data and information concerning the questions to be asked in 1970, the scope of the data sought, and the uses to which the results are put.

Some of the most frequently asked questions, along with my answers, follow:

1. Question: Is the 1970 census more extensive than previous censuses?

Answer: No. The number of questions to be asked in 1970 is about the same as in 1960, less than in 1950 and 1940, and far less than in some earlier censuses. Of the average household heads to be queried in 1970, four to five will answer 23 questions, three of twenty will answer 66 questions, and only one of twenty will answer 73 questions. Under certain unusual circumstances, some household heads will be asked to answer 89 questions.

2. Question: Will the citizen's right of privacy be protected in the 1970 census?

Answer: Yes. Whatever a respondent reports remains strictly confidential under the law. Every employee of the Census Bureau takes an oath of confidentiality and is subject to severe penalties for violation of the oath. In the long history of the census, there has never been a violation of the confidentiality of the information given.

3. Question: Would the 1970 census yield adequate results if the response were voluntary rather than mandatory?

Answer: Voluntary response at its best falls far short of response to a mandatory inquiry. Since the first Decennial Census in 1790, response has been mandatory. It is so in every other country of the world where a census is conducted. Professional statisticians will testify that a voluntary census would be unreliable and practically useless. A voluntary procedure would yield distorted and deficient statistics for whole groups of people and for entire areas. This procedure would very likely be especially prejudicial to low-income groups.

4. Question: Who uses the census results?

Answer: Census data are used by every Federal government department, State and local governments, and the private sector. Many laws depend upon accurate census reports. Questions such as those on housing are specifically required by statute. Government programs on poverty, housing, education, welfare, agriculture, transportation, veterans, and senior citizens require and rely upon the census tabulations. Many of the decisions of the Congress would be almost impossible in the absence of reliable census data.

These questions are illustrative of those which have been asked in recent weeks. The answers are necessarily brief. Enclosed is a memorandum which explains in more detail the purposes and uses of census information. If you have questions concerning the 1970 census, we would be pleased to discuss them with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Secretary of Commerce.

PURPOSES AND USES OF 1970 CENSUS INFORMATION

1. Name, sex, race, date of birth, and marital status: Questions 1 through 12 are designed to identify household occupants by name, relationship to head of household, sex, race, age and marital status. These questions

will be asked of 100 per cent of the population.

2. The housing questions: The Census of Housing, required by act of Congress in 1940 (13 U.S.C. 14), contains thirty-five (35) questions regarding the adequacy of housing facilities. Fifteen questions will be asked of 100 per cent of the population; five will be asked of 20 per cent; five will be asked of 15 per cent; and ten will be asked of 5 per cent. Some sample questions and comment on their uses follow:

KITCHEN AND BATHROOM

Question H-3 (100 per cent): Do you have complete kitchen facilities?

- Yes, for this household only
 Yes, but also used by another household
 No complete kitchen facilities for this household

Question H-7 (100 per cent): Do you have a bathtub or shower?

- Yes, for this household only
 Yes, but also used by another household
 No bathtub or shower

Comment: The absence of a kitchen and/or a bathroom for the exclusive use of the household is a major indicator of urban blight and slum conditions. This information is needed by HEW, HUD and other Federal, State and local agencies.

VALUE OF PROPERTY

Question H-11 (100 per cent): If you live in a 1-family house which you own or are buying—

What is the value of this property; that is, how much do you think this property (house and lot) would sell for if it were for sale?

Comment: Section 301 of the Housing Act of 1948 (12 U.S.C. 1701e (b)) directs the Secretary of HUD to prepare and submit to the President and Congress estimates of national urban and rural non-farm housing needs. The requirements of various public laws make it necessary to determine the value of property and, as an alternate, the rent paid for rented units.

HOUSING EQUIPMENT

Question H-22 (15 per cent): Do you have air-conditioning?

Question H-27 (5 per cent):

- (a) Do you have a clothes washing machine?
 (b) Do you have a clothes dryer?
 (c) Do you have a dishwasher?
 (d) Do you have a home food freezer which is separate from your refrigerator?

Question H-29 (5 per cent): Do you have a battery-operated radio?

Comment: When the Congress provided for the Census of Housing, it included the words "housing (including utilities and equipment)." The presence of certain household equipment provides a measure of adequacy of housing and of levels of living. The items included above are those which have particular effects on the needs for power, water and waste disposal, and related services. The question concerning radio is related to the need for communication in case of emergencies or power blackouts.

3. *Place of original and migration:* Questions 13 through 19 are concerned with identifying the country of origin, languages spoken, and patterns of housing mobility. These questions will be asked of 15 per cent of the population. Some sample questions and explanatory comments follow:

BIRTHPLACE OF PARENTS

Question 14 (15 per cent): What country was his father born in?

Question 15 (15 per cent): What country was his mother born in?

Comment: These questions, along with that regarding the birthplace of the individual, serve to identify those groups known as Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and Cubans. The census is the only source of information concerning the numbers, distribution, and characteristics of these groups.

This information is of importance to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Congress, HEW, and to other Federal and State agencies.

RESIDENCE 5 YEARS AGO

Question 19 (15 per cent):

- (a) Did he live in this house on April 1, 1965?
 (b) (If no) Where did he live on April 1, 1965?

Comment: The Departments most needing this information are Agriculture, HEW, Labor, Commerce, and HUD. This information is also of importance to the Council on Urban Affairs, which has established a subcommittee to consider the problems relating to internal migration.

4. *Education:* Questions 20, 21 and 22 deal with the number of years of school attended. They are designed to reveal the educational level of individual citizens, and they will be asked of 20 per cent of the population.

5. *Marriages and babies born:* Questions 24 and 25 request information concerning marriages and the number of babies born. They will be asked of 5 and 20 per cent of the population, respectively. The purpose of these questions is to provide information needed in the preparation of estimates of the future growth of the population. All agencies of Government are concerned with such estimates, and with information on the rates of growth of the white and non-white populations. Agencies such as HEW and HUD which are concerned with family welfare and the care of dependent children need this information in implementing their programs.

6. *Military service:* Question 26 asks whether male respondents have served in the military and, if so, during what period. This question is asked of 15 per cent of the male population. This information is needed by the Veterans Administration and other Government agencies.

7. *Employment and occupation:* Questions 27 through 39 are concerned with employment history and status, amount of time worked, occupation, and related facts. These questions will be asked of 20 per cent of the population. Examples follow:

DID YOU WORK ANY TIME LAST WEEK?

Question 29 (20 per cent):

- (a) Did this person work at any time last week?
 (b) How many hours did he work last week (at all jobs)?

Comment: The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 necessitates that the Department of Labor have census data on employment, unemployment, and occupation. Census data on unemployment are used to establish the eligibility of communities applying for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and for a wide variety of other programs.

PLACE OF WORK

Question 29-3 (20 per cent): Where did he work last week?

Comment: The Department of Transportation and HUD are concerned with major transportation and traffic problems associated with trips from home to place of work. This question provides data necessitated under the Highway Act of 1965 and also provides estimates of daytime population needed by the Office of Civil Defense.

8. *Income:* Questions 40 and 41 request information concerning income from all sources, including employment, welfare, veterans' benefits, etc. These questions will be asked of 20 per cent of the population. Income data are needed by a number of Government agencies and for a variety of Federal programs. For example, income data are needed to implement the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and also for allocation of funds under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The Appalachian Regional Development Act ne-

cessitates information on per capita income. The Department of Agriculture needs this data for its food distribution programs, including the school lunch program.

POPULATION AND HOUSING CENSUS QUESTIONS 1790-1970

1970 (PLANNED)

Population

Information obtained for all persons: Address; name; relationship to household head; sex; race; age; marital status.

Information obtained for 20-percent sample: Birthplace educational attainment; for women, number of children ever born; employment status; hours worked in week; year last worked; occupation, industry, and class of worker; activity five years ago; weeks worked last year; income last year; location of residence five years ago.

Information obtained for 15-percent sample: Country of birth of parents; length of residence at present address; language spoken in childhood home; school attendance; veteran status; location of place of work; means of transportation to work.

Information obtained for 5-percent sample: If foreign born, whether naturalized, and year of immigration; whether married more than once, date of first marriage, and whether first marriage ended because of death of spouse; vocational training; for persons of working age, presence and duration of disability; occupation, industry, and class of worker five years ago.

Housing

Information obtained for all housing units: Occupied or vacant; owned, rented, or no cash rent; if vacant, vacancy status (for sale, for rent, etc.) and duration of vacancy; number of units at this address; single or multiple family structure; trailers; number of rooms; basement; access to unit; water supply toilet facilities; bathing facilities kitchen facilities; telephone available; value or contract rent.

Information obtained for 20-percent sample: Whether on a farm; year built; number of units in structure; gross rent; heating equipment.

Information obtained for 15-percent sample: Number of bathrooms, source of water; sewage disposal; air conditioning; automobiles.

Information obtained for 5-percent sample: Number of bedrooms; number of stories; elevators; heating fuel; cooking fuel; water heating fuel; battery-operated radio sets; clothes washing machines; clothes dryers; home food freezers; television sets; dishwashers; second homes.

YEAR 1960

Population

Information obtained for all persons: Address; name; relationship to household head; sex; race; age; marital status.

Information obtained for 25-percent sample: Birthplace if foreign born, language spoken in home before coming to U.S.; country of birth of parents; length of residence at present address; location of residence five years ago; educational attainment; school attendance; whether married more than once and date of first marriage; for women ever married, number of children ever born; employment status; hours worked in week; year last worked; occupation, industry, and class of worker; location of place of work; means of transportation to work; weeks worked last year; income last year; veteran status.

Supplemental schedule for Americans overseas.

Housing

Information obtained for all housing units: Occupied or vacant; owned, rented, or no cash rent; if vacant, year-round, seasonal, or migratory, and vacancy status; trailers; number of rooms; access to unit; condition; water supply; toilet facilities bathing facilities; kitchen, cooking facilities; value or contract

rent (obtained for all housing units in large cities and for a 25-percent sample elsewhere).

Information obtained for 25-percent sample: Whether on a farm; duration of vacancy; year built; if trailer, whether mobile or fixed; heating equipment; telephone available; gross rent.

Information obtained for 20-percent sample: Number of units in structure; basement; elevator (obtained only in large cities); number of bathrooms; sources of water (obtained only outside large cities); sewage disposal (obtained only outside large cities); automobiles (in large cities; elsewhere obtained for a 5-percent sample).

Information obtained for a 5-percent sample: Number of bedrooms; heating fuel; cooking fuel; water heating fuel; radio sets; clothes washing machines; clothes dryers; home food freezers; air conditioning; television sets.

Supplemental schedules for components of housing inventory change and for residential finance.

YEAR 1950

Population

Information obtained for all persons: Address; whether house is on farm; name; relationship to household head; race; sex; age; marital status; birthplace; if foreign born; whether naturalized; employment status; hours worked in week; occupation, industry, and class of worker.

Information obtained for 20-percent sample: Whether living in same house a year ago; whether living on a farm a year ago; location of residence a year ago; country of birth of parents; educational attainment; school attendance; if looking for work, number of weeks; weeks worked last year; income last year; veterans status.

Information obtained for 3 1/2 percent sample: For persons who worked last year but not in current labor force: Occupation, industry, and class of worker on last job; if ever married, whether married more than once; duration of present marital status; for women ever married, number of children ever born.

Supplemental schedules for persons on Indian reservations; infants born in the first three months of 1950; Americans overseas.

Housing

Information obtained for all housing units: Occupied or vacant; owned or rented; if vacant, whether year-round or seasonal; type of living quarters; type of structure; number of rooms; year built; number of units in structure; condition; water supply; toilet facilities; bathing facilities.

Information obtained for all nonfarm housing units: If owned, whether mortgaged, market value; if vacant, monthly rental or sale price; if rented, contract rent, gross rent, and, if furnished, estimated rent unfurnished.

Information obtained for 20-percent sample: Lighting; heating equipment; heating fuel; cooking fuel; refrigeration; kitchen sink; radio set; television set.

Supplemental schedules for Indians and residential finance.

YEAR 1940

Population

Information obtained for all persons: Address; home owned or rented; value of monthly rental; whether on a farm; name; relationship to household head; sex; race; age; marital status; school attendance; educational attainment; birthplace; citizenship of foreign born; location of residence five years ago and whether on a farm; employment status; if at work, whether in private or non-emergency government work, or in public emergency work (WPA, CCC, NYA, etc.); if in private or nonemergency government work, hours worked in week; if seeking work or on public emergency work, duration of unemployment; occupation, industry, and class

of worker; weeks worked last year; income last year.

Information for 5-percent sample: Birthplace of parents; language spoken in home in earliest childhood; veteran status; whether wife or widow of veteran; whether child of veteran and, if so, whether father living; whether has Social Security number, and if so, whether deductions were made from all or part of wages or salary; occupation, industry, and class of worker; for women ever married, whether married more than once, age at first marriage, and number of children ever born.

Supplemental schedule for infants born during the four months preceding the census.

Housing

Information obtained for all housing units: Occupied or vacant; owned or rented; value or rent; if owned, whether mortgaged; if vacant, year-round or seasonal, and vacancy status; type of structure; number of rooms; year built; original purpose of building; exterior material; number of units in structure; condition; water supply; toilet facilities; bathing facilities; lighting; heating equipment; heating fuel; cooking fuel; refrigeration; radio set; for nonfarm renter-occupied, gross rent, and, if furnished, estimated rent unfurnished; for nonfarm owner-occupied, estimated rent, and, if mortgaged, balance due, interest rate, type of mortgage holder, distribution and amount of mortgage payments.

Note: All inquiries in the 1790 through 1930 censuses were asked for all applicable persons.

There were no housing censuses conducted prior to 1940. A few housing inquiries were included in the decennial population censuses in 1860 and 1890-1930.

YEAR 1930

Address; name; relationship to family head; home owned or rented; value or monthly rental; radio set; whether on a farm; sex; race; age; marital status; age at first marriage; school attendance; literacy; birthplace of person and parents; if foreign born, language spoken in home before coming to U.S., year of immigration, whether naturalized, and ability to speak English; occupation, industry, and class of worker; whether at work previous day (or last regular working day); veteran status; for Indians, whether of full or mixed blood, and tribal affiliation.

Supplemental schedules for gainful workers not at work on the day preceding the enumeration; blind and deaf-mutes.

YEAR 1920

Address; name; relationship to family head; sex; race; age; marital status; if foreign born, year of immigration to the U.S., whether naturalized, and year of naturalization; school attendance; literacy; birthplace of person and parents; mother tongue of foreign born; ability to speak English; occupation, industry, and class of worker; home owned or rented; if owned, whether mortgaged; for nonfarm mortgaged, market value, original amount of mortgage, balance due, interest rate.

Supplemental schedules for the blind and for the deaf.

YEAR 1910

Address; name; relationship to family head; sex; race; age; marital status; number of years of present marriage; for women, number of children born and number now living; birthplace and mother tongue of person and parents; if foreign born, year of immigration, whether naturalized, and whether able to speak English, or if not, language spoken; occupation, industry, and class of worker; if an employee, whether out of work on census day, and weeks out of work during year; literacy; school attendance; home owned or rented; if owned, whether mortgaged; whether farm or house; whether

a survivor of Union or Confederate Army or Navy; whether blind or deaf and dumb.

Supplemental schedules for the Indian population; blind; deaf; feeble-minded in institutions; insane in hospitals; paupers in almshouses; prisoners and juvenile delinquents in institutions.

YEAR 1900

Address; name; relationship to family head; sex; race; age; marital status; number of years married; for women, number of children born and number now living; birthplace of person and parents; if foreign born, year of immigration, and whether naturalized; occupation; months not employed; school attendance; literacy; ability to speak English; whether on a farm; home owned or rented; if owned, whether mortgaged.

Supplemental schedules for the blind and for the deaf.

YEAR 1890

Address; number of families in house; number of persons in house; number of persons in family; name; whether a soldier, sailor or marine during Civil War (Union or Confederate) or widow of such person; relationship to family head; race; sex; age; marital status; whether married during census year; for women, number of children born and number now living; birthplace of person and parents; if foreign born, number of years in the U.S., whether naturalized or whether naturalization papers had been taken out; profession, trade, or occupation; months unemployed during year; school attendance; literacy; whether able to speak English, and if not, language or dialect spoken; whether suffering from acute or chronic disease, with name of disease and length of time afflicted; whether defective in mind, sight, hearing, or speech, or whether crippled, maimed, or deformed, with name of defect; whether a prisoner, convict, homeless child, or pauper; home owned or rented, and if owned, whether mortgaged; if family head a farmer, whether farm rented or owned, and if owned, whether mortgaged.

Supplemental schedules for the Indian population; for persons who died during the year; insane; feeble-minded and idiots; deaf; blind; diseased and physically defective; inmates of benevolent institutions; prisoners; paupers and indigent persons; surviving soldiers, sailors, and marines, and widows of such; inmates of soldiers' homes; for owner-occupied mortgaged houses.

YEAR 1880

Address; name; relationship to family head; sex; race; age; marital status; month of birth if born within the census year; married within the year; occupation; months unemployed during year; sickness or temporary disability; whether blind, deaf and dumb, idiotic, insane, maimed, crippled, bedridden, or otherwise disabled; school attendance; literacy; birthplace of person and parents.

Supplemental schedules for the Indian population; for persons who died during the year; insane; idiots; deaf-mutes; blind; homeless children; prisoners; paupers and indigent persons.

YEAR 1870

Name; age; sex; race; occupation; value of real estate; value of personal estate; birthplace; whether parents were foreign born; month of birth if born within the year; month of marriage if married within the year; school attendance; literacy; whether deaf and dumb, blind, insane, or idiotic; male citizens 21 and over, and number of such persons denied the right to vote for other than rebellion.

Supplemental schedules for persons who died during the year; paupers; prisoners.

YEAR 1860

Name; age; sex; race; value of real estate; value of personal estate; occupation; birthplace; whether married within the year;

school attendance; literacy; whether deaf and dumb, blind, insane, idiotic, pauper, or convict; number of slave houses.

Supplemental schedules for slaves; public paupers and criminals; persons who died during the year.

YEAR 1850

Name; age; sex; race; whether deaf and dumb, blind, insane, or idiotic; value of real estate; occupation; birthplace; whether married within the year; school attendance; literacy; whether a pauper or convict.

Supplemental schedules for slaves; public paupers and criminals; persons who died during the year.

YEAR 1840

Name of family head; age; sex; race; slaves; number of deaf and dumb; number of blind; number of insane and idiotic and whether in public or private charge; number of persons in each family employed in each of six classes of industry and one of occupation; literacy; pensioners for Revolutionary or military service.

YEAR 1830

Name of family head; age; sex; race; slaves; deaf and dumb; blind; foreigners not naturalized.

YEAR 1820

Name of family head; age; sex; race; foreigners not naturalized; slaves; industry (agriculture, commerce, and manufactures).

YEAR 1810

Name of family head; if white, age and sex; race; slaves.

YEAR 1800

Name of family head; if white, age and sex; race; slaves.

YEAR 1790

Name of family head; free white males of 16 years and up, free white males under 16; free white females; slaves; other persons.

PROPOSED CLOSURE OF JOB CORPS INSTALLATIONS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on April 25, I submitted a resolution—Senate Resolution 183—opposing the shutdown of Job Corps installations before congressional authorization and appropriation action. Since then, more than 500 letters have poured into my office in protest of the projected closings. They come from local governing bodies, from officials and professional people who work with young people, from judges and editors, from political groups, from individual citizens, and from the corpsmen themselves and their families.

Some of the letters reflect a bitter disillusion and anger; some ask, reasonably, for time to assure that any cutback will be replaced with equivalent programs; all of them deplore any hasty and irrevocable action before Congress can consider its implications. I ask unanimous consent that a representative group of these letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

VISALIA, CALIF., April 23, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We are opposed to abrupt closing of Job Corps Centers until adequate and expanded facilities are actually in operation to guarantee continued training programs.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF VISALIA.

WILLOWS, CALIF., April 23, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
State Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned educators, wish to lodge our ardent protest against the closing of the Alder Springs Job Corps Center and the other 58 centers across the nation.

As teachers, we feel that we have a very important stake in these centers. The young men who attend these training institutions are all high school drop-outs. They are blatant proof of the failure of the public school system to perform its proper function. Every teacher in this system shares in the failure. A fundamental education is the birthright of every American citizen. These public school drop-outs are American citizens even if they are mostly black, and poor, and not part of the electorate. Since our school system has proved unsuccessful in its attempt to educate these young men, our society is obligated to provide some other means of education. The Job Corps has become an enormously successful alternate to education for these disadvantaged youngsters.

Many centers have been able to place as high as 70% of their trainees in jobs. When you consider that these young men are the ones that the public schools gave up on, and that the Job Corps has been functioning less than five years, this is an amazing record indeed. Of course, there are those who say that a 30% or more failure is too high, and we agree, it is. But, does that mean we do away with the institution? We haven't done away with the public school system, which has 100% failure with these particular youngsters, have we? No, it means we try to improve the system. We, as public school teachers, could perhaps improve our methods of teaching disadvantaged youngsters if we adopted some of the Job Corps' educational innovations.

It is an absurd kind of economics which says that we save a few million dollars by closing these centers in July. Don't the hopes and dreams of these young people count for anything? Some of the young men at Alder Springs have trekked over 2000 miles to a lonely mountaintop clutching at a last chance to make it in this society. So we close the camps, and we send them home to the streets without an education, with no chance for jobs, and with no hope or stake in our society. And where do they end up? At best on the welfare rolls or in prison. At worst behind the barricades, with a molotov cocktail in one hand and a gun in the other.

Funny kind of economy, isn't it?

Sincerely,

JOHN R. DALEY,
JUDY TAYLOR,
HERBERT WEHRLY,
SUSAN WILLIAMS,
S. SUE MILLER,
HELEN M. BROSCHE,
LOIS BAGES,

Teachers at Sycamore School.

EL DORADO COUNTY,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Placerville, Calif., April 25, 1969.

Senator ALLAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: Enclosed is a copy of a letter that I recently sent to President Nixon relative to the possible closing of the Sly Park Job Corps Center in our area.

We very much appreciate the strong opposition you have taken to the closing of the Job Corps Centers, and earnestly hope that you will continue your fight.

Sincerely,

HANS A. MATR,
County Superintendent.

EL DORADO COUNTY,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Placerville, Calif., April 24, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: I am writing this letter as chairman of the El Dorado County Community Relations Council for the Sly Park Job Corps Center in Pollock Pines, California. I am also the County Superintendent of Schools for El Dorado County.

May I first say that I am truly appalled at your decision to close one of the finest programs for the rehabilitation of many young people in our Nation, namely our Job Corps Centers. I am confident that numerous letters have come to your attention recently supporting this position. As one who has worked very closely for over two years with the corpsman and staff, I have been able to see firsthand the remarkable adjustment, productivity, and change in the entire mental structure of these people. When you realize that these young men have all come from extreme poverty, with very little hope for the future, and suddenly such changes are wrought in their lives, it is difficult to conceive that because of a change in administration, such outstanding work shall come to a sudden end.

It is the opinion and judgment of many citizens that the rehabilitation possibilities for these and thousands of others should not be decided at the whim of any particular administration. Give these young men a chance!

The alternate plans that we are reading about that are being suggested by your administration will in no manner correct the disillusionment and disgust that these young men now feel. Within the past few days, I have met with several of these people, and I have never before seen such disappointment in the eyes of youth. These human beings deserve better treatment.

I should also like to point out that they will be returning to the ghetto areas in their various communities at the beginning of a long, hot summer—ready for anything. I appeal to you to at least delay any action as to the closing of any of the Job Corps Centers, especially our Sly Park facility. I am enclosing some factual background material for your information, and would be most willing to offer any other substantiating statistics if requested.

I have followed your career since your first successful campaign against Representative Jerry Voorhees, and was privileged to hear one of your earliest political speeches before a joint luncheon meeting of all the service clubs in El Monte, California. I have supported you completely throughout these years; I have admired your courage and your philosophy. I hope that you will speak for these young people who, because of lack of economic and social status, cannot speak for themselves. Please reconsider your action.

Sincerely,

HANS A. MATR,
County Superintendent.

SLY PARK C.C.C.,

Pollock Pines, Calif., April 10, 1969.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSON: We the undersigned corpsmen of Sly Park J.C.C. plead that you reconsider the closing of a big portion of the Job Corps Centers.

For the most of us (corpsmen) Job Corps is just about the only chance for getting decent vocational or educational training to help us in the future in the nation and world of ours.

Please don't let us down as we have been let down in the past. What are we to do? Perhaps, back to poverty life. Please don't take our only chance for the future in this world of ours. Please don't ignore this plea.

APRIL 14, 1969.

HON. HAROLD "BIZZ" JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Following is the list of accomplishments of Sly Park Civilian Conservation Center:

Training costs per Corpsman man year are currently \$5550.

Returned value to the Forest—\$868,100.

Increased value to the community outside the Forest—\$29,700 and 1794 man hours.

Corpsmen placed—From July 1967 through December 1968, 468 trainees have passed through our Center. 367 were placed either on jobs, in the military or schools, or in Centers for advanced training. Less than 22%, or 101 trainees, were not placed. In this category are the AWOL discharges and disciplinary separations.

The academic improvement to Corpsmen is roughly two (2) academic school years growth in reading and one (1) year in math. Average length of stay per trainee is 5½ months.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM O. COTTER,
Center Director.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
ORANGE COUNTY,
April 25, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The League of Women Voters of Orange County urges members of the House and Senate to oppose closing 50 Job Corps Centers July 1 until such time as adequate and expanded facilities are available and functioning.

Our opposition to the abrupt closing of the Centers is based upon socio-economic factors:

1. The "savings" anticipated comes about, in part, through serving smaller numbers. The 30 new "mini" Centers proposed by Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schultz, have a capacity for 4,625 enrollees. In January 1969, 7,219 young men and women were enrolled in the nine urban Job Corps and 7,450 in the 50 conservation Job Corps to be closed—over 10,000 more young people than could be accommodated in the new skill centers.

2. Eight of the Centers to be closed are in California. Los Pinos in Orange County is held in high esteem by the State Department of Employment, Southern Area, Orange County Welfare Department and Orange Youth Opportunities officials. Founded four years ago it serves an average of 224 volunteer residents, 16 to 21 years old, per each average seven month training period. It has been filmed and pinpointed as having good working programs for its enrollees who enter, on the average, with third grade reading skills and fourth grade mathematical ability. They graduate seven months later with 7th and 8th grade skills plus motivation and know-how to hold jobs. Basic education, vocational and social skills are taught to help these emotionally defeated, educationally handicapped youth. Los Pinos has cost the federal government slightly less than \$1 million annually to operate. Such an investment in youth is a good alternative to increased police and welfare rolls.

There is need for re-evaluation not disposal of the Job Corps Centers.

The League of Women Voters recommends more Job Corps, not less, for all hard core unemployed as the kind of long term creative program that makes solid sense. This would be conservation practiced to the highest degree.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM BEMUS,
President.
Mrs. THOMAS BROWN,
Human Resources Director.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
April 30, 1969.

ALAN CRANSTON,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge retention of the Job Corps.

ERVIN HAFTER,
Department of Psychology,
University of California.

CITY OF PLACERVILLE, CALIF.,
April 25, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Tuesday, April 22, 1969 the Placerville City Council unanimously went on record as being opposed to the closure of the Sly Park Job Corps Center. Prior to making this decision the City Council, through its staff, conducted an in-depth study of the costs and any ultimate benefits resulting from education and training accomplished by the Job Corps Center. The Council, for instance, found that costs per trainee per year at the Sly Park Center amounted to just over \$5,500 per trainee which is considerably less than the \$8,000 stated by the Secretary of Labor. We also found that the average term of training for the Corpsmen is approximately five and one-half months and during this time the individual trainee work experiences add approximately \$1,000 of additional value in the National Forest.

The Sly Park Corpsmen, since the inception of the Center, have volunteered some 1,800 hours of labor to such projects as Head Start, summer camp counseling, assisting local school districts—all projects that would not have otherwise been accomplished, and assisted in the development of a regional park facility owned by the City of Placerville. The Council also took into consideration data on what has happened to Sly Park Job trainees after completing their training programs, and we found that of the 468 Corpsmen that spent time at the Center between July, 1967 and December of 1968, 367 were placed, which amounts to approximately 80 percent. Again, a figure far higher than that given by the Secretary of Labor.

At the beginning of the program at Sly Park, the local area people watched very critically the operation of and the results obtained at Sly Park. We believe it is safe to say that the people of this area are now very much convinced that the Center and the money spent there to be very worthwhile.

We, therefore, urgently request that the Sly Park Job Corps Center be removed from the list of those Centers proposed for closure.

Respectfully,

DUANE F. WROE,
City Manager.

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
April 26, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: We applaud your efforts to keep the Job Corps Centers open.

Here is a clipping from the "Letters to the Editor" column of the *San Francisco Chronicle* dated April 24, 1969, which may help you convince some reluctant Senators of the necessity to keep these centers open.

Yours very truly,

DOROTHY M. HORTON.

[From the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Apr. 24, 1969]

CHANCE FOR A DROPOUT

EDITOR: For two years (1966-68) I was dean and acting principal of an urban high school. During that time I came into daily contact with any number of young men who had dropped out of school with no saleable skill and with little hope of acquiring any. Since

lunchtime at the old alma mater is where the action is these boys came back by the dozens causing a serious drop-in problem.

Only a high school principal, responsible for the welfare of 2500 students and teachers, can know the feeling of foreboding when knots of unemployed, resentful young men are seen loitering near the school. He knows too well that his school is exposed to the streets through a dozen entrances by which unauthorized outsiders may enter. It is a common occurrence to encounter strangers in the cafeteria, the courtyard, or in the halls. Informing them to leave the premises has been known to spoil a principal's day. The resulting tragedy is twofold, a personal one for the hopeless young men, and an equally serious one for the schools. At every principals' meeting the reports were the same—it's the non-student hangers-on who instigate trouble or provoke school protective measures that cause confrontation and crises.

In the harried existence of high school deans and principals, the Job Corps offers a boy an alternative to gambling in doorways and a hope of salvaging some of the lives that without help are certainly condemned to desperation and degradation. Occasionally, a student who had dropped out or was falling would come into my office to have his Job Corps papers signed. Usually, he was happy to have the opportunity to learn a trade. On visits to the Parks Center I met several former students who were at different stages of training. All seemed to be content and were looking forward to their first decent job. My colleagues and I were impressed by the no-nonsense, businesslike approach to the instructional goals. The objectives were straightforward—train the student to get a job. Every aspect of his corps life was geared to this goal.

Now, it is proposed that the Job Corps be cut back, including the Parks Center. Presumably, the United States cannot afford it. . . .

Not a dime will be saved by this so-called budgetary saving. From New York to Chicago to San Francisco the thousands of unskilled young men who return to their slums and the thousands who will never leave them will, by turning to less desirable pursuits, make a mockery of this convenient "savings." For those of us in the front lines of urban education it is a frightening prospect. Surely, \$8000 worth of training to give a young man a chance in life can share an equal priority with Apollo missions, SSTs, ABMs, and \$40 million submarines sliding down the ways at Mare Island.

With "crime in the streets" approaching catastrophic proportions, is my prediction that the rejected young men will pose a far greater threat to national welfare and security than the object of the new submarine.

His wasted life must touch all our lives. Self-interest and survival demand that the Job Corps be retained and expanded. The hopeless young men make my neighborhood unsafe, terrorize our parks, and cause me anxiety whenever my children are out in the evening. They ruin schoolboy athletic events, necessitate guards at all school dances, and in their rage are every ready with fire bombs. To counter this inevitable consequence to despair by constructive Job Corps training makes good sense and cents to me. Have we gained anything if we secure the approaches to the North Pole and the Pacific but at home dare not take a walk on a spring evening?

PAUL A. LUCEY.

SAN FRANCISCO.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY
SERVICE, INC. (WICS),
Pasadena, Calif., April 23, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: Please use your influence to retain the Women's Job Corps under

O.E.O. as originally conceived, and stop the shut down of Women's Centers. To scrap a successful program and the knowhow so laboriously achieved in favor of another experiment seems a tragic waste. While the proposed skill centers would help some girls, they do not answer the needs of thousands of rural girls who live beyond commuting distance, or the thousands from our slums who need a change of environment more than anything else.

Respectfully,

Mrs. C. C. CHASE,
Director of Pasadena WICS.

HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CALIF.,
April 22, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: We are very shocked and saddened to learn of President Nixon's stand on the cut in the Jobs Corps. By contrast, we are much in support of your position and encourage you to sustain and, if possible, increase your vocal opposition to this injustice. We were somewhat comforted after having heard your press interview aired on Los Angeles television news programs last night, but realize that you have a very difficult, if not lonely task in front of you.

My husband is in the savings and loan business and I am a legal secretary, so we are not asking for these programs to be continued for us, or those directly in contact with us. We do, however, see that the Job Corps affords advantages to the underprivileged that cannot be realized through any other existing governmental outlet.

We are great believers in liberation through education. Not being members of any distinguishing group, other than white, middle class, Christian American, does not make us insensitive to the problems of those in other categories. We don't mind paying taxes, as high as need be, for programs involving education, training, urban renewal, mental health, physical health or any other people related area. We do, however, object strongly to being taxed to aid in killing people, developing an ineffectual ABM system (or even one that may prove to be competent), etc. Actually, we can't see much merit in a space race which costs us billions, when other countries find it necessary to send their young, eager citizens to the U.S. on a Peace Corps type mission to help our illiterate, starving, abused people.

First, let's clean our own house and help our own weaker citizens, then we can tackle outer space, foreign aid, etc. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. NANCIE SMITH.

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,
April 22, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: Please be advised that I am opposed to the closure of the Job Corps Centers as proposed by the administration.

In reviewing the accomplishments of these centers, particularly in terms of the numbers of individuals placed into productive occupations, I find this has been a worth while expenditure of time and funds.

Substitution of ghetto area training facilities for the centers will not accomplish as much, as this will not remove the trainee from the environment which created his dependency status. Attempts at this method of training in Boston and in San Francisco have been failures.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. SHANCK, M.D.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
April 22, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: What can be done about the administration's cutbacks in the Job Corps program? It seems an inhuman cruelty to build up hopes and then to crush them in an "economy move". It seems false economizing to deny a person job training so that he might become self-sufficient. It becomes ludicrous in view of the high success this program enjoyed.

Why is it that money is always plentiful for defense systems such as the ABM? It seems that the ABM is both questionable and, in my view, undesirable; why not divert the moneys from the ABM to such constructive programs as the Job Corps? This seems a saner and a more humane policy.

We read constantly of the alienation of the poor and of the minority groups; how can we hope to reach them by elimination of efforts designed for their assistance? Hopefully you will be able to mollify this alienation by asking for a full restoration of the Job Corps program.

Sincerely,

ANGELA SCHILZ.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
April 23, 1969.

Re the closing of certain Job Corps Centers
Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my distress concerning the recent decision to close many of the existing Job Corps Centers.

It is my belief that programs such as the Job Corps are essential to the long term well being of the nation. The type of training provided by the Job Corps enables individuals to develop marketable skills and the resultant earning potential necessary if they are to become an asset rather than a liability of society.

Therefore, I urge you to use your best efforts to preserve the Job Corps and hope that you will continue your fine efforts to that end.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES R. HAYES.

ANTELOPE VALLEY,
Lancaster, Calif.
ASSOCIATION,
Palmdale, Calif.
April 22, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I cannot understand the decision of this Administration in the cut back of the Job Corps and Conservation Corps. If an alternate plan were being presented to replace this program it might have made some sense.

I trust you will continue to fight for the retention of at least the Conservation Corps—

(1) as they are effecting a good work in our National Forests that benefits everyone.

(2) secondly, they are helping young men become productive citizens, hence taxpayers, not welfare recipients.

(3) thirdly, I cannot understand how we could build such a complex as Fenner Canyon Conservation Corps, to name just one familiar to me and then close it down and let it rot.

(4) the Fenner Canyon Conservation Corps has been active in community activities which has helped the corpsmen and the community. Recently, it was the Little League diamonds in Palmdale and nearby and presently they are helping in the building of a Y.M.C.A. locally. It is true they will

benefit from that facility when completed, but our community will also.

Please continue your battle in behalf of these Corps centers.

Cordially,

MERV DIRKSE,
Associate General Director.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,
April 21, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand you are trying to keep the Job Corps Centers open, and I am writing in support of them and urge that they be augmented rather than closed.

Education, such as, provided by the "Job Corps" and "Headstart" programs are essential to end the terrible poverty problems that confront the United States today; since lack of education and lack of skill are root causes of poverty.

While private industry has a large unfulfilled obligation to help in this area, the biggest responsibility for eradicating poverty rests with the Federal, State and Local governments, being of, by and for the people.

All people now in, or trying to get in, the Job Corps program are being betrayed by the closing of the camps. I am sure it is a very bitter feeling to dream and hope for the chance to escape the poverty and degradation of slum living, and when the dream seems about to be realized to have it crushed by the capricious act of the government. Where do they go from here? What kind of a heritage is the United States giving them?

If the cuts are strictly for economy, I suggest the cuts come from less useful programs such as NASA, Foreign Aid (much of which is probably misused), Farm Subsidies (Why pay farmers and congressmen not to grow crops?), nonproductive GS employees, etc. and I would like to say the Vietnam War, but feel this would probably be unrealistic.

Until we become less concerned with missiles, and the rest of the world and until we put our own country in order we are doomed to be plagued with racial strife, riots, starvation, poverty and crime. The Job Corps can be an extremely effective tool in combating these conditions.

To expand slightly. It was shocking to discover the extreme poverty of some Americans. I feel the time is long overdue for us to eradicate poverty and children permanently brain damaged due to starvation. To me this should be the first order of business, transcending everything else.

Please don't let this be an exercise in futility.

ARTHUR HANSON.

APRIL 20, 1969.

SIR: My wife and I feel that the decision to close so many of the Civilian Conservation Centers should be reconsidered. We have had some contact with the corpsmen of the Sly Park Center in Pollock Pines, Calif., and are impressed not only with the work the corpsmen have done on the Eldorado National Forest and in the local community but in the benefit which most of the young men seem to derive from the program.

We both believe that cutting the cost of government without losing needed services is commendable. And yet we wonder if this move is not false economy. It seems to us that the money spent on these corpsmen will be paid back many times over; not only by the positive contribution each man will make as he enters a productive job, but also by the amount of public funds saved through decreases in welfare spending, necessary police protection, and prison operation.

Also, it is depressing to realize that this great nation will spend so much money to

kill people in a foreign country, and yet balks at spending money to help some of our own citizens gain the ability to enjoy the kind of life which this country provides for so many of us.

If it is possible to make the program more efficient, we certainly hope that this will be done. We urge, however, that the program not be curtailed until something as good or better is developed to take its place.

Mr. and Mrs. ALAN GRAPEL.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF GLENDALE, CALIF.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The League of Women Voters of Glendale are encouraged by your efforts to keep open the Job Corps Centers. We support the Job Corps as a result of our study of Human Resources.

The nearby Fenner Canyon Center is staffed and operating and we feel until the urban skill centers are available and functioning as a replacement, the centers should remain open.

We respectfully urge you to continue your efforts in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MILTON GOLDFINE,
Human Resources Study Chairman.

ARCHDIOCESAN COUNCIL OF
CATHOLIC WOMEN,
San Francisco, Calif., April 26, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We were shocked to learn that Labor Secretary George Schutz was persuaded to phase out the Job Corps, June 30th.

We urge you to do all that you can to save the Job Corps Training Program for young drop-outs from poverty areas.

It has been my privilege to meet thirteen Job Corps girls in 1968 and 1969, and I was impressed with the girls and what the Job Corps training was doing for them. They were grateful for this opportunity for a second chance.

These young people cannot be put back into the environment from which they have been lifted.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. KENNETH C. WILSON,
ACCW Chairman,
Community Affairs Commission.

APRIL 25, 1969.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: I am writing to protest the closing of the Job Corps Centers. I am a dorm mother at Parks and I believe the Center is helping many fellows live more useful lives, which, in the long run, benefits our country. It is an investment in youth and a pity to abandon the program.

Yours truly,

SHEILA J. RYCHNOWSKY.

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
April 26, 1969.

Sen. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a former campaign worker, and as chairman of the Legislative and Political Actions Committee, of the John F. Kennedy Young Democrats; I would like to express our deepest thanks for your opposition to the proposed cutback in the Job Corps program. As a member of the Labor and Welfare Committee, your efforts are much appreciated.

The committee would like to urge you to seek amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to maintain the Job Corps program intact under title one of the act. We feel that Congress has the power to force the Labor Department to accept the Job Corps program, and we would urge Congress to exercise that power.

Of special concern to the J.F.K. Young Democrats is the Parks Job Corps Center. In four years this center has trained and placed about 8,725 Corpsmen out of a total enrollment of 14,292 since inception of the center. The cost, as well, has been reduced from \$10,884 per Corpsman in 1965, to \$5,276 per Corpsman in 1968. We see this program as a great success, and can see no reason for its closing. We urge you to work within the Labor and Welfare Committee, as well as on the floor of the Senate, to maintain the Job Corps program, and the Parks Center intact.

Sincerely,

STEVEN GALE, JR.
Chairman, JFK Young Democrats Legis-
lative & Political Action Commission.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
SAN BERNARDINO,
San Bernardino, Calif., April 24, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are vitally interested in the possible closing by July 1 of the Job Corps Center.

We do not feel that a realistic program can be set up for these people by that date.

We have a Job Corps Center in Oak Glen that contributes because it works in the area of Conservation. These young men have contributed much in fire-fighting, building and reforestation.

We hope that you will reconsider the closing date until other measures have been set up to train these young men.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. BERNICE L. SMAHA,
President.

SOROPTIMIST CLUB OF PLACERVILLE,
Placerville, Calif., April 24, 1969.

Senator ALLAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: During our regular weekly luncheon meeting, the members of Soroptimist Club of Placerville voted against the closing of the Sly Park Job Corps Center.

We feel it is of economic value, that it provides advantages from the standpoint of conservation of human and natural resources.

We believe that the Job Corps is making a contribution to the improvement of our American society.

Yours truly,

LYDIA ROHRKE,
Acting Corresponding Secretary.

JOINT ACTION IN COMMUNITY SERVICES,
April 22, 1969.

HON. SENATOR A. CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Our Board of Directors is seriously disturbed by last week's news report that your Administration intends to slash Job Corps by \$100 million (from the \$280 million requested), and to shut down 58 of the 112 training centers.

Members of our Board believe that this is an unwise action to take at this time for several reasons. First, Job Corps, though undoubtedly possessing some faults, has succeeded in providing job training for 230,000 youth—youths who are now able to work at jobs providing a good income, thus furnishing them with a financial incentive to become good citizens.

Second, Job Corps has given new hope to an alienated, unmotivated and hostile segment of this nation's youth, many of whom have known nothing but the poverty, the corruption and the hopelessness of the urban ghetto.

Third, our communities are ill prepared to receive such a sudden influx of disadvantaged and disillusioned youth. Our own local JACS committee, for example, is just

now getting organized and underway, aiming to deal with eight or ten Job Corps returnees per month. With such a drastic step as your Administration intends to take, we will probably have several hundred that need assistance all at once!

And finally, Mr. Senator, it does not seem wise to turn all these angry and disappointed young men loose on the streets of our cities (17,500 according to Newsweek Magazine) just as summer begins to swell even further the ranks of our out-of-school youth who are unemployed as well as untrained. Surely this would become another aggravation for those who are already angry with the deplorable conditions in which they live in our central cities.

So we are appealing to you, Mr. Senator, please reconsider this drastic action! Don't shut down the Job Corps centers; investigate them, upgrade them even close those which seem irrelevant or inefficient. But please don't eliminate half of them and cripple the other half!

Try to give civic-minded rehabilitation volunteer groups such as ours a chance to function and show what we can do to help the returning Job Corpsmen find jobs and become self-respecting, job-holding, tax-paying citizens with a real stake in American Society. Please give these disadvantaged youth some hope and give groups like ours a chance to help them themselves. This is all we ask. Please give this matter your prayerful consideration.

Sincerely and hopefully yours,
Mrs. Ann L. Gates, Chairman, Mr. David Nelson, Mr. Eugene Banks, Dr. Gerald Goldstein, Mrs. Elizabeth Wettach, Mr. Albert Cox, Jr., Mr. Bud Goldberg, Rev. Earl Mohler, Mrs. Elaine Gulley.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF ESCONDIDO,
Escondido, Calif., April 22, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The League of Women Voters of Escondido urges you to oppose the abrupt closing of 59 Job Corps centers by July 1, 1969.

For more than four years our members have thoughtfully studied the needs for such "anti-poverty" programs. Many of our members volunteer their time to programs other than the Job Corps. We feel continued withdrawal of promised assistance and opportunity cannot help but make the disadvantaged cynical and disillusioned about the depth of commitment the nation has to overcoming poverty and discrimination.

As urban "mini" skill centers are developed, they may prove better able to fill the needs of the severely disadvantaged. The League of Women Voters does not, however, believe that opening "mini" centers necessitates the abrupt closing of these Job Corps centers.

Thank you for your consideration of our position against abruptly closing 59 Job Corps centers by July 1, 1969.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. JEAN R. NOVET,
President.

WILLOWS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Willows, Calif., April 22, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am writing to request that you utilize your influence to retain California's Jobs Corps Centers.

The tentative decision at the federal executive level to discontinue these centers represents a tremendous blow, not only from the standpoint of bringing to a close a project which is rapidly developing into one of the better educational and training programs for the type of youngsters concerned, but

also will adversely affect the economy of rural areas near which these centers are located.

I have personal knowledge regarding the educational growth of corpsmen assigned to the Alder Spring Jobs Corps Center located west of Willows. Through the close cooperation of the center and our local public schools we have been able to offer educational services to corpsmen which have resulted in individual gains in skills and knowledge which have not been previously attained by these corpsmen and probably would never have been attained without the existence of the jobs corps program.

From the viewpoint of community economics a conservative estimate would indicate that there is a direct expenditure in Willows of \$500,000 annually from Jobs Corps direct and indirect sources. The elimination of this community income would obviously constitute a severe financial blow.

Your cooperation in this matter will be sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ERWIN A. DECKER,
Superintendent.

EL DORADO HIGH SCHOOL,
Placerville, Calif., April 22, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: I am writing this to express my concern over the phasing out of the Sly Park Job Corp Center in El Dorado County.

I am concerned about the return of these boys to an environment from which I believe they should be removed.

I am concerned about the future education and job placement of these boys. Sly Park has an excellent record in both instances.

I am concerned about the effect on the economy of this area which is already in some degree of difficulty.

I am concerned with the fact that the government has an established facility in which several hundreds of thousands of dollars have already been spent and which they want to abandon to build another facility in a metropolitan area.

I am concerned that this could well be the last chance for some of these boys and that they will eventually become wards of the state from which they came.

We can spend millions of dollars to maintain our position in Asia to promote good will amongst underprivileged nations of the world and neglect the very people who are most in need right here in our own nation.

I do hope that you will do everything in your power to see that this facility and all facilities like it are maintained for the underprivileged youth of this nation.

Sincerely yours,

STEVE O'MEARA,
Vice-Principal.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
PROBATION DEPARTMENT,
Hawthorne, Calif., April 21, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I understand that you will be presenting a bill to Congress asking that the Job Corps Centers in California be retained. I ask that you act with all urgency and that all possible steps be taken to keep open at least the Camps now operative.

I am a deputy probation officer with Los Angeles County and have been working with youngsters for a number of years. I am well acquainted with the problems the community and home may present to an adolescent, and the difficulties in obtaining suitable placement for him, once removal from the home is indicated.

Job Corps, while not a cure-all—as is no placement setting—came as a most wel-

comed addition, and at a most opportune time. Youngsters 16 and over are difficult to place—most are behind in school, many lack even the most rudimentary training, some cannot be returned to their homes and must be emancipated or placed on their own upon release from an institutional program. Job Corps offered for these youngsters a chance at remedial work, at intensive vocational training—and most important, placement in an environmental situation conducive to learning, and removed from the community factors encouraging delinquency and truancy from school.

I am particularly unhappy at this point as I have a youngster whose application was sent to Job Corps Headquarters in the middle of March, who normally would have been accepted and sent to a Job Corps Camp 3 or 4 weeks ago, and who is still in our Juvenile Halls awaiting Jobs Corps placement. The delay, as indicated by the Job Corps worker, is directly attributable to President Nixon's orders closing the camps—particularly those orders closing all male Job Corps camps in California.

I have now been informed that placement of this youngster—who finally received an entry date of April 22nd—has been postponed indefinitely, meaning he can wait now in Juvenile Hall from several days to several weeks before an opening will be available. Thousands of Job Corps youngsters now in the California camps must be replaced purportedly before any new youngsters will be accepted.

Those of us who are concerned about children, who work with the inner-city youth whose family lacks generally even the most rudimentary means of helping him—find our hands further tied by a government which seems to feel, at least to some extent, that these youths are expendable.

Urban centers—recommended by the President—are not and cannot be the answer where the child cannot remain in the home or in the community. Urban centers cannot even necessarily serve the needs of the child remaining in the home, when the youngster has already dropped out of school, and lacks even the motivation to seek employment or elementary job training.

These youths are 16 and 17 are not only drop-outs from school, they are drop-outs from society as well—and if an attempt is not made now to reach them, there is little doubt that many, if not most, will eventually fill our jails and prisons.

Again, Job Corps is not a cure-all, but it is a start. I am sure that I speak for most others in the probation field when I ask that our centers be retained, and that our youngsters be given at least this one last chance.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. JULIA SZONDY.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA CONFERENCE
OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS,
Oakland, Calif., April 22, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am a member of the East Bay Community Council, serving on the Parks Job Corps.

Recently a statement was made that the Department of Labor is going to call for the closing down of the Parks Job Corps Center. I naturally hate to see this, because Parks has done an outstanding job, and has been productive and successful in the training of almost 9,000 young men.

At the present time there are 1700 corpsmen who are waiting for a chance to become productive citizens. I feel that Parks is an excellent investment in the lives of young men.

At this time I question seriously the closing of this institution. These young men need to be given every advantage they can possibly get. I would appreciate it very much

if you could lend your influence to the keeping open of the Parks Job Corps Center.

Thank you for any consideration you might give.

Sincerely yours,

S. R. JAYNE,
Secretary.

AMERICAN GI FORUM OF THE U.S.,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., April 23, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The National Office of the American Forum strongly requests your assistance in prohibiting the closing of the Job Corp Centers. As you are aware, here in California, the most seriously affected will be Camp Parks in Pleasanton, California.

The time has come when human lives must no longer be measured in monetary value. The Job Corp is providing a service to the unreachable youngster with an exceptional opportunity to better himself.

As a National Veterans Organization working for the betterment of the Mexican-American Community, we urge that you give us your support in this very worthy cause.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL CAMPOS,
National Chairman.

CAMINO COMMUNITY CHURCH,
Camino, Calif., April 21, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: It has been my privilege to minister to the spiritual needs of many of the Job Corpsmen of the Sly Park Job Center here in northern California for the past two years.

During this period, I have come to know some of the men quite personally and have listened to their stories of almost incredible hardships and poverty. Many of them have been disowned by their parents and have no place to call home except the Job Corps center. Last Christmas I had three of the men in my home for a Christmas dinner. As a Christmas present, I offered each one of them a telephone call to his family. The offer was refused with this comment: "Pastor, you just don't understand: We have no home; Job Corps is our home. We have no parents, at least parents who care about us; Job Corps is our parents, and they care."

Before any announcement was made concerning the closing of Job Corps centers, I heard remarks, candid remarks, about the Job Corps program from the corpsmen themselves. Some of the remarks were critical of the program, but that's to be expected because you can't please everyone. Most of the remarks, however, were highly favorably. To most of the men, the Job Corps was their last chance—"If I don't make it here, I just don't make it, period."

I appeal to you, Senator Cranston, to do all you can to retain this program. Although it may seem costly now, I feel that it has the potential of paying rich dividends later on in terms of conserved manpower, increased productivity and a heightening of the youthful spirit that is so vitally needed today.

With great respect for you and the office you hold, I remain,

Very truly yours,

DEWAYNE R. FLOHR,
Pastor.

APRIL 11, 1969.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: I am a member of Parks Job Corps Center. I have heard that Parks Job Corps is going to be closed. I would like to know why. Many of the corpsmen here at this center wants to learn a

trade and become a better American. I am an American and I love this country and have faith in our Government but there are things that I disagree on. I hope you will do the right thing. Many of us need this chance in Job Corps to become a useful person and not cause trouble.

An American.

STEPHEN STANTON.

PRICE, UTAH,
April 27, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: Thank you for proposing a resolution that the closure of the Job Corps centers be postponed until Congress has had time to deliberate on the matter.

I have firsthand knowledge of the Castle Valley Center here in Price and have been most impressed with the results of the work performed. I have always felt that if only 25% of the young men were taken from the welfare rolls, the program would pay for itself many times over. A great percentage of the enrollees who come to Castle Valley are colored boys. They appear to be apprehensive at coming to a primarily white community. They are treated with respect and they have returned that respect. We have all learned something from this experience.

I feel that the recruiting and screening could be performed more efficiently. I believe that many boys come who cannot benefit from the training because of their inability to learn. This is determined early and they are sent home. I believe these are the boys who contribute to the large percentage of those considered as dropouts from the program. Actually, it is not true and I believe the statistics are incorrect.

Some one must speak for these people. It seems to me that the affluent have never had any trouble getting anyone to speak for them, which makes me wonder why. There are not enough of our legislators who really care about the poverty stricken. I appreciate your speaking out for them. Please continue.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HOWARD P. HANKS.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I urge the continuance of the Nation's Job Corps training centers—especially Parks Center at Pleasanton. My plea has gone to President Nixon, Congressman Cohelan and Mr. Robert Finch. I said, in part "It surely cannot mean the bankrupting of the federal exchequer to keep this camp open—but it can mean the bankrupting of the spirit and opportunity for hundreds of young men." "This is the surest way to keep the revolution going—promise them a chance and then take it away."

I appreciate your efforts in behalf of a Congressional review of the grievous decision, and will do all I can to help.

My thanks to you.

JEANNE GLOE.

APRIL 26, 1969.

APRIL 21, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the Corpsmen of Dorm 560, Camp Parks Job Corps, Pleasanton, California, would like you to know that all we want in life is a chance. We should say another chance. We have been given a chance in life but we didn't know how to take advantage of it. We now realize what kind of mistakes we have made.

Sir, we are human beings, yellow, white, black and brown. We do not want to be put back in the streets again. Why do the lead-

ers want to take away what we have here and talk about putting us in mini-centers? The way it stands, before we came here we have always been getting mini-treatment all of our lives.

We do not deserve mini-treatment. We deserve the kind of treatment we and all the other Corpsmen at all the other centers are now getting.

Sir, we have enough pimps and dope pushers and users and gamblers and bank robbers. Sooner or later we will all be in the armed services of the great United States. While we are overseas fighting for our country, you, the leaders, are giving us the chance to die for you and the rest of the fine people of these United States. But while we are here in the States give us the chance to live and learn and then we will gladly die.

What Mr. Nixon must do is to take under consideration that we are here for a purpose, or otherwise we would not be here. As a matter of fact, most of the guys here have roughly mapped out their lives. They have acknowledged the fact that there are qualifications that they must meet in which to be accepted into society. Literacy isn't enough. We need more than just reading and writing. We need the training that will enable us to get a good job. If we could financially aid ourselves, we would.

Mr. Nixon speaks on the economic crisis. We understand the crisis. He also speaks on the taxpayers' expenditures. But has he realized that we are also taxpayers as well as consumers?

We hope that you will let him know how much we need to finish our training, and that the Job Corps is helping us do this.

Sincerely,

Janice Hawkins, dorm mothers, James Smith, New York; Alphonso K. Wallace, Daytona Beach, Fla.; Alex Hilbert, Jr., Miami, Fla.; Nathan Smith, Piedmont, Ala.; Lynn Hamlet, Florida; Wallace Smith, South Carolina; Leonard Lyons, Alexandria, Va.; John Mangum, Jackson, Miss.; John Rovwell, Columbia, S.C.; Robert James, California; Arden Small, New York; Jesse Mathis, Tennessee; Lofton Lewis, Jacksonville, Fla.; Roosevelt Darnell, Mississippi; Bruce O. McClure, Georgia; Robert Carter, Jackson, Miss.; Glenn Miller, Florida; Freddie Fletcher, Florida; Oliver Chisholm, Massachusetts; Ronald Carpenter, Alabama; Marvin Woodward, Georgia;

Barbara M. Watson, Pauline M. Hodgins, dorm mothers; Phillip Williams, A.G.; John Korrell, South Carolina; Dewayne Lee, Florida; Alfred Newton, Florida; Seymour Johnson, Texas; Herbert Hollingsworth, Florida; Dewitt Cross, California; John Short, Jr., Los Angeles, Calif.; Leroy Bride, Mississippi; Willy Applewhite, Jackson, Miss.; Glen W. Brown, Pennsylvania; Rey Bruxton, Tennessee; James Hill, Florida; Nathaneal Osby, North Carolina; David Harris, New York; Wiley Barnes, Virginia; Charles R. Jones, California; Clinton Foster, Michigan; Ronald Pswith, California; Joshua Bloomfield, North Carolina; Juan Acosta, Arizona; the Corpsmen of Dorm 560.

SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE,
Sacramento, Calif., April 25, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I have followed most of your actions on important matters closely and feel that California is very fortunate indeed in having you as our representative. It is hoped that you may be influential in bringing attention to the need to continue (or possibly double) the Job Corps program.

It was with utter disbelief that I learned the administration is seeking to eliminate

Job Corps centers throughout the nation. To eliminate these programs, the most effective of all anti-poverty efforts, without reason and in such an arbitrary manner is the height of irresponsibility! As one who has served as a volunteer with the O.E.O., as a Board member, and has carefully analyzed all programs dealing with poverty, I would state that this is one of the really effective programs that has successfully fulfilled its responsibility to improve basic conditions affecting the poor; to break the cycle of welfare dependency, to instill hope and faith in the American system, and to establish human dignity in young men.

I have no vested interest in this program. As an educator in the School of Education, I have simply sought the truth about the effectiveness of this program since its beginning. During the past five years, I have personally conducted more than 800 persons through conservation (and urban) centers so they might determine for themselves the value of such programs in American society. Despite questions many of these persons from the public schools, colleges, and from the community, had prior to their visitations, all of them were overwhelmingly impressed with the results. Many of them felt compelled to send letters to their legislators to continue to support the Job Corps.

The feelings and insights into these programs were based not only upon the effectiveness of the programs themselves, but in contact with corpsmen they saw renewed hope of these youths to become contributing members of society. They saw complete dedication of staff members and their influence in instilling a sense of dignity, maturity, and responsibility in these youths.

This is a very difficult decision to accept, to see this total program "go down the drain" at the whim of our "decision-makers." It is very apparent that those seeking to eliminate the program have not taken the time to analyze programs nor have determined the disastrous effects of their demise. The arbitrary, if not capricious, decision to simply send these boys back to their ghetto environments... and eventually to penal institutions at much greater cost in money and human lives should be regarded by all legislators as completely unacceptable to them and to their constituents. At best, it will move the anti-poverty program back ten years.

Without these programs designed originally to change environmental conditions and to break the syndrome of joblessness, despair, welfare, ignorance, malnutrition, medical and dental diseases, intolerable home conditions, and inability to qualify for any type of skilled work, there would be no alternative left for them except to be pushed down in our societal structure. Even worse, the overt actions of those dismissed whose hopes and newly transplanted values have been suddenly shattered are bound to be felt in every city to which they will return.

Understandably, thousands feel as I do about the closure of these centers. Many will send letters or telegrams to their legislators, and probably these legislators will regard many of these messages as reflecting simply financial loss to the community. This would be only a minor concern to these people. The reciprocal value of these programs to communities such as El Dorado and Shasta was most apparent in establishing tolerance, acceptance of ethnic differences, and respect for the individual. As you may recall, people in these conservative, all-white communities were strongly against the establishment of these centers at first. Now that they have seen first-hand the value of these programs in the personal and social and economic development of these youths, whom they have taken into their homes, churches, and business establishments, they are reluctant to accept the decision to discontinue these centers.

I hope that you and your fellow legislators

are also reluctant to accept the discontinuance of these vital, needed proven centers and will continue to oppose those who do.

Very truly yours,
MERLE W. VANCE.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
SACRAMENTO,
Sacramento, Calif., April 24, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: As you know, the League of Women Voters has supported the Job Corps. Our members have observed that removing young people from environments which hold little hope for improving opportunities for employment and placing them instead in settings where job and educational training are available is certainly worthy of trial. We feel that now is not the time to close the Job Corps, and we oppose abrupt closure.

Certainly the replacement of facilities in the 30 urban centers by July 1 is unrealistic. Therefore, we wish to register our opposition to the abrupt closure of Job Corps until adequate and expanded facilities are made available and functioning.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. ALONZO E. MEYER,
President.

SONORA, CALIF.,
April 24, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: This letter is written to ask that you exert all the influence at your command to stop the proposed closure of the Five Mile Job Corps Center here in Tuolumne County. If their statistics are correct, and I have no reason to doubt them, that eighty percent of their former clients are now gainfully employed, they are indeed performing an outstanding service to the country.

As a person who has spent twenty eight years in the field of Corrections, I am aware that the young men who are enlisted in the Job Corps program are prime candidates for delinquency. They are the drop outs, the misfits who, unless something is done for them will almost certainly become involved in criminal activity. It appears that the Five Mile Job Corps Center is doing that something and doing it very successfully.

The closing of this facility would, in my mind, constitute a senseless and short sighted economy. Again may I ask that you do all within your power to see that this very worthwhile program continues.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD M. COMSTOCK.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF LIVERMORE,
April 25, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The Livermore League of Women Voters asks that you join us in opposing the abrupt closing of many of our Job Corps Centers, in favor of either continuing the program or gradually phasing it out when better means of training are put forward.

We are not disputing that there are inefficiencies within the Job Corps and there may very well be more effective ways of training our disadvantaged youth, although our "local" center, Camp Parks near Pleasanton, has substantially reduced its costs per Corpsman since its inception. We feel that to abruptly terminate these Job Corps Centers in July will not only have the effect of wasting the monies already expended on the training of those Corpsmen who will be unable to complete their studies, but would

also be highly unfair to the many young men who have been given a chance of becoming worthwhile members of society, only to have it snatched away with no comparable plan available. Even if the mini-centers now proposed were in operation by July, they would still be unable to handle all of the Corpsmen who will be affected by the closure of the Job Corps Centers.

We feel very strongly that the Job Corps Centers should continue to operate at least until alternative means of training can be guaranteed to all the Corpsmen now enrolled in these programs. When one considers the cost of training a Corpsman so that he becomes an asset to society, as opposed to the problems and associated costs if he is a liability, the closing of the Centers on such short notice seems a very short-sighted form of economy.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. GEORGE H. BLOOM,
President.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., April 19, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: This letter is just to advise you that my husband and I heartily applaud your efforts at saving the Job Corps Program. It seems that this Program indeed strives to give the self-reliance and job skill which is a prerequisite to human dignity. This is worth increased taxes if this is the basis for President Nixon's decision to close the Job Corps Centers.

Please, Senator Cranston, continue your fight on behalf of the Jobs Corps.

Sincerely,
FRANCINA M. SINGLEY.

APRIL 20, 1969.

ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: I want to protest the closing of the Job Corps in general and particularly the Job Corps at Sly Park near Placerville, Calif.

The Job Corps has not only been of benefit to the boys but also to the community. The Job Corps has done many things for our community and has improved understanding and relationship with minority groups.

Sincerely,
MARION CONKLIN.

GARDEN VALLEY, CALIF.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF BERKELEY,
BERKELEY, CALIF., April 23, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The Berkeley League of Women Voters was quite dismayed to learn of the decision to close a number of Job Corps Centers by July 1st, including the Parks Center in our area. Admittedly the entire Job Corps Program has encountered difficulties, including high costs, a high dropout rate, and problems in placing its graduates. The 30 urban "mini" Job Corps Centers which Secretary of Labor George P. Schulz has announced will replace the Job Corps Centers being closed may indeed represent a more satisfactory approach to this aspect of the problem of the hard core unemployed.

However, the proposed new facilities do not appear to be adequate to deal with the number of persons who were previously served by the Job Corps. Moreover, it seems most unrealistic to imagine that such urban centers will be functioning by July 1st. The nation can ill afford to precipitously withdraw assistance already promised to some of its most disadvantaged youth at a time when so many of our less fortunate citizens are already dubious if not cynical about the extent of the nation's commitment to provide equal opportunities for education and employment.

The Berkeley League of Women Voters urges that you oppose the announced closing

of Job Corps facilities in California and throughout the nation until adequate replacement facilities have actually been established.

Sincerely,
Mrs. HEINZ FRAENKEL-CONRAT,
President.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
April 21, 1969.

SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am writing to protest the closing of the Job Corps Centers throughout the United States. The high employment rate of the young men trained by the Job Corps offsets the high cost of this training and education. These boys do not return to their rural or urban ghetto habitat and so are absorbed into the mainstream.

Besides, the cost of their training is far less than the amount which would be spent on them if they remain unemployed and in their ghetto environment.

It has been proved that mini-job corps centers in the ghetto do not work. The boys are not motivated, continue in their delinquent behavior, have a high rate of absenteeism and have a very low percentage of success.

Thank you for paying attention to my views.

Yours truly,
CATHERINE JOYCE.

APRIL 25, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am writing to urge you to oppose the closing of the Job Corps centers, particularly the Parks Job Corps Center in Pleasanton, California.

There is no disputing that one can compute the economics of continuing or closing the Job Corps centers, but the question involves the lives—the self-respect—of human beings. I deny any implication that people can be inserted into a cost-effectiveness judgment. It may be that it is cheaper to put people on relief than to train them to be skilled workers, but if the dole destroys self esteem, dollars become least important. The opportunity for education and training afforded by the Job Corps program goes far to insure that the corpsmen will not wind up on the welfare or unemployment rolls. These young men have no other alternative—they are trying, in many instances in the only way available to them, to become responsible, working citizens and taxpayers.

In addition to the high placement percentage of corpsmen from Parks into industry, military service and institutions of higher learning, the young men have also participated voluntarily in many community services, proving the worth of the Job Corps program to the taxpayers of the community as well as to the corpsmen themselves.

Without the Job Corps, most of these boys have no hope or opportunities for the future. Besides the job training, they are learning about life in America as it is lived by the great middle class and what it is to participate in community affairs. It would be a great tragedy, economically and socially, if the Parks Job Corps Center were closed.

Very sincerely,
MARGARET E. RILEY.

LIVERMORE, CALIF.

APRIL 22, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with regret I feel I must write to you in a negative way, particularly since you are supposedly a relative of my family and a fellow Quaker. However, I feel it is the duty of the citizens in this

democratic society to let the leaders of our country know what some of their political opinions are on various matters. I am, therefore, writing about my feelings regarding the Job Corps and your recent decision concerning its future.

I am dismayed, shocked, and frankly angry that you are going to discontinue our very fine Job Corps. I know the Job Corps has been extremely beneficial to many young men throughout the country and particularly in our rural areas in Northern California. It is my belief that now many of these men, who would have contributed constructively to our society because of the opportunities available to them through the Job Corps, will become, instead, delinquents, welfare recipients, and to say the least, undesirable members of our society. I can not believe your reason for discontinuing the Job Corps is an economical one because ultimately these unfortunate young men will cost our society many more dollars and cents than would continuing the Job Corps—for reasons mentioned above.

May I ask what, then, is your reason?

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN W. TRUEBLOOD,
Student Body President, Independence
High School Representative, Ronald
Reagan Youth Conference.
SHINGLE SPRINGS, CALIF.

THE COMMUNITY UNITED
METHODIST CHURCH,
Elk Grove, Calif., April 24, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am deeply concerned that the Nixon Administration has found cause to discontinue a large number of the Job Corps centers in America. I am sure there have been many difficulties surrounding the administration of the OEO. The kind of projects it has fostered has, in some ways, I suppose, encouraged people to cheat or loaf or misuse funds. I suppose some of this has happened in the Job Corps program. However, I find it difficult to justify the discontinuance of a program that I have found to be as helpful to many people in California as I have found it to be. Therefore, I protest the closure of the Job Corps centers throughout the country and ask you to take whatever action in Congress is necessary to make the Administration either keep them open or make it very painful for them to close the centers.

Sincerely,

GORDON S. FAIRCHILD.

THE CASTRO VALLEY DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Castro Valley, Calif., April 25, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: We urge you to use your influence to retain the Camp Parks Job Corps Center in Pleasanton, Calif.

We are enclosing for your information a copy of a letter which we have today sent to President Nixon, likewise urging him to reconsider his decision in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANCES WOLCH,
Corresponding Secretary.

APRIL 25, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We urge you to reconsider your decision to close down the Camp Parks Job Corps Center in Pleasanton, Calif., and others like it, reducing the program and transferring the remaining portions of it to urban centers.

The Job Corps has a very good percentage of success in its efforts to reclaim these young men; we understand that the cost per man is

around \$8,000.00, but the ultimate saving, in salvaging an otherwise wasted life at (probably) public expense and turning it into a productive one, far outweighs the initial investment.

How does the cost of the entire program compare with that of ABM systems, moon landings, etc.?

We believe the Job Corps program should be retained, improved, and expanded—not curtailed, and not moved to larger urban centers and back to the same environment that helped give rise to the initial problems.

Sincerely,

CASTRO VALLEY DEMOCRATIC CLUB.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 22, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am writing to urge your strong support in favor of the retention of the Job Corps Training Centers. I am disturbed by the news reports that deep cuts in Job Corps funds are contemplated.

As one who has helped select the girls for their Job Corps Training Center, I know what this opportunity has meant to many young girls caught in the desperation of ghetto poverty. This was one of the most imaginative of the poverty programs. Although costs are high, I feel that any girl rehabilitated and provided with independence financially and emotionally is worth every penny spent.

I want to urge retention of the Job Corps Centers as constituted until the sub-committee on poverty has had a chance to complete its study and to design alternative programs.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MERIAM FRANKEL.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
April 24, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Washington, D.C.:

We support resolution blocking closure Job Corps centers until Congress considers the matter.

Mrs. RUSSELL GIDEON,
Seattle YWCA JCYW Committee.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
April 16, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Stop this closing of Job Corps center before an equally worthwhile program is available to our untrained poverty youths. Letter following.

Mrs. GEORGE HERZOG,
WICS Project Director, Women Job Corps
Recruiting.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
April 24, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your resolution blocking the abolition of 59 training centers.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SAN DIEGO
YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,
April 22, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: We strongly urge your opposition to the closing of 59 Job Corps centers by June 30, in view of the fact that a large number of enrollees will not be able to complete their training if this closing date is observed; we feel that it is un-

realistic to discontinue present programs until replacement facilities are in operation.

We would greatly appreciate your consideration of our views in this matter.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. PETER B. WEISER,
President, League of Women Voters of
Los Gatos-Saratoga.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
April 24, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Washington, D.C.:

We support efforts to keep Job Corps centers open until situation review by Congress.

Mrs. JOHN GRAHAM,
President, YWCA.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
April 18, 1969.

MESSES. ALAN CRANSTON, GEORGE MURPHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We as a company of over 100 have had good experience with the graduates of the Job Corps program and feel this money is well worth the effort as against other programs.

MERCHANDISERS, INC.,
FRANK FARELLA.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN
VOTERS OF EUREKA,
Trinidad, Calif., April 23, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: We urge you to oppose the closing of 59 Job Corps centers by July 1st as planned by Secretary of Labor, George P. Shultz. The League of Women Voters supports the Job Corps as an effort worthy of trial to provide the opportunity of education and employment for disadvantaged young people. The over 10,000 young men and women now in the program for whom there will be no room in the "mini" skill centers planned by the Labor Department are very likely to become cynical and disillusioned about the depth of commitment the nation and the Congress have to overcoming poverty and discrimination. At a time when militant groups are urging increasingly extreme solutions to the resolution of problems of minorities, it seems very unwise to withdraw support from a program which offers some hope to those caught in the poverty cycle.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie has also raised the question of the legality under the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 of closing more than one-half of the centers as this would mean that less than 40 per cent of male enrollees will be in conservation corps. Until the urban "mini" skill centers are developed and able to fill the needs of the severely disadvantaged, we hope you will oppose the abrupt closing of the Job Corps centers.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JAMES D. JOHNSON,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
SOUTH SAN MATEO COUNTY, INC.,
Menlo Park, Calif., April 21, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The League of Women Voters of South San Mateo County is convinced the Job Corps Centers should not be closed until other adequate facilities are open and operative. Otherwise, there seems to be no guarantee for the continuation of the program to train the hard core unemployed and underemployed. We feel it is unrealistic to believe that 30 urban centers would replace the Job Corps Centers by July 1. It seems this precipitous action might

contribute to the already current feeling of disillusionment of the disadvantaged.

In our own area there is already considerable protest evident in the press about the proposed closing of Camp Parks. People feel there should be an alternate camp in operation before it is closed.

Cordially,

Mrs. WILLIAM IVERSON,
President.

REDDING, CALIF.,
April 24, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to see the Job Corps Program continued.

I am informed on the good that has come to the men in the Corps and to the neighborhood served by the Toyon Job Corps near Redding, California. These young men, as well as improving their own lot in life, have set an excellent example for other youths in the neighborhood.

Please extend the power of your Office to continue the Job Corps Program.

Very truly yours,

ALLYN MARTIN.

PLACERVILLE, CALIF.,
April 22, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: When you are contemplating cutbacks in the Job Corps Program I would like to have you consider the following facts:

1. In California it costs \$5,000.00 to maintain one Corpsman for one year.
2. The cost to maintain a boy under the California Youth Authority is \$5,500.00.
3. At the Sly Park Job Corps, in this county, follow-up studies have been made on each Corpsman. The findings show that six months after leaving Sly Park 80% of the ex-Corpsmen are fully employed; 10% are in military service; and 10% are enrolled in school on a full time basis.
4. While at Sly Park, the average Corpsman raises his reading ability of 2 years and his mathematical ability by 1 year.

The technical training received at Sly Park must surely be a factor in the adjustment to life after leaving the Job Corps. While in our community some of the Corpsmen served as volunteers in the local Head Start Program. Acceptance of their help by the community benefited everyone, in my opinion.

The greatest resource our country has is still our human resource. There must be a variety of programs to meet the needs of a population which has a variety of problems. By increasing the potential of our entire population we add strength to America.

Yours truly,

MARY C. LENO.

APRIL 19, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: As neighbors of the Camp Parks Job Corps, we would like to urge your support for continuation of this program. We have been amazed at the progress the Corpsmen have made, and are convinced it is due to the wholesale changes made in their lives by having decent food, clothing, housing, adults who care, and fellow students on the same rough road.

The Nixon alternative is a poor substitute in every sense—too few youngsters involved, and no attempt to change the living conditions or mental attitudes of the students. As such it won't be worth its cost, and will probably be scrapped as "ineffective" in a year or so.

Saving a single life from public dependence is worth a lot more in cold cash than a Job Corps education costs us. Please fight shortsighted pennypinching arguments

against this valuable concept for salvaging these "lost lives".

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. D. STEINBERG.

SONORA, CALIF.,
April 21, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I would like to voice my protest against the proposed closure of the Five Mile Job Corps Center, in Sonora Tuolumne County, California.

It is my belief the Job Corps is doing the work intended, enabling young people to get the start in life they need. Many of the young men are getting their only chance to obtain a skill.

What is more expensive, educating of people to become self-supporting or supporting them on welfare or in prison? It is my belief the government will have a better investment in tax-paying citizens rather than putting out more welfare or building bigger prisons.

Many of us cannot imagine the type of hopeless life some of the young men lead before joining the Job Corps. I do not believe anyone would care for life in a big city slum or rural poverty. This is just where many of the men will have to return if the center is closed down. For the first time in many young lives, someone cares about the individual. A good meal three times a day, a decent place to sleep, and medical care are other first time experiences.

If our economy is in such a state to have to cut items out, let us pull out of Vietnam. If due to diplomatic, political and other reasons we cannot pull out, then let us fight and get it over. Vietnam is a real drain on the tax-payers dollar. Our self-help programs could use this money to a greater advantage.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF UKIAH, INC.,
Redwood Valley, Calif., April 22, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The League of Women Voters of Ukiah urges you not to close the Job Corps centers until adequate and expanded facilities are in operation to guarantee continuation of programs to train the hard core unemployed and underemployed.

The League does not believe that opening "mini" centers necessitates precipitous closing of Job Corps centers. The "saving" anticipated comes about, in part, through serving smaller numbers.

The relatively high yearly costs per enrollee in the Job Corps are somewhat offset because many of these young people, especially in the conservation centers do constructive work whose value has been appraised at \$56 million by the end of 1968.

It has taken time to convince the disadvantaged that we are sincere—we urge you not to disappoint them again. Oppose the abrupt closing of the Job Corps centers until such time as adequate and expanded facilities are available and functioning.

Yours very truly,

AVA PETERSON,
President.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
San Francisco, April 21, 1969.

RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: The Planning Committee of the San Francisco Council of Churches urges a reconsideration of the pending action to close the Parks Job Corps Center, Pleasanton, California.

We have been exerting every effort to slow down the increasing crime rate and to de-

velop positive programs to combat the urban crisis by working with various youth groups. We know the need. The Kerner Report details the need. There is general recognition that job training and placement has the top priority as #1 need. How, then, can there be justification to abolish a center that is doing this job and doing it effectively?

The record of 6,847 verified placements with an additional 2,000 training related placements out of a possible 14,000 is of prime importance. The cost of \$5,400 per trainee per year is lower than the average of \$5,700, and is reflected in a positive approach rather than treatment and detention of offenders which may range to \$6,000 and more.

The age range is 18-22 years which encompasses the group of young males who are most prevalent as offenders. The spread of races served, 2% Oriental, 4% American Indian, 13% Spanish American, 16% Caucasians, 69% Blacks is all inclusive. The trainees come from throughout the United States and the follow-up placement program through the State Employment Service is very effective.

It would be hard to find a project in which public monies would have a more direct impact on combatting the #1 priority problem of unemployment in the ghettos. The training of young males to be self-supporting, and being equipped to handle a job with the resultant self confidence and responsibility this develops is a sound investment in our country's future.

We urge you to take action to direct that funds be allocated to retain the Parks Job Corps Center and to provide the means to continually improve the program to serve the needs of the greatest number of these young people.

Sincerely,

JOHN WILLIAMS,
Vice Chairman, Planning Department,
San Francisco Council of Churches.

BELMONT, CALIF.,
April 19, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: Each morning's paper brings new surprises for me from the Nixon Administration; but the decision to do away with the Job Corps Center at Parks, near Pleasanton, California, certainly wins my "Fickle Finger of Fate" award.

It's beyond my ability to comprehend such a suicidal decision. The administrative troubles and past violent outbursts about which the San Francisco Chronicle wrote will surely be a "Teddy Bear's Picnic" compared to the violent potential of turning all those young black people back to the hopelessness of Oakland's streets, after having been shown some opportunity for improving their lives. It is decisions like this, that each day cause me to lose hope in my government's ability and will to deal with the realities of life.

Mr. Cranston, if you can do anything at all to get this decision reversed, please do so and thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WARREN H. STURMER.

PLACERVILLE, CALIF.,
April 20, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am writing to protest the termination of the Job Corps program and to ask that you do all in your power to enable it to continue.

I am a teacher in El Dorado County and I have seen what the program has accomplished at the Sly Park Job Corps Camp. Without this fine educational training program I feel sure that many of these boys will soon be in serious trouble.

Cannot we tax-paying citizens have some

say in the way a small portion of our earnings go?

Cannot a fair amount go to helping society rather than waging war?

Sincerely,

MARY R. BECK.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
April 20, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The enclosed San Francisco Chronicle editorials may be of interest to you—From what I hear, Parks Job Corps Center near here is doing an excellent job in training young people and finding jobs for them.

We applaud your remarks quoted in the editorial.

Very sincerely yours,

MADELINE W. GARVEY.

MENDOCINO FOREST CAMP: A JOB OF HUMAN SALVAGE

There is nothing untypical about the following history of an 18-year-old:

He dropped out of school during his second year in high school, and when he arrived at the Alder Springs Job Corps Camp in the Mendocino National Forest six months ago he scored zero on the reading test.

Now he is up to 12 on a 17-point scale, and within several weeks he should be able to read Life magazine and the Reader's Digest without difficulty.

In mathematics, he moved from 2 on the achievement scale to 18 in the same period.

SKILL

He has learned to handle power tools with skill. He has the makings of a good carpenter.

And by the time the four U.S. Forest Service Civilian Conservation Corps camps in California are shut down on July 1 for reasons of economy, this young man should be able to get and hold a job.

There are many ways of describing the work that is being done for and by the 210 young men from 16 to 21 who are part of a three-year-long experiment to salvage human beings.

OBJECTIVE

Dean W. Lloyd, a husky 42-year-old career forester who has been in charge of the camp since last June, explained his assignment.

"Our objective is to take people who are drains on society—who appear headed for the welfare rolls or prison—and try to turn them into taxpayers," he said.

"We get young men who have failed in school and society, and with odds like that we can't succeed in every case. We succeed about 70 per cent of the time."

Gordon Peters, the photographer I traveled with into the pine and fir forest in the Coast Range where the Alder Springs camp is located, said the visit was the first time in years he had taken pictures of so many young men without running into a single surly kid.

INTELLIGENT

Joe Kegley, a construction man from Orland, which lies east of the camp in the flatlands of the Sacramento Valley, said he was surprised how quickly his young students were learning the skills of woodworking.

"These men are intelligent," he said. "It's amazing to me how much they learn. They need a little more supervision at the start than other young men I've worked with, but they turn out good pieces of work."

"My friends and neighbors think the Job Corps is a waste of time and money, but if they would come up here and see what we're doing, they'd know better."

EDUCATION

Lee Brumage, 19, of Cochran, Ga., said that, after dropping out of school in the fifth grade he believes he is on the verge of qualifying for a high school diploma.

"I want an education, and I want a good job," he said. "As long as I can learn stuff, I'm going to stay with it."

What Brumage and the other youths have been offered is an austere life in unfamiliar surroundings. The barracks, the mess hall, the classrooms and most of the other structures in the camp are in green metal buildings, sparsely furnished.

ILLITERATES

The regimen for everybody is the same—a week of school alternating with a week of work.

Especially for the 25 per cent of the youths who enter the camp as illiterates and another 15 per cent who can read so little they are classed as "functional illiterates," the schooling comes as something of a shock.

"Imagine a big boy reading a book like that," said David Chapman, 19, of Talladega, Ala., a veteran of 11 months at the camp. He held up a beginner's reading book with pictures of two little children on the cover.

"But if a guy likes the program, he gets past books like that in a hurry."

TURNED ON

Deanna Foster, who teaches advanced English while her husband, Mike, teaches mathematics, spends eight hours a day teaching a series of classes of seven or eight young men.

"I love it," said Mrs. Foster, who moved to the camp from Mill Valley six months ago. "We can get a nonreader through a basic reading program in six months if he gets turned on by school. And 90 per cent of them do, which is all the more remarkable because so many were turned off so badly before they got here."

"This educational system is so much better than the public school system it's pitiful," said the camp director whose teen-aged son and daughter attend Willows High School 40 miles to the southeast.

READING

"In remedial reading particularly, the public school system could take advantage of these new methods. When a kid can go from zero to 10 on the rating scale here, he obviously is more intelligent than the public school gave him credit for."

One of the most promising teachers has turned out to be Paul Blacketer, 20, a Yreka native who was assigned to Alder Springs because of an error.

QUESTIONS

While awaiting a hoped-for transfer to the Upward Bound college program, young Blacketer said. "I'd say 85 to 90 per cent of the kids I work with want to learn, and they feel easy asking me questions. It's a lot easier asking a fellow corpsman than a teacher."

Robert Vasseur, 16, who dropped out of school in Santa Cruz after the eighth grade, had some praise for Blacketer.

"He taught me percentages," the youth said. "I don't think I'd ever have finished school in Santa Cruz. When I was there I just got in trouble and stuff like that. Now I want to go into forestry or be a carpenter."

The work program for the Job Corps trainees includes carpentry, auto repair and heavy equipment operation.

In the years of the camp's existence, the youths have built two camps for Forest Service firefighters and are at work on two more. They have improved roads, have constructed two campgrounds for the public and have turned out a steady supply of picnic tables, signs and other camping gear.

They also devoted a total of 3300 man-hours last year to fighting forest fires.

BUDGET

Next year's proposed budget, for example, included \$386,000 worth of improvements in public and Forest Service facilities in the Mendocino National Forest. The out-of-pocket cost would have come to an estimated \$182,000 for materials.

By closing the camp, the administration has said it would save the \$1.2 million cost of operating Alder Springs.

But if conventional accounting methods were used to compute costs, the figure would be much lower. At present, when the young trainees put up a building at a public campground, the cost of the lumber and the nails and other material is charged not to the camping program but to the Job Corps budget.

If only the price of materials were deducted, the cost of the camp would be reduced to about \$1 million a year. And if normal allowances for labor on permanent public projects were made, the figure would be below \$800,000.

In the next fire season, for example, it will be necessary to hire firefighters to replace the Job Corps trainees.

It would not be accurate to say that all of the trainees will be sorry to see the remote center closed. There are still patches of snow in the area, and the road west to Covelo is blocked by the winter snowpack at the pass.

COMPLAINTS

A group of trainees who had been at the camp for only three weeks and who were still homesick sought out Peters and me to tell us of their complaints.

Several said they much preferred President Nixon's plan to concentrate the job training program in the big cities.

"That way I can stay home and see my girl," one youngster of 16 said. "I'll be right back with the old gang."

APRIL 20, 1969.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been a volunteer worker for the Women's Job Corps for nearly three years.

During this time I have interviewed several hundred girls who needed to be removed from their home environments and taught skills to better their chances of finding employment and raising their own standards of living.

Job Corps is their last chance to gain training and dignity.

I urge that Job Corps be retained in its original concept.

Sincerely,

LYDIA K. HUNTER.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE
PALOS VERDES PENINSULA,
Palos Verdes Peninsula, Calif., April 24,
1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: Members of our organization oppose the abrupt closing of the Job Corps Centers: and commend your efforts to keep them open. We feel that there should be no cut back in the number of hard-core unemployed and underemployed now served by the Job Corps.

From our observations of local job-training programs, there seems to be no single answer in reaching the hard-core with meaningful programs. However, any urban project should be "in the neighborhood" and not too large in numbers.

Education and employment for the hard-core youth should have top priority. Adequate provisions must be made for placing these youths from phased out centers into viable programs. Adding them to the struggling existing programs is no solution.

Sincerely,

JANET KELBLEY,
Mrs. Lawrence Kelbley,
President, League of Women
Voters, Palos Verdes Peninsula.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE STUDIES OF PESTICIDES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the National Cancer Institute has recently released an interim report entitled "Studies of Pesticides and Other Agricultural and Industrial Chemicals." This report was based on 5 years of research. It indicates that certain long-lived pesticides when administered orally to mice produce significant numbers of tumors.

We have been told of the mutagenic properties of DDT and other insecticides. It has been reported that the reproductive cycle of salmon in the Great Lakes as well as other predator birds and fish have been interrupted as a result of the ingestion of high levels of DDT. Recently the Food and Drug Administration seized commercial coho salmon in the Great Lakes because of the high levels of DDT found in the edible portions of the fish. Now we have disturbing evidence that carcinomas may also be the product of extensive exposure to DDT.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the disturbing report and the text of the letter which I have addressed to Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences, be printed in the RECORD, for I believe that they are of general interest.

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

INTERIM REPORT ON STUDIES OF PESTICIDES AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS

BACKGROUND

In May, 1963 the President's Science Advisory Committee issued a report on the "use of Pesticides", recommending additional studies on "chronic effects on organs of both immature and adult animals, with particular emphasis on tumorigenicity."

In response to this need, the National Cancer Institute, through a contract with Biogenics Research Laboratories (recently purchased by Litton Industries, Inc.), Falls Church, Virginia, initiated investigations concerned with long-term toxic effects of a number of pesticides and other agricultural and industrial chemicals, some of which are now in rather wide use.

These complex investigations, underway since 1964, constitute the largest group of such experiments performed in a single effort and involved approximately 20,000 mice and 130 chemical compounds. Evaluation of all the data is not yet complete. It should be emphasized, however, that even with this large number of animals the investigations were designed as probing experiments mainly to provide information suitable for subsequent work rather than to obtain final information for assessing human health hazards.

Also it should be emphasized that the dose levels employed in these probing experiments were purposely administered at the maximally tolerated dose levels and that they are enormously higher than those to which human beings are likely to be exposed.

A preliminary analysis of the results in November and December, 1968 suggested that some of the compounds administered to mice at these high dose levels might be causing tumor development. A decision was made at that time to submit an abstract for the scientific meeting of the Society of Toxicology to be held on March 10-12, 1969 in Williamsburg, Virginia. The abstract was accepted by the Society for the presentation of a preliminary report at the March meet-

ing. Further study of the data by NCI scientists and consultants, as well as scientists of other Government agencies, led to the conclusion that additional statistical analyses ought to be employed before the data could be interpreted with sufficient certainty as regards determination of tumorigenicity in mice under the experimental conditions employed. Because of these considerations the authors of the preliminary report decided that they should defer presentation of the paper which would have necessarily been incomplete and therefore misleading. It was understood by all that the studies would be reported fully at a later date as soon as all the analyses were completed.

Some of the additional analyses have been completed and an interim report, which is being submitted for publication in the scientific literature follows.

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

A Bioassay of Pesticides and Industrial Compounds for Tumorigenicity in Mice (An Interim Note).

Summary

The tumorigenicity of selected pesticides and industrial compounds was tested by continuous oral administration to both sexes of two hybrid strains of mice, started at the age of seven days. Maximum tolerated doses were given. It was found that administration of 11 of the 123 test compounds (three compounds in the total of 130 were not tested by the oral administration route) induced a significantly elevated incidence of tumors, mostly hepatomas; such incidence was approximately the same shown by the mean of a group of positive control compounds. The 11 compounds include the insecticides p,p'-DDT, Mirex, bis (2-chloroethyl)-ether, chlorobenzilate, and stroban; the 5 fungicides PCNB, Avadex, Ethyl selenac, ethylene thiourea, and bis(2-hydroxyethyl) dithiocarbamic acid potassium salt; and the herbicide N-(hydroxyethyl) hydrazine. Ninety compounds gave no significant indication of tumorigenicity after oral administration. The possible relevance of these experiments to human exposure is discussed.

The environment of man contains an increasing number of synthetic chemicals which may be hazardous and which require testing for toxicity and tumorigenicity. This statement is an interim report of a large scale study designated to screen selected pesticides and industrial compounds for tumorigenicity in mice. The results were considered to be of sufficient interest to the general public to warrant publication of certain portions of the study at this time. The complete experiment included bioassays on 130 compounds in two hybrid strains of mice by two routes of administration, i.e., by single subcutaneous injection and continuous oral administration. Among the compounds were seven carcinogens included as positive controls,¹ 104 pesticides and 19 industrial compounds. The compounds were selected for inclusion in the study on the basis of three criteria: (a) chemical structure suggesting possible carcinogenicity, (b) evidence of toxicity described in the literature suggesting potential hazards to man, or (c) widespread use of the chemicals. Even though nearly 20,000 mice were used in these studies, the several investigations were done as preliminary, probing experiments and were not expected to provide final definitive information on every compound.

This initial report is motivated by extensive exposure of man to some of the compounds tested and focused on the data of greatest public health significance. Thus, only the results of oral administration are herein considered. Evaluation of these data revealed that 11 compounds are clearly tumorigenic for the strains of mice used at

the high dose levels which were administered. The results for another group of 19 compounds are still inconclusive and require further evaluation. Ninety compounds did not give significant indication of tumorigenicity in this study. A full account of the study will be published at a later date.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals and housing

"Specific pathogen free" mice were obtained from Cumberland View Farms to establish a breeding colony. Females of the C57B1/6 strain were mated with C, H/Anf or AKR males (herein designated as strains X and Y, respectively) to obtain the two F₁ hybrid strains used in these experiments. The animals were kept in facilities having separate clean and dirty corridors with unidirectional air flow from the clean to the dirty corridor. Animal attendants wore sterile gowns, masks, gloves, and shoe covers.

Chemicals, dose determination, and administration

Chemicals were obtained from commercial sources. Their composition was confirmed by infra-red spectroscopy, gas chromatography, or thin-layer chromatography. The chemicals were administered to the mice without further purification.

The maximum doses which could be tolerated were given. These levels were selected following a sequence of studies during which the maximum levels resulting in zero mortality were determined for a single dose, then for 6 daily doses and finally for 19 daily doses.

The maximum tolerated dose of each compound in mg/kg of body weight is shown in Tables 1-4. For the tumorigenicity testing this dose was given by stomach tube beginning at 7 days of age in a suspension of the vehicle indicated on these tables. The same absolute amount of each compound was given each day until the mice were 4 weeks old; the dose was not readjusted according to weight gain during this period. After weaning at 4 weeks of age, the chemicals were mixed directly with the diet which was provided ad libitum; no vehicle was used. The concentration in the diet, listed as ppm on Tables 1-4, was calculated according to the weight and food consumption of the 4 week-old mice so that once again they would receive approximately the maximum tolerated dose that had been calculated according to mg/kg body weight. The same concentration was maintained throughout the entire observation period of approximately 18 months.

Distribution of animals

At weaning, 18 mice of each sex of each strain were retained for study. Thus, 72 animals were given each compound *via* oral administration. One exception to this was the positive control compound ethyl carbamate for which there were 24 mice of each sex of each strain. Six animals were kept in each cage. The animals on test with each compound were placed in one of four rooms. Each room contained an additional group given gelatin suspension during the period when compounds were administered by stomach tube. Each room also housed at least one positive control group.

Autopsy and diagnosis

The experimental design called for autopsy at 18 months of age. The logistics of performing autopsies on a study involving almost 20,000 mice were complex, however, and the actual time of autopsy varied somewhat among the groups. These times are shown as the "weeks at term" on Tables 5-7. This range of termination times existed among the negative and positive control groups as well as among the experimental groups.

The autopsy procedure included an external examination and a thorough examination of thoracic and abdominal cavities with histologic examination of major organs and of any grossly visible lesions. The head was

¹Footnotes at end of article.

not dissected. Thyroid glands were examined and section in mice treated with Amitrol and one negative control group but not in other groups.

Statistical analysis

Since there were several negative control groups that differed with respect to their location within the four rooms, time of entry into the experiment and length of time until autopsy, the variance among these groups was analyzed with respect to the incidence of hepatomas, pulmonary tumors, lymphomas and total mice with tumors. The first test performed was the "chi-square test for heterogeneity of proportions after adjustment for stratification" as described by Armitage.² The stratification in this application was the sex-strain combinations. This test was not significant at the 5% level with any of the four categories of tumors. Similar ordinary chi-square tests were done on each sex-strain category and no significant differences were found. As a final analysis of the negative control groups, the proportions of the various tumors among mice were regressed on the average time until death.³ This was done with each sex-strain combination for each of the types of tumor. In only one of the sixteen such analyses was a significant positive relationship noted: the liver tumors among strain Y males. Here of the 18 mice in one control group, OD, 5 had tumors, 3 of which were hepatomas; this group also had the greatest age at death, 89 weeks (Table 5). However, for liver tumors of strain X, there was a negative correlation between the incidence of hepatomas and the age at term. In both these cases the figures are based on a very small number of hepatomas. Thus, the conclusion was reached from the several analyses performed that there was no significant evidence of differences among the negative control groups. In subsequent comparisons with positive controls and experimental compounds, the five negative control groups were lumped together.

The individual positive controls and experimental groups were compared with the grouped negative controls. The analysis presents the corrected relative risk⁴ for each comparison. The relative risk is a measure of the tumor incidence among the treated mice as compared to the controls. The analysis was performed with four tumor groupings: hepatomas, pulmonary tumors, lymphomas, and total mice with tumors. The significance tests of each sex-strain subgroup and their various combinations are by the Mantel-Haenszel procedure,⁵ and the combined relative risk uses the weighted geometric mean⁶ with the $\frac{1}{2}$ corrections used throughout.^{7,8}

As an additional test to compare the tumor incidence of mice treated with experimental compounds with those treated with positive control compounds, the 7 positive controls were lumped together and the corrected relative risk was calculated for each experimental group compared to this baseline.

RESULTS

The tumors seen in this study were principally those of the liver, lung, and lymphoid organs. Tumors of other organs were rare except in the case of two positive control compounds: Amitrol which induced thyroid carcinomas in practically all the animals; and ethyl carbamate which induced a substantial number of adenomas of the Harderian gland. Because of the rarity of other types of tumors, only tumors of the three principal organs affected are considered here. Other tumors are counted, however, in the column "Total Mice with Tumors" of the tables.

The diagnostic criteria for liver tumors were those described by Lemon.⁹ According to her criteria, liver tumors are diagnosed as "hepatomas" unless metastases are found; then they are designated as carcinomas. This

distinction is not made to indicate that those which do not metastasize are benign, but rather because the histologic appearance of tumors of the liver of the mouse is not a good guide to their behavior. Metastasizing hepatic-cell tumors were rare in the present study. Thus, the tables in this manuscript and the statistical calculations include the two sub-classifications grouped together as "hepatomas."

Pulmonary tumors consisted principally of adenomas according to the criteria of Stewart.¹⁰ A few adenocarcinomas of the lung were noted, but because of their relative scarcity both types are considered together as "pulmonary tumors."

Tumors of the lymphoid organs were originally classified by the criteria of Dunn.¹¹ Most of the tumors were Type B reticulum-cell sarcomas. A smaller number of animals had malignant lymphomas associated with leukemia while other types of lymphoma were rare. In a study designed to investigate the tumorigenicity of chemicals rather than the pathogenesis of tumor types, it was felt to be more meaningful to combine all of these tumors into a single category, "lymphomas."

As indicated in Tables 6 and 8, the tumorigenicity of the positive control compounds was manifest primarily through the induction of hepatomas. Iosofrole was only weakly tumorigenic, but all other positive control had an elevation of hepatomas significant at the 0.01 level. Only 3 of the 7 positive controls had a significant increase in pulmonary tumors, and only ethyl carbamate induced a significant yield of lymphomas.

The pattern of tumor types among experimental compounds was similar to that with positive control compounds. Thus, the major evidence of tumorigenicity by experimental compounds lies in the increased incidence of hepatomas (Tables 7 and 9). For each of the 11 experimental compounds listed in Table 9, the increased incidence of hepatomas was significant at the 0.01 level for the sum of both sexes and both strains, the sum of males of both strains and for the males of at least one of the strains considered separately. Females were generally less affected than males, but several compounds induced hepatomas in them as well. When the relative risk for hepatoma development among these 11 experimental compounds was compared with the overall risk in the positive controls (Table 10) it was found that in 10 of them, at least one sex-strain subgroup had a greater risk than the corresponding sex-strain subgroup of the combined positive controls. The remaining compound, chlorobenzilate had a relative risk approaching that of positive controls for males of both strains.

The incidence of tumors of the lung and lymphoid organs showed a less striking elevation than hepatomas. The incidence of lymphomas in some subgroups of mice treated with p,p'-DDT, Ethyl selenac, ETU, and Strobane and the incidence of pulmonary tumors among mice treated with Avadex were significantly increased over the negative controls.

Mice treated with compounds listed in Table 3 did not have a significant elevation of tumor incidence at the 0.01 level of any type of tumor in any sex-strain subgroup or combination of groups after oral administration. Mice treated with compounds listed in Table 4 had an elevation of tumor incidence in an uncertain range; with these compounds, additional statistical evaluation and/or experimentation will be required before an interpretation can be made.

DISCUSSION

The interpretation of these data require consideration of two questions: "What is the biologic behavior of mouse hepatomas?" and, "What relevance do studies with a single, high dose level in one species have for evaluating the hazard of other dose levels in other species?"

Confusion arises from the fact that classical terminology of neoplastic disease would suggest that the term "hepatoma" refers to benign tumors whereas a malignant tumor of the liver should be referred to as a "carcinoma." The opinion of Lemon⁹ has already been quoted on the impossibility of making this distinction between benign and malignant liver tumors in the mouse. Andervont and Dunn¹² reported the transplantability of mouse liver tumors. They found no correlation between transplantability and morphologic characteristics. Many transplantable tumors had cytologic characteristics which were so similar to normal liver that the distinction was difficult to make upon microscopic observation. Gross observation appeared to be a more reliable criterion. Thus, the term "hepatoma" as used in this manuscript should not be considered as implying that these tumors are benign. Indeed, it seems more reasonable to conclude that the great majority had malignant potentiality.

The problem of species specificity for chemical carcinogens has been discussed by several authors^{13, 14, 15} and will not be discussed in detail here. There are differences among species; some may be susceptible to tumorigenesis by a given chemical and others may show relative or absolute resistance. At the present time there is no way to predict whether man may be more or less susceptible than the mouse to the induction of tumors by the compounds reported here. It should be stressed that the dose received by the mice was far in excess of that likely to be consumed by humans.

Another problem in interpretation lies in the fact that laboratory experiments are designed to test a single chemical and to prevent exposures to other chemicals as much as possible. The environment of man, on the other hand, contains a complex mixture of chemicals. The way in which these interact to either enhance or inhibit carcinogenicity is a complex, difficult problem which has received insufficient investigation.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT

In the report it is clear that 11 of the compounds chosen for study at very high doses are capable of producing an increased incidence of tumors in mice. Also 90 compounds clearly did not produce an increased tumor incidence in these studies. An additional 19 compounds could not be assigned with certainty to either of these two groups. Additional studies employing larger groups of animals will be required to determine the tumorigenicity of these 19 latter compounds in mice.

These probing experiments again point out the complexity and difficulties inherent in the use of animal model systems for assessing health hazards, including tumor development. In general, animal experiments have proved their usefulness in many fields of biomedical research as aids in making judgments about men. Nevertheless, it is well-known that considerable differences in responsiveness of different animal species to a given chemical substance occur. This is generally the reason studies conducted under a variety of conditions and experimental data from more than one species of animal are needed before extrapolation to the human situation is appropriate. Moreover, it is often important to have extensive information on dose response relationships and also insight into how the administered compounds are metabolized. Therefore, caution must be exercised in interpreting the data from a single species. Thus, the data reported in this study must be examined with all other pertinent information before conclusions as to their significance for man can be made.

An additional complexity with certain kinds of tumors is the great difficulty in determining whether they are malignant. Experts differ as to the appropriate classification, definition and criteria of malignancy.

Footnotes at end of article.

Although it is difficult occasionally to determine whether tumors should be classified as malignant on the basis of their microscopic morphology, most human tumors diagnosed by biopsy are deemed malignant on this basis. Some pathologists believe that malignancy cannot be definitely determined, however, unless it has been demonstrated that the tumor has spread to other sites (metastases); others believe transplantability of a tumor to a different animal is an important criterion for malignancy.

Mouse hepatomas clearly illustrate this difficulty. They demonstrate varying degrees of alteration from the normal structure of the liver. There is not a good correlation between structure and transplantability, though a number of hepatomas with very little change from the normal structure are known to transplant under conditions where normal liver tissue is not transplantable. Some hepatomas metastasize and others apparently do not. The longer the animal lives after the tumor is initiated, the greater the chances are that metastases will be found if the tumor does metastasize. Though available data are not extensive, it is likely that few mouse hepatomas do metastasize. Nevertheless, many mice with hepatomas will die with shortened life span before metastases appear.

In these studies, because of the difficulties outlined above, the tumors have been listed as hepatomas without attempts to separate them into benign or malignant categories. This has been done on the advice of leading experts, including those especially knowledgeable regarding mouse liver tumors. Since the available data do not provide a distinction between benign and malignant tumors, it is not possible at this time to categorize the positive compounds as carcinogenic.

A group of experts will therefore be con-

stituted in the near future to review all pertinent information and make recommendations on whether any of the compounds should be labeled as carcinogenic. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is seeking the aid of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council in constituting such a group of experts.

Further animal experiments already are under way. In addition to the 19 compounds for which tumorigenicity results were uncertain, additional chemicals in wide use will be studied as further capacity for screening becomes available. As indicated above, testing is needed in multiple species, at different dose levels, by different routes of administration, etc. under carefully controlled and standardized conditions. Thus, a sizable apparatus will be required if society's needs are to be met. Such an apparatus does not now exist, although the National Cancer Institute has initiated beginning efforts in this direction. Moreover, because of difficulties in interpreting animal data in reference to man, epidemiologic studies on human carcinogenicity must be expanded in order that the data from man can be related meaningfully to data from animal studies.

The scientific staff of the National Cancer Institute will continue to work closely with both federal and non-federal scientists and concerned members of society in order to resolve these problems.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Falk, H. L., Thompson, S. J., and Kotin, P.: Carcinogenic Potential of Pesticides. Arch. Environmental Health 10:847-858, 1965.

² Armitage, P.: The Chi-square Test for Heterogeneity of Proportions after Adjustment for Stratification. J. Royal Statistical Soc. (B) 28: 150-163, 1966.

³ Snedecor, G. W. and Cochran, W. G.: *Statistical Methods*. Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State Press, 6th ed., 1967, pp. 246-248.

⁴ Lillienfeld, A. M., Pedersen, E., and Dowd, J. E.: *Cancer Epidemiology: Methods of Study*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967, pp. 131-134.

⁵ Snedecor, G. W. and Cochran, W. G.: op. cit., pp. 253-256.

⁶ Gart, J. J.: On the Combination of Relative Risks. Biometrika 18: 601-610, 1962.

⁷ Gart, J. J. and Zweifel, J.: On the Bias of Various Estimators of the Logit and its Variance with Application to Quantal Bioassay. Biometrika 54: 181-187, 1967.

⁸ Snedecor, G. W. and Cochran, W. G., op. cit., p. 497.

⁹ Lemon, P. G.: Hepatic Neoplasms of Rats and Mice, in *Pathology of Laboratory Rats and Mice*, Cotchin, E. and Roe, F. J. C., eds., Philadelphia, F. A. Davis Co., 1967, pp. 25-56.

¹⁰ Stewart, H. L.: Pulmonary Tumors in Mice, in *Pathophysiology of Cancer*, 2nd ed., Homberger, F., ed., New York, Hoeber-Harper, 1959, pp. 18-37.

¹¹ Dunn, T. B.: Normal Pathologic Anatomy of the Reticular Tissue in Laboratory Mice, with a Classification and Discussion of Neoplasms. J. Nat. Cancer Institute 14: 1281-1431, 1954.

¹² Andervont, H. B. and Dunn, T. B.: Transplantation of Spontaneous and Induced Hepatomas in Inbred Mice. J. Nat. Cancer Inst. 13: 455-503, 1952.

¹³ Clayton, D. B.: *Chemical Carcinogenesis*, Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1962, pp. 56-61, 97-98.

¹⁴ Hueper, W. C. and Conway, W. D.: *Chemical Carcinogenesis and Cancers*, Springfield, Charles C. Thomas, 1964, p. 468.

¹⁵ Arcos, J. C., Argus, M. F., and Wolf, G.: *Chemical Induction of Cancer*, V. I., New York, Academic Press, 1968, pp. 340-347.

TABLE 1.—POSITIVE CONTROL COMPOUNDS

Compound No.	Common name	Chemical name	Dosage mg./kg.	Vehicle ¹	P.p.m.
034	Urethan	Ethyl carbamate	158	0.5-percent gelatin	600
078		Ethylene imine	4.64	do	13
089	Amitrol	3-Amino-1,2,4-triazole	1,000	Dis. H ₂ O	2,192
122	Aramite	2-(p-Tert. butyl phenoxy)-isopropyl 2'-chloroethylsulfite	464	0.5-percent gelatin	1,112
160	Dihydroisofrole	4-Propyl-1,2-methylenedioxybenzene	464	Dis. H ₂ O	1,400
161	Isosafrole	4-Propenyl-1,2-methylenedioxybenzene	215	do	517
162	Safrole	4-Allyl-1,2-methylenedioxybenzene	464	do	1,112

¹ Used during stomach tubing period only.

TABLE 2.—EXPERIMENTAL COMPOUNDS WHICH RESULTED IN AN ELEVATED TUMOR INCIDENCE

Compound No.	Common name	Use	Chemical name	Dosage mg./kg.	Vehicle ¹	P.p.m.
060	PCNB	F	Pentachloronitrobenzene	464	0.5-percent gelatin	1,206
065	p,p'-DDT	I	2,2-Bis(p-chlorophenyl)-1,1,1-trichloroethane	46.4	do	140
096	Mirex	I	Dodecachlorooctahydro-1,3,4-metheno-2H-cyclobuta[cd]pentalene	10	do	26
098	Avadex	F	2,3-Dichloroallyl diisopropyl thiocarbamate	215	do	560
109		I	Bis(2-Chloroethyl)-ether	100	Dis. H ₂ O	300
129	Ethyl Selenac	F	Selenium diethyl dithiocarbamate	10	0.5-percent gelatin	26
153	ETU	F	Ethylene thiourea	215	do	646
154		H	N-(2-Hydroxyethyl) hydrazine	2.15	Dis. H ₂ O	5
168	Chlorobenzilate	I	Ethyl-4, 4'-Dichlorobenzilate	215	0.5 percent gelatin	603
170		F	Bis(2-Hydroxyethyl) dithiocarbamic acid potassium salt	464	do	1,112
171	Strobane	I	Terpene Polychlorinates	4.64	do	11

¹ Used during stomach tubing period only.

Note: I, insecticide; F, fungicide; H, herbicide; R, rodenticide; and IC, industrial compound.

TABLE 3.—EXPERIMENTAL COMPOUNDS WHICH DID NOT CAUSE A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN TUMORS AFTER ORAL ADMINISTRATION

Compound No.	Common name	Use	Chemical name	Dosage mg./kg.	Vehicle ¹	P.p.m.
024	Simazine	H	2-Chloro-4,6-bis-(ethylamino)-1,3,5-triazine	215	0.5-percent gelatin	603
205	Propazine	H	2-Chloro-4,6-bis(isopropylamino)-1,3,5-triazine	46.4	do	102
026	Captan	F	N-Trichloromethylthio-4-cyclohexene-1,2-dicarboximide	215	do	560
029	N-Propyl isome	I	Di-n-Propyl-3-methyl-6,7-methylenedioxy-1,2,3,4-tetrahydropnaphthalene 1,2-dicarboxylate	2,000	do	6,000
030	2,4-D Isopropyl ester	H	2,4-Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid, isopropyl ester	46.4	do	111
031	2,4-D Butyl ester	H	2,4-Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid, n-butyl ester	46.4	do	149
032	2,4-D Isooctyl ester	H	2,4-Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid, isooctyl ester	46.4	do	130
047	Sevein	I	1-Naphthyl-N-methyl carbamate	4.64	do	14
048	IPC	I	Isopropyl-N-phenyl carbamate	215	do	560
050	Dowcide-7	F	2,3,4,5,6-Pentachlorophenol	46.4	do	130

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 3.—EXPERIMENTAL COMPOUNDS WHICH DID NOT CAUSE A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN TUMORS AFTER ORAL ADMINISTRATION—Continued

Compound No.	Common name	Use	Chemical name	Dosage mg./kg.	Vehicle †	P.p.m.
051	Zineb	F	Zinc ethylene bis thiocarbamate	464	0.5-percent gelatin	1,298
503	Diuron	H	3-(3,4-Dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea	464	do	1,400
82	Dodine	F	n-Dodecylguanidine acetate	21.5	do	254
056	Maneb	F	Manganese ethylene bis thiocarbamate	46.4	do	158
057	Maleic Hydrazide	H	1,2-Dihydropyridazine-3,6-dione	1,000	do	3,000
058	Thiram	F	Tetramethylthiuram disulfide or bis (dimethylthiocarbamyl) disulfide	10	do	26
061	2,3,5-T	H	2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxy acetic acid	21.5	do	60
062	Ferbam	F	Ferric dimethyl dithiocarbamate	10	do	32
063	2,3-D	H	2,4-Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid	100	do	323
	2,4-D	H	2,4-Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid	46.4	do	149
066	Atrazine	H	2-Chloro-4-cethylamino-6-isopropylamino-s-triazine	21.5	do	82
069	Captax	IC	2-Mercaptobenzothiazole	100	do	323
070	Ethyl zimate	F	Zinc-diethylthiocarbamate	100	do	260
071		IC	Phenyl isothiocyanate	46.4	do	158
074	Aitax	IC	Benzothiazyl disulfide	464	do	1,577
075	Unads	F	Tetramethyl thiuram monosulfide	100	do	377
076	Dichlone	F	2,3-Dichloro-1,4-naphthoquinone	10	do	30
077	Dicryl	H	3,4'-Dichloro-2-methyl acrylanilide	21.5	do	73
079	Nabam	F	Disodium ethylenebisdithiocarbamate	21.5	Dis. H ₂ O	73
080	Agerite DPPD	IC	Diphenyl-p-phenylenediamine	1,000	DMSO	3,385
082	Bismate	F	Bismuth dimethylthiocarbamate	10	0.5 percent gelatin	1,492
085	Hercules-7531	H	3-(Hexahydro-4,7-methano-indan-5-yl)-1,1-dimethylurea	464	do	1,492
086	Folpet	F	N-Trichloromethylthiophthalimide	215	do	603
087	Tilam-6-E	F	Propyl ethyl-n-butyl thiocarbamate	100	Corn oil	323
090	Sulfax	IC	Zinc salt of 2-mercaptobenzothiazole	1,000	0.5 percent gelatin	3,385
091	Sulfads	F	Dipentamethylene thiuram hexasulfide	100	do	300
092	Butacide	I	Piperonyl butoxide in solvent vehicle	464	do	1,112
093	Botran	I	2,6-Dichloro-4-nitroaniline	215	do	603
094	Karathane	F	Dinitro(1-methylheptyl)-phenyl crotonate	1	do	3
095		H	2-(2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxy)-propionic acid	46.4	do	121
099	Cumate	F	Copper dimethyl dithiocarbamate	46.4	do	168
100	Mucchloric acid	F	α-S-Dichloro-S-formyl acrylic acid	21.5	do	56
101		F	2-Sec.-butyl-4,6-dinitro phenol	2.15	do	7
102	Agerite powder	IC	Phenyl-S-naphthylamine	464	do	1,206
103	Rotenone	I	Tubatoxin	1	do	3
104		IC	Biphenyl	215	do	517
105	Anthraquinone	F	9,10-Anthraquinone	464	do	1,206
106	ANTU	R	1-(1-Naphthyl)-2-thiourea	2.15	do	6
107		IC	Diphenylacetoneitrile	215	do	560
108	Planofix; NAA	H	1-Naphthalene acetic acid	215	do	517
111	Dehydroacetic Acid	F	3-Acetyl-6-methyl-2,4-pyridione	100	do	240
112		H	1-Naphthalene acetamide	464	do	1,298
113		IC	Diphenylcarbonate	100	do	260
114		H	Monochloroacetic acid	46.4	Dis. H ₂ O	149
115	Cacodylic acid	H	Dimethyl arsinic acid	46.4	do	121
116	Paraxenol	IC	p-Phenyl phenol	464	0.5 percent gelatin	1,400
117	Dowicide 1; orthoxenol	IC	o-Phenyl phenol	100	do	280
118		F	Copper-8-hydroxy quinoline	1,000	do	2,800
119	α-Chloralose	R	Anhydroglucochloral	10	do	28
120	Pma; Pmal; Pmas; Scuti; nylmerate.	H	Phenyl mercuric acetate	10	do	24
121		IC	p-Methoxyphenylacetic acid	215	do	560
123	Vanguard GF	F	Ferric nitrosodimethyl dithiocarbamate and tetramethyl thiuram disulfide	100	do	240
125	Butyl zimate	F	Zinc dibutyl dithiocarbamate	1,000	do	2,600
128		F	2,6-Dichloro-4-nitro aniline	215	do	731
130	Agerite white	IC	Sym. dibeta-naphthyl-p-phenylene diamine	100	do	280
131	Durax	IC	N-Cyclohexyl-2-benzothiazole sulfenamide	215	do	692
132	Methyl zimate	F	Zinc dimethyl dithiocarbamate	4.6	do	15
133	Methyl Selenac	F	Selenium dimethyl dithiocarbamate	10	do	34
135	Amax	IC	N-oxydiethylenebenzothiazole-2-sulfenamide	464	do	1,492
136	Ethyl cadmate	F	Cadmium diethyl dithiocarbamate	21.5	do	65
137	Agerite 150	IC	p-Isopropoxydiphenylamine	1,000	do	3,000
138	Agerite Alba	IC	Hydroquinone monobenzyl ether	464	do	1,492
139	Phenothiazine	I	(Thiodiphenylamine) dibenzo-1,4-thiazine	215	do	560
140	Vanguard N	F	Nickel dibutyl dithiocarbamate	46.4	do	158
	Do.		do.	0.1	do	0.20
141	Vancide BN	F	Sodium bithonolate disodium 2,2'-thio bis(4,6-dichlorophenoxy)	2.15	do	7
142	Gibberellic acid	H	2,4a,7-Trihydroxy-1-methyl-8-methylenegibb-3-ene-1,10-carboxylic acid 1-4 lactone	464	do	1,298
143		F	Dimethyl dithiocarbamic acid dimethyl amm. salt	100	do	260
145		H	α-(2,4-Dichlorophenoxy) propionic acid	100	do	260
146		H	α-(2,5-dichlorophenoxy) propionic acid	46.4	do	93
147	Ovex	F	p-Chlorophenyl-p-chlorobenzene sulfonate	464	do	1,019
148		R	Triphenyl Tin Acetate	0.464	do	1,206
150	CIPC	I	Isopropyl-N(3-chlorophenyl)-carbamate	464	do	1,118
151	2-(2,4-DP)	H	2-(2,4-Dichlorophenoxy)-propionic acid	10	do	2
152	Isolan	I	1-Isopropyl-3-methyl-S-pyrazolyl-dimethyl carbamate	0.0215	Dis. H ₂ O	0.0603
157	Ethylene urea	H	2-Imidazolidinone	215	0.5 percent gelatin	646
158	Tetrafidon	F	2,4,5,4-Tetrachlorodiphenyl sulfone	100	do	260
159	Telodrin	I	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,8-Octachloro-3a,4,7a-Hexahydro-4,7-methano phthalen	0.215	do	0.646
165	Genite-R99	F	2,4-Dichlorophenyl benzene sulfonate	1,000	do	2,400
166	Heteroauxin	H	Indole-3-acetic acid	215	do	646
167		I	4-Dimethylamino-3,5-xyleneol	100	do	300
169	Thiodan (Endosulfan)	I	6,7,8,9,10-Hexachloro-1,5,5a,6,9,9a-hexhydro-6,9-methano-2,3,4-benzo dioxathiepin-3-oxide	2.15	do	6
				1	do	3

† Used during stomach tubing period only.

Note: I, insecticide; F, fungicide; H, herbicide; R, rodenticide; and IC, industrial compound.

TABLE 4.—EXPERIMENTAL COMPOUNDS WHICH REQUIRE ADDITIONAL EVALUATION

Compound No.	Common name	Use	Chemical name	Dosage mg./kg.	Vehicle †	P.p.m.
027	Piperonyl butoxide	I	α-[2-(2-n-Butoxyethoxy)-ethoxy]-4,5-methylenedioxy-2-propyl toluene	100	0.5-percent gelatin	300
028	Piperonyl sulfoxide	I	1,2-Methylenedioxy-2-[2-octyl sulfinyl propyl]-benzene	46.4	do	111
049	SDDC	F	Sodium diethylthiocarbamate	215	Dis. H ₂ O	692
052	o,p'-DDD	I	2-(o-Chlorophenyl)-2-(p-chlorophenyl)-1,1-dichloroethane	215	0.5 percent gelatin	560
059	Monuron	H	3-(p-Chlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethyl urea	215	do	517
067	p,p'-DDD	I	2,2-Bis(p-chlorophenyl)-1,1-dichloroethane	100	do	300
068	Ethyl tellurac	F	Tellurium disthlydithiocarbamate	46.4	do	149
072	Perthane	I	1,1-Bis(p-ethylphenyl)-2,2-dichloroethane	215	do	815
073	Chloranil	F	Tetrachloro-p-benzoquinone	215	do	646
081	Vancide PB	F	1,2,3-Trichloro-4,6-dinitrobenzene	46.4	DMSO	121

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 4.—EXPERIMENTAL COMPOUNDS WHICH REQUIRE ADDITIONAL EVALUATION—Continued

Compound No.	Common name	Use	Chemical name	Dosage mg./kg.	Vehicle ¹	P.p.m.
083	Redax	IC	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	1,000	DMSO	3,769
088	Ledate	F	Lead Dimethylthiocarbamate	46.4	0.5 percent gelatin	130
097	Omal; dovicide 2S	F	2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	100	do	260
110	Azobensene	H	Diphenyldimide	21.5	do	56
124	Cyanamide	H	Calcium cyanamide	100	do	240
127	Vancide	F	2,2-Thio bis(4,6-dichlorophenol)	46.4	do	111
134	Ethyl tuads	F	Tetraethyl thiuram disulfide	100	do	323
149	Zectran	I	4-Dimethylamino-3,5-xylyl-methyl carbamate	4.65	do	11
156	CCC	H	2-Chloroethyl trimethyl-ammonium chloride	21.5	do	65

¹ Used during stomach tubing period only.

Note: I, insecticide; F, fungicide; H, herbicide; R, rodenticide; and IC, industrial compound.

TABLE 5.—TUMORS AMONG NEGATIVE CONTROL MICE

Compound	Compound number	Strain ¹	Mice at term		Total mice necropsied		Weeks at term		Hepatomas		Pulmonary tumors		Lymphomas		Total mice with tumors	
			Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Untreated	X		14	16	17	18	88	88	1	0	2	1	1	2	6	3
Control, OD	Y		18	16	18	17	89	89	3	0	2	0	1	2	5	2
Untreated	X		15	17	15	18	78	78	3	0	2	1	0	1	5	2
Control, OE	Y		18	13	18	15	78	78	0	0	3	0	0	1	3	1
Untreated	X		12	18	14	18	80	80	3	0	0	1	2	1	4	2
Control, OF	Y		18	17	18	18	80	80	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Untreated	X		16	16	17	17	81	81	1	0	1	0	2	0	7	1
Control, O	Y		17	14	18	15	81	81	0	1	3	2	0	0	3	2
Gelatin	X		16	16	16	16	82	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Control	Y		18	15	18	17	83	83	1	0	2	1	0	1	3	2
Total	X		73	83	79	87			8	0	5	3	5	4	22	8
Negative control	Y		89	75	90	82			5	1	10	3	1	4	16	7

¹ Strain X=(C57B1/6 x C3H/AnF)₁; strain Y=(C57B1/6 x AKR)₁.

TABLE 6.—TUMORS AMONG POSITIVE CONTROL MICE

Compound	Compound number	Strain ¹	Mice at term		Total mice necropsied		Weeks at term		Hepatomas		Pulmonary tumors		Lymphomas		Total mice with tumors	
			Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Ethyl Carbamate ²	34	X	9	13	20	23	71	69	8	12	6	6	1	3	13	19
		Y	15	18	22	19	73	74	14	5	15	17	6	1	20	18
Ethylene imine	78	X	4	14	17	15	78	77	15	11	15	15	0	0	16	15
		Y	1	3	16	11	77	77	9	2	12	10	0	2	16	11
Mitrol ³	89	X	0	0	18	18	54	58	16	18	0	0	0	0	16	18
		Y	0	0	18	18	53	60	16	17	0	0	1	0	16	17
Aramite	122	X	16	16	16	17	81	78	6	1	0	1	1	1	7	8
		Y	17	16	17	16	78	81	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	4
Dihydrosafrole	160	Y	16	16	17	17	82	82	10	0	4	5	1	1	12	7
		Y	15	15	17	18	82	82	8	1	5	4	0	1	11	6
Isosafrole	161	X	18	16	18	16	82	82	5	1	3	1	1	0	8	2
		Y	17	16	17	16	82	82	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
Safrole	162	X	14	14	17	16	82	82	11	16	0	0	0	0	11	16
		Y	17	16	17	17	82	82	3	16	0	0	0	0	3	16

¹ Strain X=(C57B1/6 x C3H/AnF)₁; strain Y=(C57B1/6 x AKR)₁.² Adenomas of the Harderian gland were found in 24 mice.³ Carcinomas of the thyroid were found in 64 mice.

TABLE 7.—TUMORS AMONG MICE RECEIVING EXPERIMENTAL COMPOUNDS WHICH RESULTED IN A HIGH TUMOR YIELD

Compound	Compound number	Strain ¹	Mice at term		Total mice necropsied		Weeks at term		Hepatomas		Pulmonary tumors		Lymphomas		Total mice with tumors	
			Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
PCNB	60	X	14	18	18	18	78	78	2	4	2	1	2	0	5	5
		Y	16	17	17	17	78	78	10	1	1	0	1	1	11	2
p,p'-DDT	65	X	17	11	18	18	81	81	11	4	2	0	0	1	11	5
		Y	18	13	18	18	81	81	7	1	2	0	1	6	8	7
Mirex	96	X	0	0	18	16	59	70	6	8	0	0	0	0	7	8
		Y	0	0	15	16	59	69	5	10	0	0	0	0	5	10
Avadex	98	X	15	16	16	16	85	84	13	3	4	2	0	1	14	5
		Y	16	14	18	15	85	86	10	1	4	1	0	0	12	2
Bis(2-chloroethyl)-ether	109	X	11	18	16	18	80	80	14	4	0	0	2	0	16	4
		Y	15	17	17	18	80	80	9	0	2	0	0	1	10	1
Ethyl Selenac	129	X	16	14	18	17	82	82	12	3	0	0	3	2	16	6
		Y	17	14	17	17	82	82	3	0	3	1	1	3	5	4
ETU	153	X	14	18	16	18	83	82	14	18	1	3	0	1	14	18
		Y	18	13	18	16	82	82	18	9	2	0	3	4	18	12
N-(2-Hydroxyethyl) hydrazine	154	X	17	17	17	18	79	79	8	1	1	1	1	0	10	2
		Y	18	16	18	17	79	79	10	0	1	2	0	1	10	3
Chlorobenzilate	168	X	12	17	17	18	83	83	9	0	0	1	3	1	11	2
		Y	16	18	17	18	83	83	7	0	0	2	1	1	8	3
Bis(2-Hydroxyethyl) dithio-carbamic acid potassium salt	170	X	14	17	16	18	80	80	13	12	0	1	1	0	14	13
		Y	15	16	17	17	80	80	13	3	1	2	0	2	13	7
Strobane	171	X	10	17	15	18	80	80	2	0	1	1	5	2	8	3
		Y	18	18	18	18	80	80	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	0

¹ Strain X=(C57B1/6 x C3H/AnF)₁; strain Y=(57B1/6 x AKR)₁.

TABLE 8.—RELATIVE RISK FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TUMORS AMONG MICE TREATED WITH POSITIVE CONTROL COMPOUNDS WHEN COMPARED TO NEGATIVE CONTROLS

Compound	Compound	Strain	Hepatomas			Pulmonary tumors			Lymphomas			Total mice with tumors		
			Male	Female	Sum	Male	Female	Sum	Male	Female	Sum	Male	Female	Sum
Ethyl Carbamate	34	X	15.72	(1)	19.06	16.07	18.97	17.24	1.04	3.17	2.07	14.60	140.53	110.99
		Y	126.52	120.61	124.65	115.84	1159.00	130.78	123.51	1.41	16.05	137.02	1124.16	158.36
		Sum	111.66	140.07	115.17	110.57	128.52	115.22	15.04	2.35	13.29	19.35	157.84	119.10
Ethylene imine	78	X	152.15	(1)	180.91	183.982	1748.43	1135.39	0	0	0	128.11	(1)	152.11
		Y	19.69	14.30	18.08	121.296	159.00	137.30	0	4.59	3.77	(1)	(1)	184.81
		Sum	129.65	145.76	132.94	136.028	1256.93	159.66	0	2.79	1.87	144.09	1259.35	180.87
Amitrol	89	X	155.52	(1)	101.68	0	0	0	0	0	0	16.87	(1)	130.22
		Y	1102.60	1633.89	1183.09	0	0	0	5.11	0	2.07	129.80	1117.44	150.22
		Sum	174.33	1150.55	1139.42	0	0	0	1.86	0	1.04	12.35	1159.79	140.16
Aramite	122	X	15.21	(2)	15.79	0	2.19	1.30	1.31	1.69	1.48	2.02	18.37	13.88
		Y	1.41	0	1.47	0	5.89	2.73	0	0	0	.73	3.63	1.75
		Sum	3.56	5.12	3.78	0	4.00	2.00	1.40	1.20	1.29	1.40	15.79	12.82
Dihydrosafrole	106	X	11.78	0	11.78	3.52	10.62	16.74	1.23	1.69	1.44	5.81	16.68	16.21
		Y	13.91	4.66	10.83	3.37	7.05	14.48	0	1.50	1.55	7.99	5.23	6.60
		Sum	12.72	4.66	11.26	3.82	18.70	15.42	1.34	1.59	1.48	16.83	15.93	16.40
Isosafrole	161	X	3.43	(2)	4.18	3.06	2.34	2.79	1.16	0	.94	2.07	1.61	1.91
		Y	2.51	0	2.31	0	0	0	5.42	0	2.24	1.51	0	1.20
		Sum	3.05	5.28	3.32	1.80	1.61	1.73	2.14	0	1.37	1.81	1.13	1.61
Safrole	162	X	14.88	(1)	14.53	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.52	(1)	17.55
		Y	3.75	1597.67	15.56	0	0	0	0	0	0	110.73	14.99	
		Sum	8.52	1,069.85	19.86	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.51	(1)	16.19

¹ Increased tumor yield significant at 0.01 level.
² Relative risk calculated as infinite. This figure may result from the absence of tumors in the control group and is not necessarily significant.
³ Increased tumor yield significant at 0.05 level.

STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Department of Defense proposes to spend \$48.6 million on social and behavioral science research in the next fiscal year. Of this amount, \$5.2 million is for studies with foreign policy implications and \$7.5 million is for foreign area research. The Committee on Foreign Relations has devoted considerable study to this and other aspects of the Pentagon's research program. As a result of the study, I am convinced that Congress should make some drastic revisions in that program.

The proposed authorization for Department of Defense research is included in S. 1192, now being considered by the Committee on Armed Services. I have submitted a statement of my views on these activities to the committee and, in the light of the general interest in this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement and related information printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT SUBMITTED TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION REQUEST CONTAINED IN S. 1192, APRIL 29, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on certain aspects of the Department of Defense research program to be authorized by S. 1192.

During the last two years the Committee on Foreign Relations has devoted a great deal of study to Department of Defense research programs involving foreign policy matters. As a result of this study I am convinced that Congress should drastically revise the Department's social science research operations. I hope that the Committee, in appraising the budget request for research, will take a hard look at each project in the field of the social sciences, being conducted abroad, by the so-called "think tanks," and financed under the college subsidy program, Project Themis. If the Committee goes over these programs item by item, I am confident that it will see clearly the need for substantial improvements. Let me discuss briefly several aspects of this research program.

According to information provided by the Defense Department, a total of \$45.4 million

will be spent on social and behavioral science research in FY 1969. \$48.6 million is budgeted for FY 1970. Of this, \$5.2 million is for studies with foreign policy implications, and \$7.5 million is for foreign area research. I ask to have printed following my statement, a listing of the unclassified social and behavioral science research projects, by category, and a compilation of the research projects underway in foreign countries.

The ballooning of military financed research in non-military areas is seen by what is taking place in Thailand. The bibliography of recent Department of Defense research in Thailand is 63 pages long, listing 508 separate reports. An article by Stanley Karnow in the January 20, 1969 *Washington Post* reported from Bangkok that, "About a dozen different research firms employing nearly 200 American specialists spend some \$11 million a year in Department subsidies on various projects here." The following are a few examples:

- (1) Directory of the Social Sciences in Thailand.
- (2) Social Structure and Shifting Agriculture—The White Meo.
- (3) Blue Book of Coastal Vessels in Thailand.
- (4) Studies of Bladder Stone Disease in Thailand.
- (5) Tests of the Gama Goat in Thailand.

Defense financed foreign area research continues unchecked despite the Project Camelot fiasco of several years ago and more recent incidents in Sweden, Japan, and India. In the next fiscal year the Department of Defense proposes to spend \$7,547,000 on research about foreign areas. Yet only \$125,000 is budgeted for external research by the agency responsible for our nation's foreign affairs, the Department of State. The entire budget for the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research is only two-thirds the \$6.2 million budgeted by the Defense Department for foreign policy research. It is obvious that the Department of Defense is involved in many research activities simply because it, and not the Federal agency with proper jurisdiction, has the money available.

A panel of the Defense Science Board, whose recommendations for increased activities by the Defense Department in the behavioral and social sciences have been endorsed by Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, has stated that the military has a responsibility to wage "peacefare." I, for one, do not wish to see the United States involved militarily in waging "peacefare" around the world any more than I wish to see us wage warfare. Judging from the titles of some current re-

search projects, I fear that "peacefare," as conceived by the military oriented social scientists, means Pax Americana, and inevitable involvement by the United States in internal disputes of countries all over the world.

Research projects, such as the following, to be carried out under authority of this bill are more likely to lead to additional Vietnams than to a realistic assessment of our proper role in the world:

- (1) Conflict Contingencies in the 1970's.
- (2) Prediction of International Military Capabilities and Events.
- (3) Alternative Strategies for Insurgent Conflicts.
- (4) U.S. Army Psychological Operations Requirements Worldwide.
- (5) Capabilities and Interests Study.
- (6) Studies in the Processes of Political Development and Revolutionary Behavior.
- (7) Ideology and Behavior.

All too many of these studies—underway and proposed—indicate that the Pentagon planners have not learned any lessons from Vietnam, but that they are busily engaged in blueprinting strategies where our military will play the key role in trying to maintain order in a disorderly world. I, for one, do not want the Senate to encourage the planning of more Vietnams.

Another aspect of the military research program which merits a drastic reduction is research carried out by foreign institutions, primarily colleges and universities. According to the Defense Department, 440 research projects are now underway in 44 foreign countries throughout the non-Communist world. Here are a few examples:

- France—"Nervous Process Underlying Behavior and Learning"—\$50,000.
- Greece—"Aftershocks and Crustal Structure in Greece"—\$145,000.
- Iran—"Nutritional Studies (Iran)"—\$70,000.
- Israel—"Investigation of Leadership Qualities of Kibbutz-Raised Young Men"—\$50,000.
- Lebanon—"Factors Associated with Cultural Change"—\$238,000.

There is trouble aplenty over military research being carried out in our own educational institutions and there is no need to ask for the same kind of trouble in 44 other countries. Unless the brakes are put on this program, more incidents are inevitable. A compelling need in our foreign affairs today is to make the American presence abroad less visible. We do not accomplish that by linking foreign universities to our military establishment. Most of this research has little, if any, direct bearing on the proper role of the armed forces or could not be carried out in a domestic institution. I urge the Committee to phase out all but the es-

sential foreign-based research as rapidly as feasible.

Another area which deserves the careful attention of the Committee is that of the "think tanks"—the 16 Federal Contract Research Centers where over \$300 million in Defense funds are being spent this year. The Committee on Foreign Relations found evidence of much duplication and waste of taxpayers' money in the small part of the "think tank" activity it looked at. These institutions, supported in most instances almost entirely by Defense contracts, should be kept under much closer scrutiny by the Congress since the Defense Department is seemingly incapable of doing the job.

During its investigation of the 1964 incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin, the Committee on Foreign Relations was refused access to a study prepared by the Institute for Defense Analysis, with Defense funds. The study, relating to the decision making process leading to the United States response, could possibly shed light on a confused period and help avoid future stampedes in time of crisis. But the issue here is far more important than whether or not the Committee on Foreign Relations is given this one report. No congressional committee should be denied copies of any research reports, paid for with taxpayers' money, except on grounds of executive privilege. I hope your Committee will correct this problem and I submit an amendment on this point for its consideration.

In 1967 the Department of Defense initiated Project THEMIS, whose purpose is "to stimulate the development of additional centers of defense-relevant research." Dr. Foster told the Committee on Foreign Relations last year that THEMIS could provide "a wider geographical distribution of Defense research funds favoring institutions and areas which do not now receive substantial support." Translated, this means a direct subsidy program for higher education. One reason for the widespread turmoil we now have in our

colleges is their too obvious association with the military establishment.

Twenty-seven million dollars was budgeted for THEMIS in 1967; \$28.5 million was appropriated for FY 1969, and the budget request for FY 1970 is \$33 million. This amount will support continuation of 92 projects at 52 universities and colleges, and allow initiation of an additional 25 projects. One area in which the Defense Department solicits research proposals, the THEMIS promotion pamphlet states, is in "... the evaluation of the reliability and validity of current national security forecasting procedures, and the systematic interpretation and selection of strategic and tactical signals relevant to deterrence, escalation, crisis management and multilateral military activities." That covers quite a bit of territory.

Of the top 500 defense research contractors, 99 are educational institutions, led by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology which received over \$119 million in Defense funds last fiscal year. I ask permission to have included in the hearing record the latest ranking of nonprofit recipients of research contracts.

The increasing dependence of colleges and universities on the Defense Department largesse is not a healthy situation for the institutions, the students, or for our free society. The type of thinking that assumes a role for the Defense Department in subsidizing higher education, however, sees no conflict between the role of the academician as a teacher and independent thinker and as a hireling of the Defense Department. As a long-time supporter of increased Federal aid to education I do not quarrel with the concept of government assistance; I question here only the means and the methods by which aid is furnished. The Department of Defense is not the proper agency to carry out an aid to education program and the \$33 million budgeted for THEMIS in FY 1970 could be used more effectively on any of the

many authorized educational programs which are sadly underfunded. I urge the Committee to approve only the amount needed to meet existing contract obligations under Project THEMIS, thus starting an orderly phase-out for the program. This should enable a reduction by one-half or more in the budget request. Perhaps these savings, in a small way, will help make it more feasible to assist colleges and universities in the manner approved by the Congress—through the established programs of aid to higher education.

In summary, I recommend that the Committee take the following action on the Department of Defense research program:

- (1) Reduce the authorization request for the social and behavioral sciences by at least one-half;
- (2) Phase out all research in foreign institutions not involving a direct essential military requirement;
- (3) Reduce substantially funds for the "think tank" operations and institute stricter controls over their operations;
- (4) Require that, upon request, appropriate congressional committees be furnished with copies of any research report prepared under Department of Defense auspices;
- (5) Eliminate funds for expansion of Project THEMIS and phase out the program as existing contracts expire.

I again thank the Committee for this opportunity to comment on this program and I hope that it will take appropriate action to correct these abuses.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 1192

The Secretary of Defense shall, in response to any request made to him in writing by a committee of the Congress, promptly submit to such committee a copy of any report, study, or investigation requested by such committee if such report, study, or investigation was made in whole or in part with Department of Defense funds.

POLICY PLANNING STUDIES WITH FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS

SPONSOR: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OCRD

[Note: Information concerning 21 projects is classified and, therefore, not included in this listing]

Project title	Project description	Contractor/investigator	Previously initiated, underway in fiscal year 1969	Initial funding in fiscal year 1969	Planned for fiscal year 1970
Beliefs and habits of certain foreign populations of significance for psychological operations (U).	Classified.....	CRESS.....	\$49,000		
U.S. Army psychological operations requirements worldwide.	Overview, ordering, integration of PSYOPS knowledge and thinking to provide guidance for planning, operations, training, research.	CRESS.....	7,000		\$25,000
Development of critical target analysis information for the U.S. strategic psychological operations in Southeast Asia.	Identification of questions to be used as essential elements of information to collect information required in conduct of PSYOPS.	CRESS.....	7,000		
Development of methodology for tactical use by psychological operations units.	Develop practical methodological guidelines enabling PSYOPS officers to evaluate attitudes in overseas areas with reasonable degree of accuracy.	CRESS.....	68,000		
A systematic framework for psychological operations.	Estimation of worldwide requirements for U.S. Army PSYOPS in time frame 1970-77.	CRESS.....	49,000		50,000
Internal security.....	Research on civil, paramilitary and military police operations related to overseas internal defense and development.	CRESS.....	77,000		80,000
Combating insurgent infrastructure in Southeast Asia.	Research on techniques to eliminate Communist insurgent movement in South Vietnam. Application of findings to dissimilar environment of second country in SEA.	CRESS.....	81,000		85,000
Strategic and tactical factors underlying internal defense and development.	Analyses of processes involved in internal conflict.....	CRESS.....	77,000		75,000
Utilization of military assistance program equipment by developing nations.	Assess capability of military personnel and institutions in developing nations to operate, maintain, support equipment furnished under Military Assistance Program.	CRESS.....	34,000		
Social processes relevant to military planning for stability studies of African groups.	Study of African socio-political structures, dynamics, and leadership resources and attitudes.	CRESS.....	34,000		
Changing roles of the military in developing nations.	Subcontracted studies of changing roles of military establishments.	CRESS.....	2,000		
Assessment of cultural meanings through associative group analysis technique.	Development, testing of technique for collecting culture and audience—Specific information on foreign societies.	CRESS.....	93,000		100,000
Cultural Information and Analysis Center (CINFAC).	An information storage, retrieval, analysis facility providing information services concerning foreign areas and cultures to qualified requesters.	CRESS.....	750,000		750,000
Evaluation of the impact of visual PSYOP in the Republic of Korea.	Determination of effectiveness of on-going PSYOP activities conducted in ROK to maintain positive disposition toward UNC/USFK.	CRESS.....			70,000
Research on civic action and community assistance programs in Panama.	Identification of techniques and procedures that contribute to operational effectiveness of military civic action programs.	CRESS.....			85,000
Feasibility study of a system for debriefing MAAG advisors (Debrief).	Development, evaluation of techniques and instruments for debriefing US military personnel who have served overseas in military assistance program.	Human Resources Research Office..	45,000		69,000
Development of concepts and techniques for area training (Area).	Development for behavioral criteria to improve effectiveness of area training.	do.....	45,000		

POLICY PLANNING STUDIES WITH FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS—Continued

SPONSOR: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OCRD—Continued

[Note: Information concerning 21 projects is classified and, therefore, not included in this listing]

Project title	Project description	Contractor/investigator	Previously initiated, underway in fiscal year 1969	Initial funding in fiscal year 1969	Planned for fiscal year 1970
Program of instruction for the development of cultural self-awareness (Cope).	Design, production and evaluation of program of audiovisual instruction for development of cultural self-awareness.	Human Resources Research Office	\$113,600		\$115,000
Factors influencing effectiveness of advisor-counterpart interactions (Refract).	Develop operational techniques to assess effectiveness of advisor-counterpart relations and identify factors that influence them.	do	45,000		23,000
United States-Thai security guard (ES-73)	Assess effect of cultural factors on performance of personnel involved in Thai security guard program.	do	122,700		
Development of generalized method for repairing self-instructional foreign language courses (Autospan).	Effort organized around the development and evaluation of prototype course in Spanish.	do	113,600		138,000
Implementation and modification of the USMACTHAI adviser debriefing program (Refocus).	Develop and evaluate techniques for systematic continuation and modification of adviser debriefing program within U.S. Military Assistance Command, Thailand.	do	122,700		
Overseas Military Posts and Communities (Sojourn)	Develop techniques to gather information pertinent to management, organization and planning for U.S. military communities overseas.	do	68,000		
Development and evaluation of a Southeast Asian cultural assimilator.	Compile assimilator and evaluate advantages and disadvantages of using this as a principal teaching vehicle.	do			23,000
Guidelines for effective management of foreign national employees of the U.S. Army.	Survey of experiences of U.S. supervisory personnel and development of data bank of critical incidents and cultural differences relevant to civilian personnel operations.	do			69,000
Research on troop-community relations, Korea	Evaluate and further develop orientation program designed to improve relations between U.S. soldiers and Koreans.	American Institutes for Research	185,000		185,000
Research on troop-community relations, Thailand	Develop and test orientation program designed to improve relations between U.S. soldiers and Thai population.	do	90,000		112,000
Research on troop-community relations, Panama	Develop and test orientation program designed to improve relations between U.S. soldiers and Panamanians.	do		\$70,000	70,000
Impact of body size on Korean utilization of U.S. equipment and analysis of ROKA Reserve training.	Assess implications of anthropometric data for utilization of U.S. military equipment; and preparation of casebook analysis of training program for ROKA Reserve divisions, assessment of implications for use in other countries.	Rowland & Co.	65,000		70,000
Socioeconomic aspects of American military commanders' control of goods brought into a developing country.	Analysis of problem of military control of materiel introduced into developing countries.	HRB Singer, Inc.	0		80,000
Sources and indicators of trends in the Pacific region.	Develop information on major economic, demographic sociological trends in Oceania.	National Academy of Sciences	*0		
Subtotal			2,534,600	105,000	2,804,000

SPONSOR: U.S. ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Comprehensive epidemiologic studies in developing countries.	Study of disease conditions and vectors in selected rural populations.	The Johns Hopkins University, Alfred Buck, MD.	\$168,533		\$115,000
A sociomedical study of the Lisu of northern Thailand.	Anthropological fieldwork among the Lisu tribe.	University of Illinois, E. Paul Durrenberger.		\$43,687	0
The culture of health and illness in a Southeast Asian village.	Beliefs and behavior relating to health and illness in a village in Thailand.	University of Pennsylvania, Gertrude Marlowe.	0		0
Interpersonal perception and the psychological adjustment of group members.	Study of group effectiveness in divergent cultural groups.	University of Illinois, Fred E. Fiedler.	0		0
Social structure and ecology of Red Karen-Shan interethnic relations in Province Mai Hongson (Thailand) emphasizing environmental health aspects.	Study of social customs and attitudes in relations to disease.	University of Illinois, Frederick K. Lehman	8,440		0
Subtotal			176,973	43,687	115,000

SPONSOR: NAVY, OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Anthropological research to assist Navy strategic planning.	Investigator will combine anthropological variables with economic techniques in order to conceptualize and predict mobility in foreign military hierarchies. Will be completed in May (1969).	University of Texas, I. Buchler	0		
A technique for deriving Navy planning information from analysis of mass media.	Make content analysis of Chinese Communist values, attitudes, problems, and decisionmaking by analyzing mass media output.	Mental Research Institute, J. Weakland.	\$22,000		\$25,000
The development of a method for forecasting decisions and actions for military groups.	Make cross-national data base analysis of the effects of different military postures and strategies on the decisionmaking of foreign military groups; research will also be conducted on the predicted responses of these groups to perceived politico-military threats.	Western Behavioral Science Institute, J. Raser.	28,000		
Improved Marine Corps training for civic action, civil affairs, and related programs.	To research information necessary to develop a valid strategy for Marine programs designed for training personnel to interact with indigenous populations in counterinsurgency environments. Contract terminates in March (1969).	Matrix Corp., R. Campbell	18,000		70,000
Development of USMC combined action capabilities for Vietnam and future contingencies.	To provide information useful to USMC in developing pacification or "other war" capabilities to utilize in limited or small war situations.	Human Sciences Research Inc., M. D. Havron.		\$94,000	95,000
Environmental forecasting for Navy long-range planning.	Conduct research to obtain a more precise description of future international environments and to examine the implications which these descriptions have for naval mid- and long-range planning.	McDonnell Douglas Aircraft Co., D. N. Ivanoff.	425,000		
Identification of factors influencing the effectiveness of management and leadership.	Field data collection on the training, leadership characteristics, preferences, and effectiveness of foreign managerial personnel and trainees.	University of Rochester, B. M. Bass.	45,000		50,000
Factors involved in modifying hostile attitudes.	Research on factors which determine whether attitude change of Far East groups is based upon persuasive communications on strategic issues.	University of Maryland, E. McGinnies.			20,000
Reduction of hostility in groups to enhance team performance.	Research conditions which produce hostility or cooperation among individual and groups from different nations.	University of Pennsylvania, A. Pepitone.	8,000		0
Leadership requirements in differing organizational settings.	This project, completed December 1968, was conducted to determine how worker behavior and leadership styles vary between national groups as a function of the structure, personnel, values, etc., of the organizations of which they work.	University of Missouri, B. Biddle	0		
Identification of variables which predict international conflict.	Trend analysis of China in its relation with the great powers and selected medium powers from 1922 until the present.	Stanford University, R. North			25,000
Comparative analysis of leadership practices.	Research on effects of different types of leadership on the productivity and morale of Far Eastern groups in order to improve training programs for U.S. Navy personnel who will train, supervise, or work with these groups.	Western Washington State College, R. Meade.			10,000
Total			146,000	94,000	295,000

See footnotes at end of table.

POLICY PLANNING STUDIES WITH FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS—Continued

SPONSOR: AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (OAR)

[Note: Information concerning 21 projects is classified and, therefore, not included in this listing]

Project title	Project description	Contractor/investigator	Previously initiated, underway in fiscal year 1969	Initial funding in fiscal year 1969	Planned for fiscal year 1970
Innovation and social change in developing countries.	Guidance for training of personnel to be assigned to foreign duty....	Hebrew University, Israel, Dr. S. Eisenstadt.	0		
Information system for analysis of a closed society....	Method for coding and analyzing data on a strategic area (Chicom)...	University of California, Berkeley, Dr. C. Y. Glock.	0		
Comparative analysis of military career patterns.....	Cooperation with friendly foreign military forces.....	University of California, Los Angeles, Dr. O. Grusky.	0		
Methodology for analysis of internal social movements.	Providing predictive base for forecasting social movements in selected countries.	University of Pittsburgh, Holzner and Yang.	0	0	
Behavior norms: Japanese and American youth.....	Comparison of attitudes and behavior of the youth of 2 countries for military assistance and manpower resource purposes.	University of Maryland, Dr. E. McGinnies.	0		
Research to improve language training—Western European countries.	Update training materials and courses in Western European languages.	Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., Dr. T. Sebeok.	0	0	
Transfer of technology under military auspices.....	Cooperation with foreign military assistance and training programs.	Howard University, Dr. D. Spencer.	0	0	
Political functions of the military in the Middle East and North Africa.	Improved understanding of the role of foreign military forces in stabilization of Middle East.	Operations and Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., A. Perlmutter.		\$47,000	0
Simulation studies of communication behavior under stress.	Use of foreign national students in communication studies of stress in laboratory simulations.	Ohio State University, H. Quarantelli.	0	43,000	\$45,000
Research on special personnel utilization problems of USAF.	Develop methods for analyzing behavior and performance of AF personnel in stressful duties (including special forces, and survival and resistance in captivity situations).	Preston and Associates, J. Monroe.	0	70,000	70,000
Cultural differences in training task approach.....	Cross-cultural study of differences in training techniques, using United States and Puerto Rican students.	New York University, Dr. J. Weitz.	0	0	25,000
Perception of threat, evaluation of stress and decisionmaking.	Study of the way individuals and groups including civilian populations, their leaders and military organizations are likely to respond to the threats inherent in aerospace warfare and other impending dangers.	Catholic University, Washington, D.C., A. Frances.		67,000	68,000
Studies in the processes of political development and revolutionary behavior.	Strategic analysis of selected developing countries from documentary and other available data.	University of Pennsylvania Foreign Policy Research Institute, Kintner and Schwarts.		63,000	62,000
Training system for effective interaction with foreign military personnel.	Development of realistic training programs using people of different cultures in problem-solving situations.	Tufts University, Dr. B. Wedge.		55,000	55,000
Information system for updating, retrieval and analysis of data on Eastern European political leaders.	Provide USAF access to data archive on Eastern European leadership trends.	University of Pittsburgh, Prof. Carl Beck.		25,000	0
Data analysis center for comparative study of leaders (mainly Far East and SEA).	Development of system to provide DOD and academic access to available data on leaders.	University of California, Berkeley, Dr. D. Nasatir.		70,000	80,000
Total funding (estimates).....				440,000	405,000

SPONSOR: ARPA/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES—DEFENSE RESEARCH DONE IN FOREIGN AREAS

Himalayan border countries project.....	Describe political-social-economic development in the Himalayan border states. No field work now taking place in India. Research being conducted at the India Office Library and at the Institute of Commonwealth at the University of London. Termination being negotiated by agent.	University of California, Berkeley, Dr. Leo Rose.	0		
Cross-national studies of conflict dynamics and resolution.	Present understanding of bargaining and negotiating behavior comes from research done solely with American subjects. This project cross-checks such knowledge by using similar data from European subjects to provide American military personnel with ability to deal effectively with European counterparts. Overseas work done entirely by foreign nationals in a cooperative program Expires August 1970.	UCLA, Dr. Harold Kelley.....	\$80K		0
Human interaction and communication.....	Improve ability to communicate where obstacles such as language and cultural differences exist. Overseas work entails validation of previously developed techniques for rapid acculturation of American military personnel to foreign environments. Expires August 1971.	University of Illinois, Dr. Fred Fiedler.	100K		
Social change as a result of modernization.....	To determine most effective uses of DOD aid to developing nations so that conflict between traditional cultural values and pressures toward modernization are minimized. Transfer to non-DOD agency under discussion.	Kalamazoo College, Dr. Stillman Bradfield. Penn State University, Dr. George Guthrie. Princeton University, Dr. Harry Eckstein. Rice University, Dr. William McCord.	0 0 0 0		
Subtotal.....			242K	0	0
Cultural change in developing societies (THEMIS)....	DOD is frequently required, through aid and establishment of bases, to make massive infusions of men and material into traditional societies. This project studies the effects of such situations, with reference to ways of ameliorating the disruption which sometimes results from large-scale American military presence overseas. Work has taken place in American Micronesia, and contract will transfer to Air Force—which has large bases in this area.	University of Kansas, Dr. Felix Moos.	0		
Nonverbal communication cross-cultural studies.....	Some nonverbal communicative acts i.e., gestures and facial expressions, appear to be common to all cultures while others are highly culture-specific in their meanings. Understanding these meanings will enable American military personnel to communicate more effectively in foreign societies. No further work overseas to take place under this contract. Money to be used for conclusion in United States of work begun overseas. Expires August 1970.	Langley Porter Institute, Dr. Paul Ekman.	62K		0

See footnotes at end of table.

POLICY PLANNING STUDIES WITH FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS—Continued

SPONSOR: ARPA/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES—DEFENSE RESEARCH DONE IN UNITED STATES BUT RELATED TO FOREIGN AREAS

[Note: Information concerning 21 projects is classified and, therefore, not included in this listing]

Project title	Project description	Contractor/investigator	Previously initiated, underway in fiscal year 1969	Initial funding in fiscal year 1969	Planned for fiscal year 1970
Foreign communication and defense.....	Describe communication mechanisms of China and Soviet Union and develop computer simulation of message flow so as to predict spread of information and news in future. Expires September 1969.	MIT, Dr. Ithiel Pool.....	0		0
Military implications of international bargaining and negotiations.	Build predictive theories of bargaining and negotiating processes to avoid, limit and resolve military conflict. Increase understanding of the relation of such processes to international politico-military systems through development and use of computer simulations. Intermediate results in use by Joint War Games Agency and Industrial College of the Armed Forces.	SDC, Dr. Gerald Shure..... Northwestern University, Dr. Harold Guetzkow.	\$250K 125K		\$1,136K 94K
Human factors in modernization.....	Originally planned as foreign study of peasant societies undergoing development and modernization. No field work undertaken and project is phasing out. Expires September 1969.	MIT, Dr. Fred Frey.....	0		0
Strategic analysis of social conflict.....	Continuation of Dr. Schelling's work to improve understanding of revolutionary processes.	Harvard University, Dr. Thomas Schelling.	75 K		78 K
Prediction of international military capabilities and events.	To develop quantitative methodology and theory for use of publicly available data (U.N., news media, etc.) to improve predictions and understanding of actions by foreign nations.	University of Hawaii, Dr. R. Rummel. University of Southern California, Dr. Charles McClelland. Yale University, Dr. Bruce Russett.	130 K 80 K 80 K		130 K 80 K 80 K
Subtotal.....			740 K	0	1,598 K
Total.....			982 K	0	1,598 K

¹ ARPA funded.
² Funded in fiscal year 1968.
³ Funded in fiscal year 1967.
⁴ Partial support.

⁵ Planned.

Note: Dashes (---) indicate not applicable or that project is completed; 0 indicates project is continuing, although funding is completed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH PROJECTS USING INFORMATION ABOUT FOREIGN AREAS

SPONSOR: ARMY, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, MILITARY OPERATIONS (ODCSOPS)

[Note: Information concerning 20 Projects, including all Projects sponsored by ARPA/AGILE, are classified and not included in this listing]

Project title	Project description	Contractor/investigator	Previously initiated, underway in fiscal year 1969	Initial funding in fiscal year 1969	Planned for fiscal year 1970
Strategic analysis of subsaharan Africa, 1969 (SASSA) (8 substudies).	Includes studies of U.S. strategic interests, environmental trends, and U.S. policies and programs.	RAC.....	\$70,500		\$74,000
Strategic analysis of Europe, 1969 (SAEUR) (6 substudies).	Includes studies of French foreign policy, European trade prospects, development of Siberia and Soviet-Japanese trade.	RAC.....	122,300		128,000
Strategic analysis of north Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia, 1969 (SANESA) (8 substudies).	Includes studies of Algeria, Yemen, Indian political leadership, Cyprus, and Inter-Arab relations.	RAC.....	95,300		100,000
Strategic Analysis of Southeast Asia, 1969 (SASEA) (8 substudies).	Includes analyses of Malaysian foreign policy, regional military cooperation, and Australian foreign and military policy.	RAC.....	124,000		130,000
Strategic analyses of Latin America, 1969 (SALA) (5 substudies).	Includes studies of strategic, economic, military, and other aspects of Latin American positions and treaties.	RAC.....	93,000		100,000
Strategic analysis of northeast Asia, 1969 (SACNEA) (4 substudies).	Includes studies of aspects of China's policies and changes and analysis of Japanese and North Korean policies.	RAC.....	122,400		130,000
Theater fire support concepts.....	Omitted because of classification.	RAC.....		\$15,000	
Conflict contingencies in the 1970's.....	To identify those minor contingencies which would occur worldwide in 1972-79 period and would require U.S. participation.	RAC.....		26,200	
United States and regional collective security arrangements (COLSEC) (2 substudies).	Analyze U.S. policies concerning selected existing collective security arrangements. A concept of selective noninvolvement will be explored.	RAC.....		40,000	
The Pacific-Indian Ocean region as a strategic zone.....	Analysis of the impact of the British withdrawal, technological advancements, and increased Soviet and CHICOM interest in the Indian Ocean region.	RAC.....		35,300	
Latin American nuclear free zone (LANFZ).....	Will address questions concerning U.S. bases, installations, and activities in the zone of application of LANFZ Army plans for the defense of the Panama Canal.	RAC.....		29,300	
Vulnerabilities of Communist China to U.S. Psychological Operations.	Determination and assessment of vulnerabilities of China and methods of exploitation by U.S. and/or allied PSYOPS.	RAC.....	60,000		
Strategic Postures Study (SPOST).....	Work supporting a continuing Army Staff study effort to analyze and evaluate alternative postures for the U.S. the U.S.S.R., and CPR in the 1968-80 period.	SRI.....	820,000		860,000
Total.....			1,507,500	145,800	1,522,000

SPONSOR: AIR FORCE, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Japanese rearmament, nuclear, and space programs.	A study of factors and developments affecting the Japanese military contribution to the U.S. effort in Asia, including the security pact.	Rand, P. F. Langer and M. E. Davies.	\$61,000		\$60,000
Chinese military and foreign policy.....	A continuing analysis of the background and fundamental characteristics of Chinese foreign and military policies to elucidate their implications for U.S. policy. Research provides background for consultations with Air Staff officials and for inputs to inter-departmental studies, such as work on strategic posture toward China.	Rand, A. Hsieh.....	99,000		100,000
European security issues.....	A continuing examination of trends in the political and military relations of European States, including possible changes in European security arrangements, and national developments affecting the overall European military posture.	Rand, F. C. Ikle.....	122,000		120,000
Soviet military and foreign policy.....	A continuing study of Soviet military doctrine, use of military strength for political purposes, foreign policy, and political institutions in the Soviet Union and East European States.	Rand, A. Horelick.....	252,000		250,000
Military representation in U.S. missions.....	Examines better methods of military representation in handling military aid in foreign countries, specifically India, Indonesia, Brazil, and Iran.	Rand, P. Y. Hammond.....	43,000		40,000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH PROJECTS USING INFORMATION ABOUT FOREIGN AREAS—Continued

SPONSOR: AIR FORCE, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—Continued

[Note: Information concerning 20 Projects, including all Projects sponsored by ARPA/AGILE, are classified and not included in this listing]

Project title	Project description	Contractor/investigator	Previously initiated, underway in fiscal year 1969	Initial funding in fiscal year 1969	Planned for fiscal year 1970
Sino-Soviet economic potential.....	A continuing study of the economic background of Soviet and Communist Chinese military power. Presently it includes studies of outlays, employment, and organizational problems in Soviet R. & D., Soviet foreign economic relations, and Chinese civil aviation.	Rand, O. Hoeffding.....	\$112,000		\$110,000
The role of the military in Indonesia.....	An analysis in support of Air Force plans and intelligence of the role of the military in the developing political, economic, and defense structure of Indonesia, and the probable role of Indonesia in the larger context of U.S. security interests in SEA.	Rand, G. J. Pauker.....	35,000		35,000
Asian security issues.....	To help the Air Force by delineation: (a) Future alternative regional and global environments which would affect the Air Force operations, (b) alternative postures and policies which emphasize these components which are of particular Air Force interest but which also consider other theater forces, local, paramilitary and police forces and barriers; foreign aid programs, bilateral and multilateral security arrangements, (c) comparisons of these alternative postures and policies in various potential military and political contingencies in different regional and global environments.	Rand, C. Wolf, Jr.....		\$131,000	130,000
Policy relevant technology in the 1970's and 1980's.....	To project the future of a number of technologies that have particular relevance to interactions among countries and what implications such technological developments have for U.S. military and political policy. Of interest are (a) power generation and transmission; (b) information processing and communication; (c) manufacturing and transportation.	Rand V. Gilinsky.....			2,000
Total.....			724,000	131,000	847,000

SPONSOR: OASD/ISA

Development of a planning, programing and budgeting system (PPBS) for U.S. foreign economic decision.	Development of an analytical framework or model which can be used to identify how resources are organized and focused in achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives.	Planning Research Corp.....	0		
The role of Chinese Communist external trade as an instrument for acquiring foreign technology.	Investigation of benefits that may accrue to the Chinese ballistic missile program in the next 10 years from existing trade relations with Japan, West Germany, United Kingdom, France, and Italy.	Browne & Shaw.....	0		
Strengthening international peacekeeping.....	Examination of potential opportunities and limitations of international peacekeeping forces in local conflicts and related U.S. interests.do.....	0		
Do.....	Preliminary analysis of potential U.S. interests in concepts of international peacekeeping.	Hudson Institute.....	0		
Implications for U.S. policy of a developing trend for greater stability and tranquility among the older nations.	Analysis of an apparent developing trend toward stability, reasons for this stability, issues likely to arise in areas outside the "zone of tranquility," and effects on U.S. security prospects.do.....	0		
Communist organization and operations study.....	An attempt to isolate factors affecting cohesion or disintegration within the Vietcong movement.	Rand.....	0		
The Soviet military organizational behavior.....	Exploratory research in the decision-making behavior of the Soviet military establishment.do.....	0		
Alternative strategies for insurgent conflicts.....	Studies problem of developing U.S. policy alternatives which might reduce budgetary and human costs.do.....	\$75,000		
Independent nuclear capabilities.....	Research on international ramifications of nuclear proliferation and political and technical measures that might assist in controlling proliferation.do.....	25,000		
NATO's southeast flank.....	An examination of the relationship between U.S. military aid programs and bilateral negotiations on U.S. base rights.do.....	10,000		
Country planning, programming, and budgeting system.	Research in possibilities of developing and improving capabilities within the U.S. Government for "program packaging" of U.S. military and economic assistance.do.....	0		
Asian security issues.....	An attempt to formulate and assess a number of different U.S. policies in various international environments and in various military contingencies.do.....	435,000		\$350,000
Insurgent forces.....	Development and analysis of certain U.S. experiences in Vietnam, aiming at generalization applicable to future U.S. policymaking.do.....	100,000		110,000
European security issues.....	An examination of a range of alternative security arrangements and the role of the U.S. presence in Europe.do.....	200,000		200,000
Latin America.....	Analysis of Latin America military institutions and the various environments conditioning their domestic roles and foreign relationships.do.....	40,000		50,000
Command and control problems for the national command authority.	A study of information and control facilities, systems and procedures required for management of crises and control of conflicts.do.....	50,000		50,000
Capabilities and interests study.....	An examination of U.S. interests, commitments, and capabilities required to meet future contingencies that threaten those interests.do.....	100,000		150,000
Cost methods and factors.....	A project aimed at establishing a comprehensive data base and appropriate costing methods to support studies involving the military forces of foreign countries.do.....	50,000		75,000
Special country and area studies.....	Examination of political, economic, and military policies in various regions and the implications for U.S. security policy.do.....			50,000
Project management, project formulation, and special requests.	Rand management of ISA-sponsored research, formulation, and exploration of research relevant to ISA interests, and special studies that may be requested on short notice.do.....	100,000	\$15,000	165,000
Eastern Europe.....	A series of studies on political, economic, and military trends in Europe, including security arrangements.	IDA.....	205,000		225,000
Communist China.....	A broad effort to correlate and evaluate data on Communist China's political, economic, and military objectives and to determine the foreign policy implications for the United States.	IDA.....	205,000		225,000
Exploratory research.....	Funds set aside for the formulation of new studies which may be relevant to ISA requirements.	IDA.....	40,000		50,000
An analytical summary of U.S. security for educational and research purposes.	An examination of various U.S. national security issues and their relationships.	Hudson Institute.....	10,000		10,000
Resource allocations and models for RVN Navy/AF and comparable forces.	To estimate historical total allocations and to determine implications of alternative RVN force structures and comparable forces.	Research Analysis Corp.....		60,000	0
Arms control studies.....	Studies are formulated in response to estimates of potential problems, including nuclear proliferation, regional arms control considerations, international peacekeeping, defense options under alternative "freezes" on strategic weapons, and arms control on seabeds.	Undetermined.....		100,000	300,000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH PROJECTS USING INFORMATION ABOUT FOREIGN AREAS—Continued

SPONSOR: OASD/ISA—Continued

[Note: Information concerning 20 Projects, including all Projects sponsored by ARPA/AGILE, are classified and not included in this listing]

Project title	Project description	Contractor/investigator	Previously initiated, underway in fiscal year 1969	Initial funding in fiscal year 1969	Planned for fiscal year 1970
Projects being planned.....	Studies will be developed to support ISA's ad hoc planning requirements.	Undetermined.....		\$130,000	\$140,000
Total.....				\$1,645,000	305,000
					2,150,000

Note: Dashes (.....) indicate not applicable or that project is completed; 0 indicates project is continuing, although funding is completed.

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

ARGENTINA

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
N	Universidad de Buenos Aires.....	Development of Effective Protective and Therapeutic Drugs for Radiation Sickness.	\$25.0	May 1969.....	N00014-68C-0313
F	Consejo Nacional de Invest. Cient.....	X-ray Spectrometry of Galactic Sources from So. Hemisphere.....	24.0	April 1970.....	AFOSR-1592-68
F	Universidad Nacional De Cordoba.....	Dehydroaromatic Studies.....	8.5	November 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1425-68
F	Consejo Nacional De Investigaciones.....	Kinetics and Mechanisms of Reaction and Fluorine Chemicals.....	66.0	March 1970.....	AF-AFOSR-1446-68
F	Observatorio De Fisica Cosmica, San Miguel.....	Solar Radio Bursts in 40 to 80 MH Range.....	0	April 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1574-68
F	National U of LaPlata.....	Research in Stellar Spectroscopy.....	37.0	April 1970.....	AF-AFOSR-1114-66
F	Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Cientificas y Tecnicas.....	Ultrastructure and Function in Catecholamine Containing Systems..	65.0	June 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-0963 67A
F	Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones.....	Molecular Mechanisms of Steroids Action on Respiratory Systems..	16.0	October 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-68-1395

AUSTRALIA

A	Monash University.....	Microbiological and Immunological Studies of Pathogenesis and Virulence in Leptospirosis.	\$44.0	March 1971.....	DADA17-68-G9260.
A	Adelaide University.....	Water and Electrolyte Economy of Desert Aborigines and Indigenous New Guineans.	16.0	do.....	DA MD 49 193 67-G923.
A	University of Queensland.....	Vertical and Oblique Incidence Phase Idonosomes.....	36.0	December 1970.....	DAHC 19-69-G 0012.
A	University of Melbourne.....	Nuclear Spectroscopy Measurements with Melbourne Batatron.....	37.9	April 1969.....	DAHC19-68-G-0024.
A	University of Western Australia.....	Energy Spectra of Low Energy Electrons Scattered by Solids.....	10.7	do.....	DA ARO-49-092-65-G0080.
N	University of Queensland.....	Nature and Pharmacological Action in Toxin from Deadly Jellyfish.	26.0	December 1969.....	N00014-57-C-0408.
F	University of Adelaide, Adelaide.....	Atomic and Molecular Photodisintegration.....	42.0	April 1970.....	AF-AFOSR-1568-68.
F	University of Sydney.....	Study of Cosmic Radiations at Extremely High Energy.....	378.3	September 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1486-68.
F	University of Western Australia, Nedlands.....	Solid Non-Stoichiometric Oxide Phases Inner and Outer Transition Metals.	76.5	February 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-0853-67.
F	University of Queensland, Brisbane.....	Charge and Energy Transfer in Organic Systems.....	20.8	May 1970.....	AF-AFOSR-1561-68.
F	University of Sydney.....	Numerical Studies in Gas Dynamics.....	56.5	April 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-0915-67A
F	University of Melbourne.....	Study of Ionospheric Irregularities in the Southern Hemisphere.....	0	July 1969.....	AF-AFOSR 0679-64.
F	University of Adelaide.....	Research Directed Toward Propagation of Star Particles.....	52.2	February 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1183-67.
F	University of Sydney.....	Stellar Intensity Interferometer.....	342.0	March 1970.....	AF-AFOSR-1560-68.

AUSTRIA

A	University of Innsbruck.....	Advanced Methods in Differential Equations Using Lie Series Methods.	\$11.6	June 1969.....	DAJA37-68-C-1199
A	Technische Hochschule Graz.....	Low Frequency Loop Antenna Arrays.....	12.4	do.....	DAJA37-68-C-0893
A	Institute of Hygiene, University of Vienna.....	Epidemiology, Virology and Immunology of Tick-Bourne Encephalitis and other Tick-Bourne Diseases.	15	do.....	DAJA37-68-C-1422
F	Austrian Atomic Energy Study Group.....	Atomic Vibration in Stressed Crystal Lattices.....	85.885	September 1969.....	F61052-69-C-0006
F	University of Vienna.....	Dynamics of Liquids.....	36.4	October 1969.....	F61052-68-
F	Technische Hochschule.....	Discretization Methods for Differential Equations.....	30.68	June 1969.....	AF61-052-960
F	Do.....	Stochastic Thermal Stress.....	24.58	April 1969.....	F61052-67-C-0015
F	Technische Hochschule, Vienna.....	Investigation of Transition Metal Rare Earth Alloys.....	57	March 1969.....	F61052-68-C-0016
F	Innsbruck University.....	Plasma Instabilities.....	49.5	December 1969.....	F61052-67-C-0014
F	University of Vienna.....	Composition and Content of Meteorites.....	34	February 1970.....	F61052-68-C-0040
F	Innsbruck University.....	Theoretical and Experimental Studies of Propagation and Attenuation of VLF Waves in Solid Media.	37	January 1969.....	AF61-052-00902

BELGIUM

A	Von Karman Institute.....	Flow Characteristics Associated with V/STOL Model Testing in Wind Tunnel.	\$27.2	October 1969.....	DAJA37-68-C-0352
N	University of Belgium.....	Neural Mechanisms Involved in the Processing of Visual and Auditory Information.	72.0	August 1969.....	N62558-4554
F	University Libre de Bruxelles.....	Non-equilibrium Statistical Mechanics.....	259.1	January 1969.....	AF-EOAR-0025-67
F	University Catholique de Louvain.....	Ions Produced by Chemically Reacting Systems.....	82.5	April 1969.....	AF-EOAR-0053-67
F	University of Liege.....	Hyperbolic and Elliptic Partial Differential Equations.....	9.3	March 1969.....	AF-61-052-918
F	Von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics Rhode Saint/Genese.....	The Influence of Cross Flow on Two Dimensional Separation.....	26.0	April 1970.....	AF-EOAR-26-68
F	Do.....	Application of the Blunt-Trailing Edge Blade Concept.....	70.2	March 1969.....	F61-052-67-C-0018
F	Do.....	Laminar Separation in Hypersonic Flows.....	114.2	September 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-003-68
F	Do.....	Low Density High Temperature Gas Dynamics.....	112.9	October 1969.....	AF-EOAR-55-69
F	University Catholique de Louvain.....	Experimental and Theoretical Study of Dombustion.....	42.5	September 1969.....	AF-EOAR-42-69
F	Von Karman Institute Fluid Waterloohrhode-St Genese.....	Experimental Aerodynamics.....	140.0	August 1969.....	AF-EOAR-0029-68
F	University of Liege.....	High Resolution Atmospheric IR Absorption and Sky Background Emission Interferometric Studies.	95.0	July 1969.....	AF-61-052-00955.
F	Born-Bunge Foundation.....	Development of Sleep Patterns.....	9.0	December 1969.....	F61052-67-C-0066
F	University of Liege.....	Atmospheric Effects on Optical/Infrared Radiation and Celestial Spectra.	30.0	July 1970.....	F1052-69-C-0014
F	Do.....	Upper and Lower Bounds to Structural Deformations of Dual Analysis.	10.0	October 1970.....	F61052-C-0004

See footnote at end of table.

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969—Continued

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

BERMUDA

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
N	Bermuda Biological Station	Productivity of the Tropical Atlantic	\$29	May 1969	N00014-67A-0432-0001

BOLIVIA

D	Colegio San Calixto	Spectral Characteristics of Infrasonic Acoustic Waves and Relat. Seismic Research.	\$107	September 1970	ATOSR-68-1614
F	San Andres University	Cosmic Ray Research at High Altitude	14	August 1969	AF-AFOSR-1643-69

BRAZIL

A	Universidade de Sao Paulo	Control of Ribonucleic Acid Synthesis in Giant Chromosomes	\$52.8	April 1969	DAHC19-68-G-0007
A	Minas Gerais Universidad	Schistosomiasis Drug Screening	36	May 1969	DAHC19-67-G0038
A	Federal Universidad de Bahia	Pathogenesis of Diarrhea in Severe Strongyloidiasis	13.3	April 1969	DAHC19-68-G0023
A	Instituto de Fisica URGS, Universidade do Rio Grande do Sul	Application of Methods Common to Elementary Particles Physics and Many-Body Problems	67.5	November 1969	DAHC19-69-G-0005
A	Universidade Mackenzie	VLF Atmospheric Studies LA60	24.321	February 1970	69-G-004
A	do	Solar Microwave Radio Emission LA61	40.84	do	69-G-003
A	Inst. Adolfo Lutz	Arbours Studies in Sao Paulo, Brazil	37.7	January 1969	DAHC19-68-G-0011
N	Universidade de Sao Paulo	Mathematical Investigations of Problems of Ocean Surveillance of Navigation	39	May 1969	N00014-67-C-0347
F	Comissao Nacional De Actividades Espac, J Dos Campos	Measurements of the Earth's Total Magnetic Field and Its Variations	7	June 1970	AF-AFOSR-0654-67
F	Universidade de Sao Paulo	Deuteron and Proton Reactions at 3.5M Electron Volts	98.3	April 1969	AF-AFOSR-0310-67A
F	Universidade Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre	Interaction of Atomic Nuclei with Their Environment by Nuclear Techniques	41	March 1970	AF-AFOSR-1280-67
F	Comissao Nacional De Actividades Espacia, J Dos Campos	Experimental Res. on Characteristic of Ionospheric D Layer	0	June 1970	AF-AFOSR-1019-66
F	Fundacao Servico Especial de Saude Publica	Epidemiological Studies of Amapari Virus	16	December 1969	AF-AFOSR-1430-68A

CANADA

A	York University	Kinetics of Atmospheric Constituents	\$52.5	April 1970	DA-AROD-31-124-G868
A	McGill University	Extremely Low Frequency Electromagnetic Phenomena	35.8	March 1969	DA AROD-31-124G1000
A	Canadian Commercial Corp.	Meteorological R.D.T. & E. Rocket	296	do	DA-AH01-68-C-0022
A	Royal Victoria Hospital	Investigation of Pathogenesis and Treatment of Shock	75	April 1969	PA49-193-G-9248
A	University of Manitoba	Study of Factors Influencing the Passage of Drugs into the Malarial Parasite Plasmodium Berghri.	20	February 1969	DAPA17-68-G-9257
N	McGill University	Electric Properties of Ice	51	March 1969	NONR 4417(00)
N	do	Arctic Plankton Ecology	82	April 1969	N00014-66-C-0233
N	do	HF Audio Absorption in Ice	74	March 1969	NLNR 4915(00)
N	do	Energy Budget and Other Tropical Microclimatological Research	19	February 1969	N00014-68-C-0307
N	Computing Devices of Canada	Automatic Detection and Classification	545	June 1969	N62269-68-C-0291
A	Manitoba University	Investigations of Pheromones as Chemosterilants for Insects with special reference to Synthetic Queen Substance and its Analogues	59.2	August 1969	DADA 17-68-G-9267
N	Institute of Oceanography	Systematics Biology and Hydrographic Relations of Some Species of Calanus	59	February 1969	NONR4458(00)
N	British Columbia Research Council	Marine Borer Biology	25	March 1969	NONR4505(00)
N	McGill University	Assessment of Military Performance Enhancement by Drugs	139	June 1969	NONR4896(00)
N	York University	Brain Nucleic Acid Changes During Learning	101	September 1969	NONR4935(00)
N	McGill University	Mechanisms of Polymer Degradation	26	May 1970	N00014-68-C 0237
N	do	High Magnetic Fields and Insulators	112	August 1969	NONR 3013(00)
N	Queen's University	Conference on the Structure of Density Matrices and Their Application to energy and Order Effects Problems in matter	10	February 1969	N00014-67-C-0388
N	University of Toronto	Very-High-Altitude Missile and Decoy Gas Dynamics; Missile Aerodynamics for Broad Altitude Ranges	161	August 1969	NONR4073(00)
N	University of British Columbia	Fundamental Air-Sea Exchange Processes and Their Relation to Wind Wave Generation: Oceanic Turbulence	165	October 1969	N00014-66-C 0047
F	University of Western Ontario	Dual-Cavity Microwave Refractometer Study	30	October 1969	F19628-68-C-0128
F	University of Saskatchewan	Conduct Research on the Aurora and Airglow	15	December 1969	F19628-69-C-0106
F	University of Alberta	Lattice Inves. of Critical Phase Transition Temperatures	60	June 1970	AF-AFOSR-1310-67
F	Queens University	Res. Seminar on Reduced Density Matrices	21.1	May 1969	AF-AFOSR-1601-68
F	University of Western Ontario	Some Thermochemical Studies by Mass Spectroscopy	34.9	August 1969	AF-AFOSR-1356-68
F	McMaster University	Inorganic Nuclear-Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy	117.6	March 1970	AF-AFOSR-1567-68
F	University of British Columbia	Chemical Reactions in Frozen Solutions	68.5	February 1970	AF-AFOSR-1102-66A
F	University of Toronto	The Numerical Integration of Ordinary Differential Equations	46.36	September 1969	AF-AFOSR-1357-68
F	do	Research on Dynamics of Flight Vehicles	26.1	December 1969	AF-AFOSR-1490-68A
F	do	Spectral Problems for Elliptic Operators	77.78	May 1969	AF-AFOSR-1531-68
F	University of British Columbia	Ellipsometric Studies of Plasma Anodization	30	September 1969	F33615-68-C-1074
F	Canadian Commercial Corp., Washington, D.C.	Research on Excitation Transfer Cross Section	30	May 1969	F33615-68-C-1511
F	do	Correlation of Plasma Analysis Technique	54	August 1969	F33615-68-C-1019
F	University of Toronto	Research on Hypervelocity Launchers	294	do	AF-32-615-05313
F	do	Aerodynamically Generated Sound	101.8	December 1969	AF-AFOSR-0672-67A
F	do	Symposium on Aerodynamic Noise	4	October 1969	AF-AFOSR-1423-68
F	do	Seventh International Shock Tube Symposium	15	January 1970	AF-AFOSR-1550-68
F	do	Aerophysical Investigation at Hypervelocities	119.1	March 1970	AF-AFOSR-1368-68
F	do	Kinetics of Atomic Associated Reactions Using Flash Photolysis over a Wide Temperature Range	76.2	October 1969	AF-AFOSR-1695-69
F	do	Molecular Interactions and Crystal Structures at Low Temperatures	68.7	January 1970	AF-AFOSR-1549-68
F	do	Transfer of Mass Momentum and Energy in Free Molecule Systems	129.9	January 1969	AF-AFOSR-1481-68
F	University of Toronto	Plasma Dynamics and Magnetohydrodynamics	97.2	February 1969	AF-AFOSR-1552-68
F	McGill University, Montreal	Formation and Propagation Mechanisms of Diverging Detonation Waves	23	do	AF-AFOSR-1290-67
F	University of Waterloo, Ontario	Fundamental Processes in Solid Propellant Ignition	32	February 1970	AF-AFOSR-1274-67
F	University of Toronto	Selective Excitation Spectroscopic Diagnostics	83.7	July 1970	AF-AFOSR-1608-68
F	McGill University	Study of Cloud and Precipitation Physics Utilizing Radar Techniques	0	November 1969	F19628-69-C-0107
F	University of Toronto	Infrared Chemiluminescence Studies	40	March 1970	F19628-68-C-0271
F	Laval University	Neurohumoral Control of Thyrotrophic Activity	103	September 1969	AF-AFOSR-1627-69
F	Barringer Research, Ltd.	Remote Vapor Detection	64	July 1969	AF33(615-68-C-1101)
F	Canadian Commercial Corp.	Electro-Optic Crystals for Displays	75	do	F30602-68-C-007
D	McGill University	Psychological Processes of the Central Nervous System	700.8	June 1971	DAHC15-68-C0396
D	University of Windsor	Collisional and Radiation Processes in Atoms and Molecules	66	August 1969	N0001467-C0538
D	Canadian Armament Research and Development Est.	Hypervelocity Research Program	4,642	December 1969	DA01021AMC-14468Z
D	RCA Victor, Ltd.	Radar Backscatter Studies	195	November 1969	F0469567C0158
D	University of Toronto	Raman Spectra	111.1	May 1969	Nonr 5012(00)

See footnote at end of table.

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969—Continued

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

CEYLON

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
A	Medical Research Institute.....	Leptospirosis—A Serological Survey of Occupational Groups in Ceylon.	\$0.6	July 1969.....	PA-CRD-AFE S92-544-68-G117

CHILE

A	Comision Nacional de Investigacion.....	Structure Function Relationships in Human and High Elevation Adapted Mammal Hemoglobin.	\$20.85	April 1969.....	DAH919-68 G0022.
F	National Comm. for Science and Tech.....	Growth and Structure of Single Crystal Films.....	74.795	June 1970.....	AF-AFOSR-1475-68.
F	Universidad de Chile.....	Study of Cyclopropane Derivatives Containing Fluorine.....	21	October 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-892-65A.
F	do.....	Form and Function Invariants in the Visual System.....	21	May 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1043-67B.
F	Catholic University of Chile.....	Nervous Connections in the Vestibular System.....	16	August 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1361-68.
F	Catholic University of Chile.....	Studies in Synaptic Mechanisms.....	75	December 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1559-68A.
F	Comision Nacional de Investigacion Cientifica y Technologica.	Biochemical Properties of Nerve Membranes.....	54	June 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1610-68.

COLOMBIA

F	Universidad Nacional de Colombia.....	Studies of Ecology and Disease Transmission.....	\$12	May 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1418-68.
F	Universidad del Valle.....	Disease Ecology of Tacaribe Group Viruses.....	33	April 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1558-68.

COSTA RICA

A	University of Costa Rica.....	Physiological Studies of Leishmania.....	\$7.4	February 1969.....	DADA 17-68-G-9254.
---	-------------------------------	--	-------	--------------------	--------------------

DENMARK

N	Marine Biological Laboratory.....	Ecological Investigations on Bottom Living Marine Animals.....	\$12.0	April 1969.....	F61052-67C-0089.
F	Danske Meteorologiske Inst.....	Ionospheric Research Using Active Satellite Transmissions.....	28.0	February 1969.....	AF61-052-828.
F	do.....	Arctic Geomagnetic Observations.....	5.5	March 1969.....	AF61-052-00935.
F	Technical University of Denmark.....	Material Properties at High Strain Rates.....	18.0	do.....	F61052-68-C-0032.
F	do.....	Conduct Theoretical and Experimental Studies of Backfire Antennas.....	31.0	December 1969.....	F61052-67-C-0056.

EGYPT

F	American University of Cairo.....	Semiconducting Properties in Glasses.....	\$13.904	January 1969.....	F61052-67-C-0050
---	-----------------------------------	---	----------	-------------------	------------------

EQUADOR

F	Universidad Central del Ecuador.....	Studies of Psychotomimetics.....	\$29	March 1969.....	AF-AFOSR-1436-68A
---	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------	-----------------	-------------------

FINLAND

F	Technical University of Helsinki.....	Magnetic and Quadrupole Interaction Parameters in Metals.....	\$53	December 1969.....	AF61-052-00956
F	Institute of Occupational Health.....	Mathematical and Electrical Analogues of Heat Transfer in Man.....	73	do.....	AF61-052-00936

FRANCE

A	Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes-Sorbonne.....	Metabolic and Sensory Stimuli in the Regulation of Food Intake—Behavioral and Electrophysiological Study.	\$37.4	December 69.....	DAJA37-69-C-0358
A	Institute for Cell Pathology.....	Laser Action on Living Cells.....	18.2	June 69.....	DAJA37-68-C-0929
A	Institute of Theoretical and Applied Optics.....	Influence of Defects in Thin Metallic Films on Their Optical and Electrical Properties.	26.8	do.....	DAJA37-68-C-1421
A	University of Montpellier.....	Certain Problems in Harmonic Analysis.....	10.1	September 69.....	DAJA37-69-C-0246
N	Centre National D'Etudes des Telecommunication.....	A New Solid-State Amplifier.....	80.0	do.....	F61062-68-0056
N	Campagne de Recherches et d'Etudes Aeronautiques.....	Rheo-Electrical Apology: Supercavitating Propeller Design.....	6	January 69.....	F61052-68-0074
F	University de Paris a la Sorbonne.....	Ionospheric Studies Using Active Satellite Transmissions.....	4.0	March 69.....	F61052-68-C-0055
F	Groupement Pour L'Avancement des Methode, Paris.	Measurement of Infrared Spectra of Materials.....	15	October 69.....	AF-61-052-957
F	Universite de Paris a la Sorbonne.....	Band Structure Relations in II-VI Compounds.....	25	September 69.....	AF-E0AR-0016-68
F	University d'Air-Marseille.....	Statistical Investigations of Turbulent Gases.....	67	December 69.....	F61052-67-C-0025
F	Observatoire de Paris.....	Research Directed Toward the Improvement of Planetary Photogrammetry.	37.0	June 69.....	F61052-68-C-0001
F	Naturalia et Biologia.....	Nervous Process Underlying Behavior and Learning.....	50.0	April 1969.....	AF-E0AR-0028-68.
F	University of Lyon.....	Neurophysiological Mechanisms of the States of Sleep.....	45.0	August 1969.....	AF-E0AR-0039-68.
F	Salpetriere Hospital, Inst for Med El Bio Eng, Paris.	Monitoring of Cerebral and Cardiovascular Events.....	9.2	October 1969.....	AF-E0AR-0038-68.

GERMANY

A	Institut for Animal Physiology, J. W. Goethe Universität.	Microcirculatory Behavior in Shock.....	\$0.6	July 1969.....	DAJA37-68-C-0947
A	Universität of Saarland.....	Pressure Broadening of Spectral Lines.....	2.0	do.....	DAJA37-68-C-0972
A	Rheinisch-Westfälische Technical Institut.....	Process for Ultrasonic Image Conversion.....	54.3	February 1969.....	DAJA37-68-C-0668
A	Free Universität of Berlin.....	Daily Analysis of Circumpolar 30 and 10 mb Maps E486.....	128.7	December 1969.....	DA-91-591-EUC-1104
A	German Meteorological Service.....	Special Radiosonde Program E-1093.....	4.4	January 1969.....	DAJA37-67-C-0317
A	Res. Office for Physical Bioclimatology.....	Atmospheric Aerosols Between 700 and 3,000 Meters E-1127.....	28.9	May 1969.....	DA-91-591-EUC-0331
A	Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule.....	Measurement of Thoron Concentration of Lower Atmosphere.....	28.467	April 1969.....	DAJA37-67-C-0967
A	Universität of Bonn.....	Tropical Meteorology in Various Equatorial Regions.....	48.9	March 1969.....	DA-91-591-EUC-3639
F	Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany.	Development of Subnanosecond Light Source and Measuring Devices.....	22.5	January 1969.....	F61052-68-C-0039
F	Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz, Germany.....	Research in the Atmospheric Transmission of Optical Radiation.....	52.0	December 1969.....	F61052-69-C-0016
F	Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany.	Theoretical and Experimental Investigation of 0-20cps EM Noise.....	36.2	do.....	AF-61-052-00836
F	Max Planck Institut Fur Kernphysik, Heidelberg.....	Dust Distribution Studies Using Simultaneous Measurements.....	4.0	October 1969.....	F61052-67-C-0060

See footnote at end of table.

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969—Continued

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

GERMANY—Continued

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
F	Bochum Radio Observatory	Ionospheric Studies Using Active Synchronous Satellite Transmissions.	\$7	April 1969	F61052-68-C-0054
F	Universitat Zu Gottingen	Investigation of Chemical Reactions in Shock Waves and Detonations.	39	February 1970	AF-61-052-00946
F	Univ. of Heidelberg	Research on Sulfur-Phosphorous-Nitrogen Polymers.	41	June 1969	AF-61-052-00682
F	Univ. of Saarlandes, Saarbrucken	Influence of Various Elements on Mechanical Properties of Iron.	36	March 1969	AF-61-052-00-632
F	Technische Hochschule, Munchen	Transport Properties in High Power Arcs	67	September 1969	F61052-67-C-0081
F	Universitat Zu Gottingen	Influence of Temperature on the Initiation and Stability of Detonations.	10	May 1969	AF-EOAR-0049-67
F	Technische Hochschule, Munchen, Munich	Investigation of Spectral Radiation Properties of Atmosphere and Earth.	20	April 1969	F61052-68-C-0026
F	Universitat Hamburg	Research on Galactic Nebulae Employing Liquid Dye Filters with Narrow Press Bands.	5	May 1970	F61052-68-C-0058
F	Technische Hochschule, Munich	Brittle Materials under Linear Temperature Increase	43	May 1969	AF-61-052-875

GHANA

F	University of Ghana, Accra	Ionospheric Studies Using Active Satellite Transmissions	\$10	February 1969	F61052-67-C-0027
---	----------------------------	--	------	---------------	------------------

GREECE

F	National Observatory of Athens	Provide Personnel to Assist in the Repair and Maintenance of the Razdow Telescope.	\$14.0	March 1969	F61052-67-C-0041
F	University of Athens	Ionospheric Research Using Active Satellite Transmissions	10.0	February 1969	F61052-68-C-0038
F	do	Ionospheric Studies Using Active Satellite Transmissions	33.0	do	AF61-052-00754
F	University of Thessaloniki	Research in the Restricted Three Body Problems	21.6	April 1969	AF61-052-952
D	Seismological Institute of Athens University	Aftershocks and Crustal Structure in Greece	145.0	May 1969	AF49(638)-803

ICELAND

N	Surtsey Research Society	Ecological Succession of Biota on a Newly Formed Oceanic Land Mass.	\$50.0	May 1969	F61052-67C-0087
---	--------------------------	---	--------	----------	-----------------

INDIA

A	Bombay National History Society	Studies of the Bionomics and Taxonomy of the Birds of India, Taxonomy of the Birds of Bhutan.	\$11.0	September 1969	DA CRD AFE S92-544-69-G-137
F	University of Calcutta	Radio, Astronomical and Satellite Studies of the Ionosphere	15.0	do	F61052-68-C-008
F	University of Delhi	Role of Cardiac and Pulmonary Baroreceptors in the Control of Circulations.	22.0	June 1971	AF-EOAR-0037-68

INDONESIA

A	Lembaga Biologi Nasional	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey (Indonesia) Avian Studies in Indonesia.	\$8.3	June 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G136
---	--------------------------	--	-------	-----------	----------------------------

IRAN

D	Pahlavi University	Nutritional Studies—Iran	\$70	July 1969	PH 436718
---	--------------------	--------------------------	------	-----------	-----------

ISRAEL

A	Hebrew University	Comparison of the Antigenic Structures of Human Malarias	\$50.7	April 1969	DAJA37-67-C-0647.
A	Israel Institute of Applied Social Research	Investigation of Leadership Qualities of Kibbutz-Raised Young Men.	50	February 1969	DAJA37-680C-3765A.
A	Hebrew University	Investigations of Electronic Processing in Large-Gap Semi-Conductors and Molecular.	57.6	May 1969	DAJA37-68-C-1170.
A	Negev Institute for Arid Research	Primary Investigation of Pure Deviatoric Loading of Soil E-1276	29.3	do	DAJA 37-67-C-1147.
A	Hebrew University	Investigations in Harmonic Analysis	15	October 1969	DAJA 37-69-3-0438.
A	Rogoff-Wellcome Medical Research Institute	Isolation of Snake Venom Toxins and Study of Their Mechanism of Action.	20.1	November 1969	DAJA 37-69-C-0252.
A	Technion Institute of Technology	Photochemistry of Antimalarial Drugs	26.2	December 1969	DAJA-37-69-C-0369.
N	Institute of Technology Technion-Israel	Cross-stresses in the Flow of Gases (Reiner-Effekt)	24	March 1969	F61052-67-C-0037.
N	Hebrew University	Basic Theories for Non-Numerical Data Processing	40	February 1969	F61052-67-C-0055.
F	do	Effects of Heat Sources on Planetary Circulation	20	July 1969	ZF-EOAR-0046-67.
F	do	Plasma Propagation in Magnetic Field	51	January 1970	AF61(052)-00891.
F	Weizmann Institute of Science	Magnetically Ordered Materials	151	December 1970	F61052-67-C-0040.
F	Hebrew University	Measurements of Reactions to Stress	58	July 1969	AF-61(052)-839.
F	do	Innovation, Social Change, and Institutionalization	72	April 1969	AF-EOAR-67-23.
F	Soreq Nuclear Research Center	Hydrogen Behavior in Metals Using Nuclear Magnetic Resonance	49	November 1969	61-052-904.
F	National Comm. for Space Research	Ionospheric Research Using Satellites	41	January 1969	AF61-052-00837
F	Weizmann Institute of Science	Symmetries of Subnuclear Matter	45.2	November 1970	F61052-68-C-0070
F	Tel Aviv University	Algebraic Approach to Elementary Particle Dyn.	113.8	March 1970	AF-EOAR-0010-68
F	Weizmann Institute of Science	Mechanism of Nitrogen Fixation by Ultrasonic Radiation in Water	56.9	May 1990	AF-EOAR-0024-67
F	Hebrew University, Jerusalem	Computer Simulation of Natural Pattern Generation Processes	17.28	May 1969	AF-EOAR-0045-67
F	do	Contributions to an Understanding of the Language Communication.	15.0	do	F61052-68-C-0036
F	Technion R. & D. Foundation, Ltd.	Viscoelastic and Dynamic Behavior of Polymeric Materials	50	December 1969	F61052-68-C-0015
F	Soreq Res. Est. Yavne	Magnetic Ferroelectric Crystals	35	do	F61052-67-C-0051
F	Tech R. & D. Federation Ltd, Haifa	Wake Structure Behind Two and Three Dimensional Bodies	43.7	September 1969	F61052-69-C-0020
F	do	Buckling of Shells Under Combined Loading and Thermal Stresses	127.2	February 1969	AF-61-052-00905
F	do	Dynamic Inelastic Behavior of Materials	69.5	May 1969	AF-61-052-00951
F	Hebrew University, Jerusalem	Optical and Microwave Measurements Behind Shock Waves	106	October 1969	F61052-68-C-0037
F	Technion R. & D. Foundation, Ltd., Haifa	Quantitative High Temp Infrared Spectroscopy	106	August 1969	AF-EOAR-0053-69
F	Tel Aviv University, Ramat-Aviv	Non-Continuous Magnetofluidynamic Flows	91	April 1969	F61052-68-C-0045
D	Weizmann Institute of Science	Seismic Source Identification Techniques	60	October 1969	AF61(052)-954
F	Technion R. & D. Foundation, Ltd.	Electrical Properties of Transition Metal Oxides	56	September 1969	AF-61-052-00825
F	Tel-Aviv University, Ramat-Aviv	Wall Turbulence	4	do	F61052-69-C-0018

See footnote at end of table.

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969—Continued

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

ITALY

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
A	Pharmacological Research Institute	Pharmacological and Biochemical Changes in Animals Made Aggressive by Isolation.	\$44.7	April 1969	DAJA37-68-C-1076
A	University of Genoa	Immunological Reactions in Viral Hepatitis.	42.0	do	DAJA37-68-C-0621
A	Chemical Institute of University of Rome	Individual Activity Coefficients of Ionic Species.	21.6	August 1969	DAJA37-68-C-1229
A	University of Trieste	Statistical Analysis of Oscillating Vectors E-757	23.0	January 1969	DA91591EUC 3960
F	University Degli Studi di Pisa	Comparative Neurophysiology of Vision.	45.0	September 1969	F61052-68-C-0002
F	University of Ferrara	Research on Mechanics of Breathing.	10.0	March 1969	F61052-67-C-0053
F	National Institute of Optics	Problems in Visual Performance of Pilots.	11.0	do	F60152-67-C-0057
F	University of Milan	Local Modes and Resonance Scattering in Crystal.	63.0	September 1970	AF-EOAR-0041-69
F	National Electro Tech Institute, Turin	Inorganic Crystalline Luminescence.	156.0	July 1969	AF-EOAR-0007-68
F	University of Rome	Structure of Fundamental Interactions.	29.2	May 1969	F61052-67-C-0084
F	Universita Degli Studi di Torino	Theoretical Investigations in Quantum Field Theory and Elementary Particle Physics.	96.0	December 1969	AF-EOAR-0015-68
F	Universita Degli Studi di Roma	Functional Analysis and Integral Equations Continuous Operators.	14.0	January 1969	AF-EOAR-0020-68
F	Universita Degli Studi di Pisa	Language for Automatic Programming Tools.	20.6	September 1969	F61052-67-C-0097
F	University Degli Studi di Roma	Mass Spectrometry of Refractory Materials at High Temperatures.	102.0	April 1969	F61052-68-C-0033
F	Politecnico di Torino	Research on Rarefied Gas Dynamics Hypersonic and Rotating Stall.	37.0	January 1970	AF-EOAR-0049-68
F	University Degli Studi di Naples	Non-Equilibrium Transonic Flows.	81.6	November 1969	AF-61-(052)-68-C-0035
F	Applicazioni Ricerche Scientifiche Milan	Rarefied Gas Dynamics.	41.2	July 1969	AF-61(052)-68-C-0020
F	University of Milan	Neutron Flux of Earth's Radiation Environment.	10.0	April 1969	F61052-68-C-0050
F	University of Sassari	Identification of Photodynamic Systems in the Retina.	3.0	June 1969	F61052-68-C-0073
F	Arcetri Astrophysical Observatory	Solar Radio Spectroscopy and Detection of Sun Spectral Lines.	10.0	do	F61052-67-C-0042
F	University of Perugia	Chemical Reactions by Cross Beams Techniques.	10.0	September 1969	F61052-68-C-0068
F	University of Milan	Physiology of Cerebrospinal Fluid.	17.6	June 1969	F61052-68-C-0063

JAMAICA

N	University of West Indies, Kingston	The Ecology of Reef Building Organisms.	\$72.0	March 1969	NONR 4816(00)
F	University of West Indies	The Study of the Feasibility of Measuring Atmospheric Density by using a Laser Searchlight Technique.	15.6	June 1969	AF-AFOSR-0616-67
F	do	Ionospheric Studies using Active Satellite Transmissions.	12.0	December 1969	AF-AFOSR-1537-68

JAPAN

A	National Cancer Center Research Institute	Measurement of Human Complement Components in Dengue Shock Syndrome.	\$18.0	August 1969	DAJB19-69-C-0031.
A	Kyushu University	Taxonomical and Ecological Studies on Lung Fluke, Paragonimus in Pacific Area; with special ref. to S. E. Asia.	13.0	May 1969	DAJB17-67-C-0044
A	Institute of Microbial Chemistry	Microbial Drug Resistance (Genetics and Evolution of R Factor and Plasmids).	25.0	August 1969	DAJB17-69-C-0033
A	Nara Medical College	Polymeric Structure of Hemoglobin and Its Relation to Function.	6.6	October 1969	DACRD-AFE-S92-544-69-G141
A	do	Localization by Electron Microscopy of Several Phosphatase Activities.	5.7	September 1969	DACRD-AFE-S92-544-69-G139
A	Yodogawa Christian Hospital	Spirometric Investigation of Respiratory Illness in a Hospital Population.	0	February 1973	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G112
A	Kitasato University	Nature and Mode of Action of Local Antibody in Intestine.	7.4	February 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G116
A	Saski Institute	Investigation of Cell Component Structural Changes in Homologous Transplants Compared with Normal Cells.	6.6	do	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G106
A	Nara Medical College	Electron Microscope Studies on Several Phosphatase Activities in Neurons and Gliaocytes Infected with Japanese Encephalitis Virus.	3.5	do	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G115
A	Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research	Differences in Antigenic Specificity and Immunogenicity of Tissue Transplants.	6.0	April 1969	DA-AFE-S92-544-68-G11
A	Kitasato Institute	Cytochemical Studies on Ultrastructures of Toxoplasma Gondii and Allied Organisms.	12.9	October 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-69-G126
A	National Institute of Health	Mode of Infection of Scrub Typhus.	30.0	July 1969	DA-92-557-FEC-37463
A	do	Immunological Studies on Scrub Typhus and Its Control in Japan.	31.0	do	DA-92-557-FEC-37467
A	Kitasato Institute	Studies on Encephalitozoon (Nosema Cuniculi) Infection in Man.	19.3	January 1970	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-69-G147
A	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey.	146.0	June 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G133.
A	Kanazawa University	Neuronal Activities on the Regulation of Feeding.	41.6	September 1969	DA-AFE-S92-544-69-G140.
A	Atomic Disease Institute School of Medicine, Nagasaki University.	Mammalian and Human Pyruvate and Alpha-Ketoglutarate Dehydrogenation Complexes.	44.5	June 1969	DA-AFE-S92-544-68-G113.
A	Hokkaido University	Physiological Activity of the Brown Adipose Tissue.	12.0	January 1969	DA-AFE-S92-544-67-G87.
A	Kumamoto University	Biological Reactions to Cellular Antibodies with Special Reference to their Immuno-Pathological and Immuno-Chemical Properties.	19.0	July 1969	DAJB17-69-C-0032.
A	Kobe University	Mammalian Brain Function in Vitro.	27.4	September 1971	DA-CRD-AG-S92-544-67-G5.
A	Kumamoto University	Endogenous Mechanism of Vascular Response in Inflammation, with Special Reference to Biologic Significance of Specific Permeability Factors and Their Inhibitors Newly Isolated from Inflamed Sites.	25.0	October 1969	DAJB-17-69-C-0035.
A	Kurume University	Interaction Between Arbovirus and Myxovirus.	5.8	August 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-544-68-G127.
A	Shi-Ehime Preparatory, Japan	Life Cycle and Control of Paragonimus in Shikoku Area.	4.5	September 1969	DAJB17-69-C-0030.
F	Tokyo Medical and Dental University	Gamma-Aminobutyric Acid in Sensory Physiology.	9.0	December 1969	MIPR-004-67.
F	Kumamoto University	Neural Organization of Sensory Information for Taste.	14.0	March 1969	MIPR-68-0010.

KENYA

F	University College of Nairobi, Kenya	Ionospheric Studies of Radio Emissions.	\$20	October 1969	AF61-052-00909.
---	--------------------------------------	---	------	--------------	-----------------

KOREA

A	Seoul National University	Multiplication and Antibody Formation of Japanese Encephalitis Virus in Snakes.	\$13.0	May 1970	DA-CRD-AFE-S920544-67-G78
A	Kyung-HEB University	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey (Korea).	24.4	June 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G-131
A	Seoul National University	Ecological Survey and Mass Chemotherapy of Filariasis on Che Do, Korea.	15.7	August 1970	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G-120
A	Yonsei University	Virulence of Entamoeba Histolytica According to the Strains in Korea.	16.8	January 1972	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-69-G-143.
F	do	Metabolic Adaption to Cold.	18.0	May 1969	MIPR-0013-67

See footnote at end of table.

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969—Continued

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

LEBANON

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
F	American University of Beirut	Dynamical Behavior of the Exciton	\$29.9	May 1968	AF-EOAR-0037-66
F	do	Ecology of Tick-Borne Diseases	26.5	June 1969	F61052-68-C-0059
D	do	Factors Associated with Cultural Change	238.0	September 1969	S88fa-1099
D	do	English Language Training Research	61.5	March 1969	S88fa-1066
D	do	Determination of Normal Pulmonary Function in ME subject	77.0	July 1970	S88fa-1111

MALAYSIA

A	University of Malaya	Mosquitos of Malaysia	\$55	March 1969	DADA 17-68-G9266
A	do	Weathering of Rocks Under Humid Tropical Conditions	20	March 1970	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-69-G128

NETHERLANDS

A	International Training Center for Aerial Survey	Role of Image Quality of Photogrammetric Pointing Accuracy	\$16.8	December 1969	DAJA 37-69-C-0383
A	National Defense Research Organization	Gas and Aerosol Cloud Diffusion Studies	150.0	Indefinite	TN20MWP-A-62
N	Central Lab., T.N.O.	Mechanical Strength of Filled Elastomers of the Types Used as Solid Propellants in Rocket Motors	60.0	August 1969	F61052-67-C-0059
F	National Air and Space Lab.	Fatigue Crack Propagation Structural Fatigue Test	17.7	March 1969	61-052-7076
F	Radiobiological Institute of the Organization for Health Research	Anti-LymPhocyte Serum, Homologous Bone Marrow Transplantation and Irradiation	15.0	July 1969	F61052-67-C-0099

NEW ZEALAND

F	University of Canterbury	Interaction Effects in Solids	\$43.8	April 1970	AF-AFOSR-1275-67
F	Victoria University of Wellington	Use of Mossbauer Effect in Chemistry	14.5	March 1969	AF-AFOSR-1236-67
F	University of Canterbury	Gas Phase Reactions of Atoms, Radicals, and Simple Molecules	15.0	February 1969	AF-AFOSR-1265-67
F	University of Auckland	Chemistry of Radiation Protecting Agents	23.1	February 1970	AF-AFOSR-1417-68

NORWAY

A	Electroencephalographic Laboratory	Brain, Behavior, and Intracerebral Blood Flow	\$26.0	July 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0075
A	University of Oslo	Neuropsychological Studies of Mechanisms of Visual Discrimination	13.0	September 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0263
A	do	Photochemical Atmosphere Model Containing Oxygen and Hydrogen	10.2	August 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0011
A	Norwegian Defense Research Establishment	Gas and Aerosol Cloud Diffusion Studies	150.0	Indefinite	N08MWP-A-59
N	University of Bergen	Degradation of Marine Surfaces by Salt Requiring Bacteria	21.0	June 1970	F61052-67-C-0085
F	Norwegian Defense Research, Kjeller	Bulk Semiconductor Instabilities for Microwave Application	64.0	June 1969	61-052-683, 61-052-0048
F	Auroral Observatory	Ionospheric Studies Using Satellite Transmissions	32.0	October 1969	F61052-67-C-0020
F	University of Oslo	The Investigation of Variable Radio and Optical Solar Phenomena	39.0	January 1970	F61052-67-C-0070
F	University of Bergen	X-ray and Particle Radiations at High Altitudes in the Auroral Zone	53.0	March 1969	AF61-052-869
F	Central Institute for Industrial Research	Behavior of Superalloys at High Temperatures	70.0	January 1969	F61-052-0057
D	University of Bergen	Detection Seismology	82.0	January 1970	F61052-68-C-0019
D	Norwegian Defense Research Establishment	Norwegian Seismic System Phase II	3,995.2	December 1969	F61052-68-C-0060

PERU

A	University Peruvian Cayetano Herida	Physiologic Changes in the Cardiopulmonary System by Ascending to High Altitudes	\$43.0	April 1969	DAHCI9-68-C-0028
A	do	Endocrine Alterations at High Altitude	16.6	July 1969	DAHCI9-67-G-0024
A	do	Coagulation Studies in Newcomers to High Elevations LA 134	14.0	May 1969	DAHCI9-69-G-0002
A	do	Hormone Metabolism in Men Exposed to High Elevation LA 128	20.0	April 1969	DAHCI9-67-G-0021
A	do	Respiratory Physiology on Ascent to High Altitudes	30.0	do	DAHCI9-68-G-0003
A	do	Role of Adrenal Cortex in Process of Acclimatization to High Elevation	43.0	January 1969	DAHCI9-68-G-0003
F	Instituto Geofisico Del Peru Lima	Equatorial Ionospheric Effects Study	30.0	December 1969	AF-AFOSR-1247-67
F	Instituto Geofisico Del Peru Lima	Research Directed Toward the Study of the Airglow at Low Latitudes	40.0	March 1969	AF-AFOSR-0413-67
F	Pontifici U Catolica Del/Peru	Synthesis & Reactions of BIS-and TRIS-Benzene	31.8	June 1969	AF-AFOSR-1174-66
F	Universidad Nacional de Trujillo	Comparative Analyses of Languages for Machine Processing	11.0	February 1970	AF-AFOSR-1470-68
F	Geophysical Institute of Peru	Radio Solar Measurements	9.0	February 1969	AF-AFOSR-898-67
F	Instituto Geofisico Del Peru	Observations of Earth Magnetic Field	9.9	December 1969	AF-AFOSR-1465-68
F	Instituto Nacional De Salvo	Ecology of Poisonous Animals	13.0	June 1969	AF-AFOSR-1618-68
D	Instituto Geofisico del Peru	Observation and Study of Infrasonic Waves in the Atmosphere	137.0	May 1970	AFOSR-68-1613

PHILIPPINES

A	Mindanao State University	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey (South Philippines)	\$24.5	September 1969	DA-AFE-S92-544-68-G132
A	National Museum	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey (North Philippines)	30.5	do	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G134
A	University of Philippines	Filariasis Studies in the Philippines	21.0	October 1969	DA-AFE-S92-544-68-G-105
A	do	Fluorescent Antibody Test in Measurement of Malarial Immunity	20.6	March 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G114
A	National Museum	Ecology of Southern Samar	16.3	December 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G104
A	University of Philippines	Determination of Malaria Vector on Pangutaran Island, Sulu Archipelago	9.0	May 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G109
A	do	Determination of Chloroquine Resistant P. Falciparum Parasitas, Impatawan and Other Provinces of the Philippines	8.2	November 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G125
F	Manila Observatory	Conduct Radio Observations of the Sun	83.0	May 1970	F19628-67-C-0300

See footnote at end of table.

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969—Continued

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

SPAIN

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
F	Observatory of Ebro	Inospheric Studies Using Active Satellite Transmissions	\$9.0	February 1969	AF61-052-00924
F	U De Barcelona	Electrochemical Studies on Chlorocarbon Compounds	43.8	August 1969	F61052-67-C-0065
F	do	A Study of the Synthesis and Properties of Alkaramatic Chlorocarbons	167.7	December 1969	F61052-68-C-0043
F	Inst Nacional de Tecnica Aeroespacial, Madrid	Combustion and Flame Propagation in Heterogeneous Systems	41.0	March 1969	AF-EOAR-0027-68
F	do	Diffusion Flames and Supersonic Combustion	38.0	do	AF-EOAR-0031-68
F	U of Salamanca	Morphochemical Correlations Involved in the Differentiation Eye Lens	7.2	June 1969	F61052-68-C-0072

SWEDEN

A	Sahlgrens Hospital, University of Goteborg	Newer Advances in Treatment of Shock in Man	\$109.5	May 1969	DAJA37-69-C-1175
N	University of Goteborg, Medical	Effects of Noise on Inner Ear Cells	28.0	August 1969	F61052-C-0064
F	Stockholms Universitet Stockholm	Rocket Sampling of Solid Particles in the Mesosphere	4.0	February 1969	F61052-67-C-0068
F	Kiruna Geophysica Observatory Kiruna	Study of Characteristics of Auroral Ionosphere and Its Irregularities	20.0	March 1969	F61052-67-C-0026
F	Royal University of Uppsala, Uppsala	RSCH. Design and Develop Refraction and Gravity Experiments	33.0	July 1969	F61052-68-C-0075
F	Royal University of Uppsala	Band Structure by Ultrasonic, Susceptibility and Galvanomagnetic Measurements	89.9	May 1970	AF-61-052-00937
F	do	Quantum Theory of Many Particle Systems	285.0	August 1969	AF-EOAR-0043-69
F	Research Institute for Physics	Research on Ion Implantation in Semiconductors	34.0	April 1969	F61052-68-C-0062
F	Royal University of Uppsala	Evaluation of High Latitude Cosmic Ray Data	7.5	June 1969	F61052-68-C-0034
F	Kiruna Geophysical Observatory	High Latitude Geomagnetic Data	11.5	March 1969	AF61-052-866
F	Karolinska Institutet	Distribution of Biologically Active	42.0	February 1969	AF-EOAR-0009-68
F	Goteborgs Universitet	Intra-neuronal Mechanisms for Information Storage	58.0	March 1969	AF-EOAR-0034-68
F	Royal Institute of Technology	Gaseous and Solid State Plasma Device Studies	58.0	June 1969	61-052-895
F	University of Goteborgs	Integrated Nervous Control of the Cardiovascular and Gastrointestinal Systems	18.0	December 1969	F61052-C-0044
D	University of Uppsala	Seismic Body Waves and Surface Waves	107.0	do	AF61(052)-702

SWITZERLAND

A	University of Lausanne	Investigation on Structure and Biological Activities of Human Immunoglobins M. & D. (IGM and IGD)	\$44.6	November 1969	DAJA37-69-C-60101
A	University of Basel	Variation-Resistant Matrices and Related Mathematical Topics	10.5	January 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0628
A	Physikisch-Meteorologische Observatorium	Measure of Direct Solar Radiation and Skybrightness in UV and Visible Part of Spectrum	4.9	July 1969	DAJA37-68-C-1017
F	University of Basel	Optical Spectrum of Nitric Oxide Molecule	7.6	March 1969	AF-EOAR-0074-65
F	Universitat Bern	Pulmonary Pathology of Oxygen Toxicity	55.2	April 1969	AF61(052)-941
F	Universitat Zurich	Sugar and Peptide Intestinal Digestion and Absorption	20.0	December 1969	AF-EOAR-0017-68

TAIWAN

A	Tunghai University	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey	\$15.5	September 1969	DA-FEC-309-G130
A	Kaohsiung Medical College	Biochemical Studies on Toxic Nature of Snake Venoms	43.4	June 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G124
A	Tunghai University	Biology and Pathogenicity of Biting Midges (Diptera: Ceratopogonidae) in Taiwan	7.2	do	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-68-G123
A	National Taiwan University	Host-Parasite Relationships of Schistosoma Japonicum in Taiwan	14.6	December 1969	DA-AFE-S92-544-69-G142
A	do	Studies of Cardiotoxin and Vasoactive Substance Releasing Components of Cobra Venom	17.8	October 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544-69-G138

THAILAND

A	Applied Scientific Research Corp	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey (Thailand) FE315	\$51.0	July 1969	DA FEC 92 544 G0075
A	do	Migratory Animal Pathological Survey (Thailand) FE 316	25.0	do	DA CRD AG S92 544 67 G84
A	Medical Sciences University Facilities Tropical Medicine	Investigation of Filariasis in Thailand	35.0	March 1969	DA MD 49 193 66 G9208
A	University of Medical Sciences	Schistosomiasis in Thailand, Etiology, Epidemiology, Life Cycles, Pathology, and Clinical Aspects*	55.0	January 1969	DA MD 49 193 66 G9199
A	Bangkok School of Tropical Medicine	Leptospirosis in Thailand, with special reference to Epidemiology, Pathology, and C.	35.0	do	DA AFE S92 544 68 G107
A	University of Medical Sciences	Investigations on the patterns of Epidemiology and Endemicity of Diseases occurring due to large scale environmental changes in northeast Thailand.	34.2	May 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S92-544
A	Chulalongkorn University	Fine Structure of Solar Chromosphere	44.0	March 1973	DA AFE S92 544 68 G102
A	University of Medical Sciences	Schistosomiasis in Thailand, Studies on Incidence, Epidemiology, Life Cycles and Its Causing Cercarial Dermatitis (carry-on and redirection of above*)	19.9	May 1969	DA-CRD-AFE-S82-544-67-6690
D	Applied Scientific Research Corp	Research on Tropical Environmental Data (trend) and Basic Environmental Data (trend) and Basic Environmental Data (trend) in Thailand.	740.0	Indefinite	DAJA-29-67-C-0122

UNITED KINGDOM (ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND, AND WALES)

A	University of Oxford	Defects in Crystals	\$14.8	December 1968	DAJA37-68-C-0444
A	University of London, King's College	Critical Phenomena and Phase Transitions	19.3	March 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0860
A	University of Sheffield	Theoretical Studies of Metallic Alloys	8.9	April 1969	DAJA37-68-C-1020
A	University of Sussex	Synthetic Applications of Aromatic Desilylation and Destannylation	16.7	September 1969	DAJA37-69-C-0014
A	do	Organometallic Amides	8.3	April 1969	DAJA37-68-C-1018
A	University of Nottingham	Sieve Methods and Combinatorial Analysis	4.0	March 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0822
A	New University of Ulster, North Ireland	Boron Phosphide as a Semiconductor	19.1	September 1969	DAJA37-69-C-0342
A	University of Birmingham	Monograph on Physics and Mechanics of Ice as a Material	44.8	November 1969	DAJA-37-68-C-0208
A	Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	Chemotherapy of Rodent Malaria Drug Action Against Exo-Erythrocytic Stages and Drug Resistant Strains	40.6	June 1969	DAJA37-68-G-0274
A	Maybridge Chemical Co	Potential Anti-Malarials based on Quinoline-7-Carboxylic Acid	15.4	March 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0436
A	Royal College of Art	Experimental Cartography	20.5	September 1969	DAJA37-69-C-0382
A	University of Birmingham	Study of Thermodynamic Properties and Alloy Chemistry of Transition Metal Alloy Phases	6.1	November 1969	DAJA37-69-C-0472
D	Queen's University Belfast, Ireland	Molecular Processes	334.0	March 1970	N00014-69-C-0035

LIST OF RESEARCH STUDIES BEING CONDUCTED ABROAD, ACTIVE ON JAN. 1, 1969—Continued

[Military department code: A—Army; N—Navy; F—Air Force; D—ARPA]

UNITED KINGDOM (ENGLAND)

Military department	Contract agency	Title	Cost of project ¹ (thousands)	Estimated date of completion	Contract/Grant No.
A	University of Sheffield	Quantum Mechanics of Many-Particle Systems	\$25.5	February 1969	DAJA37-68-C-0775
A	University of Nottingham	Development of High-Speed Non-Metallic Turbines and their Application to Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy.	23.2	do	DAJA37-68-C-0724
F	University of Manchester	Continuation of Research Toward Improved Lunar Photography.	37.5	January 1969	F61052-68-C-0002
F	University College	Research for Determination of Air Density Temperature and Winds at High Altitudes.	20.0	July 1969	F61052-68-C-0057
F	Imperial College	Origin of Auroral Primaries	21.0	September 1969	AF61052-00927
F	University College London	Anatomical Localization of Target Learning and Memory	110.0	May 1969	AF-EOAR-0014-68
F	Oxford University	Physiological Research on Muscle	17.0	June 1969	AF-EOAR-0032-68
F	System Research Limited	Research into the Adaptively Controlled Instruction	9.0	May 1969	F-61052-68-C-0071
F	University of Southampton	Acoustic Fatigue and Damping of Structural Elements	30.0	March 1969	61-052-0027
F	University of Liverpool	Deformation and Fracture of Metals	47.0	do	61-052-0920
F	University of Southampton	Boundary Layer Oscillations and Noise	15.0	October 1969	61-052-7009
N	University of Cambridge, Department of Pathology	Cryoprotective Mechanism	12.0	March 1969	F61052-68-C-0041
N	Oxford University, Pharmacology and Physical Chemistry Departments	Studies on Decompression Sickness and Inert Gas Narcosis	26.0	August 1969	F61052-67-C-0077
N	Sir Wm. Dunn School of Pathology, University of Oxford	Methods of Protecting Navy Personnel Against Biological Toxins	56.0	June 1969	N62558-4781
N	University of Sussex	Visual Pattern Recognition in Naval Task	125.0	September 1969	N62558-4791
N	Royal College of Advanced Technology	The absorption of Sound by Polymer Solutions	9.0	June 1970	F61052-67-C-0075
N	University of Keele	Recombination Reactions of Importance to Propulsion	7.0	September 1969	F61052-68-C-0029
N	Cambridge Language Research Unit	Semantic Research for Automated Language Translation and Information Retrieval	23.0	December 1969	F61052-67-C-0058
F	University of London	Ion Mass Spectrometry of the Lower Ionosphere	100.0	April 1971	F61052-67-C-0078
F	Cambridge University	Application of Many-Body Theory to Superfluids and Metals	38.0	September 1970	F61052-67-C-0049
F	University of Salford	Structure and Properties of Ferromagnetic Alloys	4.0	October 1969	AF-EOAR-0005-68
F	University of Durham	Electronic Properties of Dilute Rare Earth Alloys	39.4	September 1969	AF-EOAR-0006-67
F	University of Sussex	Electron Microscopy of Defects in Crystals	38.5	December 1970	AF-EOAR-0051-65
F	Imperial College of Science and Technology, London	High-Energy Physics and Elementary Particle Theory	16.5	October 1969	AF-EOAR-0012-6
F	University of Sussex	Thermal and Magnetic Properties of Helium	59.0	March 1970	AF-EOAR-23-68
F	Oxford University	Waves in Anisotropic Media	202.0	February 1970	AF-EOAR-33-67
F	do	Heat Conductivity of Solid Helium	15.0	June 1970	AF-61052-67-C-0082
F	Cambridge University	Theoretical Research in Fundamental Particle Physics	73.9	August 1969	AF-EOAR-0030-67
F	Oxford University	Nuclear Structure Studies Using Electron and Neutron Interactions	40.0	December 1969	F61052-67-C-0104
F	University of Sussex	Stereochemistry of Reactions at Germanium Atoms	8.8	June 1960	AF-61-052/0093/0
F	Imperial College of S. & T., London	Chromatography and Solvent Extraction of Organometallic Complexes	33.9	December 1969	F61052-67-C-0008
F	Royal Institute of Great Britain, London	Primary Photoprocesses in Organic Materials	48.7	October 1969	F61052-68-C-0010
F	Bristol University	Organometallic Chemistry	52.3	August 1970	AF-61/052/69-C-0011
F	University of Newcastle	Chemistry of Decaborane Coordination Chemistry of Gr III Elements	56.4	December 1970	AF-61/052/00910
F	University of Sussex	Mass Spectrometric-Thermochemical and Related Studies on Series of Inorganic Compounds	36.8	August 1969	F61052-67-C-0005
F	do	Low-Temperature Measurements on Dilute Metallic Alloys	26.0	September 1969	F61052-68-C-0011
F	Cambridge University	Growth of Burning to Detonation in Liquids and Solids	96.0	November 1969	AF-EOAR-0044-69
F	University of Sheffield	Fundamental Study of Supersonic Combustion for Hypersonic Ramjets	60.0	August 1969	AF-EOAR-0005-67
F	Fulmer Research Institute, Ltd., Stoke Poges	Heats of Formation of Mixed Metal Oxides	169.0	December 1969	AF-61/052/00863
F	University of Hull	Kinetics of Hydrogen-Oxygen and Hydrocarbon-Oxygen Systems	51.0	October 1969	AF-EOAR-0013-68
F	Victoria University of Manchester	High-Temperature Reaction Calorimetry	22.0	September 1970	AF-61(052)00928
F	Kings College	Gravitational Physics	10.0	September 1969	F61052-69-C-0012
F	Victoria University of Manchester	Photographic and Spectrographic Observations at Pic-Du-Midi Observatory	30.0	May 1969	AF61-052-00882
F	University College	Determination of Air Density, Temperature, and Winds at High Altitudes	30.0	December 1969	F61052-68-C-0057
F	University of Leeds	Stress Corrosion Cracking of Titanium Alloys	6.0	September 1969	F61052-69-C-0009
F	University of Durham	Model Compounds for Fluorinated Polymers and Fluids	6.0	December 1969	F61057-69-C-0010

UNITED KINGDOM (IRELAND)

N	Trinity College, University of Dublin	Body Temperature Regulation	\$11.0	March 1969	F1052-68C-0042
F	Queens University, Belfast	Diffusion Plasmas and Diffusion Waves	8.2	November 1969	AF-EOAR-0042-67
F	Trinity College, Dublin	Dielectric Properties of Solids and Liquids at High Pressures	3.0	December 1969	AF-EOAR-0006-68
F	University College, Cork	Microwave Studies of Gaseous Discharges	50.0	March 1969	AF-EOAR 32-67
F	University College, Dublin	Radio and Optical Emission from High Energy Cosmic Rays	25.5	December 1969	AF-EOAR-0027-67
F	University College	Thin Elastic Plates and Shells and Boundary Value	112.0	November 1969	AF-EOAR-49-69
F	University of Dublin	Energy Transport in Irradiated Systems	12.0	March 1969	F61052-67-C-0044
F	Queens University	Physical Processes of Atoms Relating to Temperature Electron Density Particle Scattering and Heat Balance	66.5	August 1969	AF61(052)-00780

UNITED KINGDOM (SCOTLAND)

A	University of Aberdeen	Asymptotic Problems in Combinatorics and Graph Theory	\$5.3	April 1969	DAJA37-C-1075
A	do	Persulphate Oxidation of Carboxylic Acid	6.6	December 1969	DAJA37-68-C-1103
F	University of Glasgow	Studies in Ring Expansion	18.4	September 1969	AF-EOAR-0013-67
F	do	Thermal Degradation of Polymers	22.0	do	AF-61(052) 00883
F	University of Edinburgh	Smooth Muscle Responses as Altered by Humoral Background	14.0	August 1969	AF-EOAR-68-0033

UNITED KINGDOM (WALES)

F	University College of North Wales	Sub-Millimeter Wave Generation and Spectroscopy	\$20	December 1969	AF-EOAR-0047-69
---	-----------------------------------	---	------	---------------	-----------------

URUGUAY

A	University de la Republica	Relationship between Wild Entourages and Mycoses, Esp. S. American Blastomycoses.	\$7.3	June 1969	DAH19-68-G0016
F	Instituto de Investigacion de Ciencias Biologicas	Anatomical and Physiological Studies on the Nervous System	88.0	April 1969	AF-AFOSR-0313-67A
F	do	Comparative Anatomy of Visual Systems	24.0	do	AF-AFOSR-0618-67A

¹ Total obligations through all years since inception.

Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test, and evaluation work

SECTION II NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Rank	Name of contractor and location	Thousands of dollars
10	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	119,175
	Cambridge, Mass.	31,662
	Lexington, Mass.	87,513
20	Aerospace Corp.	73,339
	El Segundo, Calif.	73,307
	San Bernardino, Calif.	32
22	Johns Hopkins University	57,614
	Baltimore City, Md.	2,713
	Silver Spring, Md.	54,901
30	Mitre Corp.	35,712
	Bedford, Mass.	35,712
36	Stanford Research Institute	28,716
	Ethiopia	198
	Thailand	58
	Homer Village, Alaska	18
	Menlo Park, Calif.	27,607
	Stanford, Calif.	323
	Mercury, Nev.	437
	Cheyenne, Wyo.	75
40	Rand Corp.	19,139
	Santa Monica, Calif.	19,139
44	California, University of	17,393
	Berkeley, Calif.	5,767
	Davis, Calif.	127
	Irvine, Calif.	65
	La Jolla, Calif.	5,510
	Los Angeles, Calif.	1,471
	Point Mugu, Calif.	12
	Riverside, Calif.	89
	San Diego, Calif.	3,182
	San Francisco, Calif.	256
	Santa Barbara, Calif.	870
	Santa Cruz, Calif.	44
45	System Development Corp.	17,372
	Huntsville, Ala.	414
	Lompoc, Calif.	700
	Los Angeles, Calif.	61
	Santa Monica, Calif.	13,120
	Washington, D.C.	363
	Belleville, Ill.	350
	Lexington, Mass.	375
	Rome, N.Y.	191
	Dayton, Ohio	303
	Falls Church, Va.	1,226
	Hampton, Va.	234
	Norfolk, Va.	35
46	Stanford University	16,422
	Palo Alto, Calif.	218
	Stanford, Calif.	16,204
51	Rochester, University of	13,182
	Rochester, N.Y.	13,182
55	Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc.	12,500
	Edwards, Calif.	86
	Buffalo, N.Y.	11,889
	Wright-Patterson, Ohio	37
	Falls Church, Va.	488

Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test, and evaluation work—Continued

SECTION II NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968—Continued

Rank	Name of contractor and location	Thousands of dollars
57	IIT Research Institute	12,172
	Chicago, Ill.	7,017
	Annapolis, Md.	5,130
	Wright-Patterson, Ohio	25
60	Institute for Defense Analysis	11,691
	Arlington, Va.	11,691
64	Pennsylvania State University	10,513
	University Park, Pa.	10,513
65	Research Analysis Corp.	10,067
	Iran	155
	Vietnam	880
	McLean, Va.	9,273
	Various domestic	241
66	Columbia University	9,929
	New York, N.Y.	9,929
70	Michigan, University of	9,478
	Honolulu City, Hawaii	1,600
	Ann Arbor, Mich.	6,947
	Willow Run, Mich.	734
	Ypsilanti, Mich.	197
71	Illinois, University of	8,583
	Chicago, Ill.	89
	Urbana, Ill.	8,494
72	Battelle Memorial Institute	8,322
	Germany	57
	Washington, D.C.	114
	Columbus, Ohio	8,036
	Richland, Wash.	115
78	U.S. National Aerospace Agency	7,026
	Edwards, Calif.	25
	Moffett Field, Calif.	40
	Pasadena, Calif.	19
	Washington, D.C.	77
	Houston, Tex.	155
	Ridgeley, W. Va.	6,710
85	Riverside Research Institute	6,315
	New York, N.Y.	6,315
92	Washington, University of	5,552
	Seattle, Wash.	5,552
94	Texas, University of	5,386
	Alamogordo, N. Mex.	10
	Austin, Tex.	4,598
	College Station, Tex.	68
	Dallas, Tex.	43
	El Paso, Tex.	502
	Galveston, Tex.	135
	Houston, Tex.	30
96	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute	5,143
	Woods Hole, Mass.	5,143
105	Utah, University of	4,356
	Dugway, Utah	283
	Salt Lake City, Utah	4,073
107	Syracuse University Research Corp.	4,172
	Burlington, Mass.	94
	Syracuse, N.Y.	4,078

Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test, and evaluation work—Continued

SECTION II NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968—Continued

Rank	Name of contractor and location	Thousands of dollars
117	Dayton, University of	3,610
	Dayton, Ohio	3,358
	Wright-Patterson, Ohio	252
118	Cornell University	3,595
	Arecibo, P.R.	1,585
	Ithaca, N.Y.	1,949
	New York, N.Y.	61
123	George Washington University	3,306
	Washington, D.C.	3,295
	Alexandria, Va.	11
128	Southwest Research Institute	3,149
	Wright-Patterson, Ohio	226
	Dallas, Tex.	35
	San Antonio, Tex.	2,888
131	Denver, University of	2,982
	Denver, Colo.	2,982
133	Ohio State University Research Foundation	2,958
	Columbus, Ohio	2,686
	Wright-Patterson, Ohio	272
134	American University	2,944
	Washington, D.C.	2,944
138	National Academy of Sciences	2,838
	Washington, D.C.	2,756
	Watertown, Mass.	47
	Dover, N.J.	35
139	Duke University	2,812
	Durham, N.C.	2,812
140	New Mexico State University	2,787
	Alamogordo, N. Mex.	24
	Las Cruces, N. Mex.	640
	University Park, N. Mex.	1,612
	White Sands Missile Site, N. Mex.	511
143	Alaska, University of	2,695
	College Village Alaska	2,695
146	Miami, University of	2,602
	Coral Gables, Fla.	1,141
	Miami, Fla.	1,461
147	Carnegie Mellon University	2,575
	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,575
151	Harvard University	2,524
	Boston, Mass.	182
	Cambridge, Mass.	2,182
	Fort Davis, Tex.	160
153	Minnesota, University of	2,507
	Minneapolis, Minn.	2,507
54	California Institute of Technology	2,487
	Pasadena, Calif.	2,487
155	Texas A. & M. Research Foundation	2,475
	College Station, Tex.	2,475
156	Purdue Research Foundation	2,455
	Lafayette, Ind.	2,442
	West Lafayette, Ind.	13

Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test, and evaluation work—Continued

SECTION II NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968—Continued

Rank	Name of contractor and location	Thousands of dollars
160	New York University	2,304
	Bronx, N.Y.	731
	New York, N.Y.	1,513
	Syracuse, N.Y.	25
	University Heights, N.Y.	35
167	Maryland, University of	2,100
	Baltimore City, Md.	703
	College Park, Md.	1,397
172	New Mexico, University of	1,986
	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	934
	Sandia, N. Mex.	1,052
174	New York, State University of	1,982
	Albany, N.Y.	1,538
	Buffalo, N.Y.	318
	New York, N.Y.	115
	Stony Brook, N.Y.	11
175	Oregon State University	1,969
	Corvallis, Oreg.	1,969
181	Florida, University of	1,842
	Gainesville, Fla.	1,842
182	Princeton University	1,883
	Princeton, N.J.	1,803
184	Midwest Research Institute	1,762
	Kansas City, Mo.	1,615
	Wright-Patterson, Ohio	147
186	Louisiana, State University of	1,754
	Baton Rouge, La.	1,754
188	Georgia Tech Research Institute	1,725
	Atlanta, Ga.	1,725
195	Stevens Institute of Technology	1,596
	Hoboken, N.J.	1,559
	New York, N.Y.	37
197	Wisconsin, University of	1,591
	Madison, Wis.	1,591
204	Hawaii, University of	1,568
	Honolulu City, Hawaii	1,568
210	Analytic Services, Inc.	1,495
	Falls Church, Va.	1,495
212	Cincinnati, University of	1,446
	Cincinnati, Ohio	1,446
214	Oklahoma, State University of	1,422
	Stillwater, Okla.	1,422
218	Iowa, State University of Science and Technology	1,372
	Ames, Iowa	1,372
219	Chicago, University of	1,360
	Chicago, Ill.	1,320
	Lemont, Ill.	40
222	Florida State University	1,338
	Tallahassee, Fla.	1,338
225	Colorado State University	1,329
	Fort Collins, Colo.	1,329
226	Kansas State University of Agriculture	1,321
	Manhattan, Kans.	1,321
228	Brooklyn, Polytechnic Institute of	1,304
	Brooklyn, N.Y.	1,274
	Farmingdale, N.Y.	30

Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test, and evaluation work—Continued

SECTION II NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968—Continued

Rank	Name of contractor and location	Thousands of dollars
229	Catholic University of America Washington, D.C.	1,304
234	Research Triangle Institute Iran Durham, N.C. Triangle Park, N.C.	1,254
235	Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Ga.	1,221
236	New Mexico Institute Mining and Technology China Lake, Calif. Socorro, N. Mex.	1,218
238	Syracuse University Syracuse, N.Y. Utica, N.Y.	1,197
248	Pennsylvania, University of Philadelphia, Pa.	1,125
252	Rhode Island, University of Kingston, R.I.	1,084
254	Smithsonian Institution Washington, D.C. Cambridge, Mass.	1,082
260	Indiana University Bloomington, Ind.	1,044
261	Kansas, University of Kansas City, Kans. Lawrence, Kans.	1,044
262	American Institute of Research Palo Alto, Calif. Silver Spring, Md. Camp Lejeune, N.C. Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,038
265	Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio	1,011
266	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, N.Y.	1,001
267	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington, D.C. Germantown, Md. Las Vegas, Nev. Albuquerque, N. Mex. Oak Ridge, Tenn. Richland, Wash.	995
268	Illinois Institute of Technology Chicago, Ill.	988
270	U.S. Commerce Department Boulder, Colo. Washington, D.C. Gaithersburg, Md. Rockville, Md. Suitland, Md.	985
271	Rutgers University New Brunswick, N.J.	983
273	Southern Research Institute Birmingham, Ala.	965
275	Colorado University Boulder, Colo. Denver, Colo.	964

Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test, and evaluation work—Continued

SECTION II NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968—Continued

Rank	Name of contractor and location	Thousands of dollars
277	Northeastern University Boston, Mass.	952
279	Washington University St. Louis City, Mo.	933
281	Brown University Providence, R.I.	932
282	Pittsburgh, University of Washington, D.C. Pittsburgh, Pa.	921
293	Missouri, University of Columbia, Mo. Kansas City, Mo. Rolla, Mo.	876
296	Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame, Ind.	855
297	Oregon, University of Eugene, Oreg. Portland, Oreg.	846
298	Oklahoma, University of Fort Sill, Okla. Norman, Okla. Oklahoma City, Okla.	840
309	Virginia, University of Charlottesville, Va.	787
316	Tennessee, University of Knoxville, Tenn. Memphis, Tenn. Tullahoma, Tenn.	787
317	Southern California, University of Los Angeles, Calif. San Diego, Calif.	751
319	Southern Methodist, University of Dallas, Tex.	735
321	Delaware, University of Newark, Del.	732
325	Georgetown University Washington, D.C.	732
328	Yale University New Haven, Conn. Alamogordo, N. Mex.	714
334	Houston, University of Houston, Tex.	709
338	Auburn University Auburn, Ala.	680
339	University Corp., Atmospheric Research Boulder, Colo. Sunspot, N. Mex.	680
341	Dartmouth College Hanover, N.H.	657
342	Arizona State University Tempe, Ariz.	657
348	American Society for Engineering Washington, D.C.	655
351	Lowell Tech Institute Billerica, Mass. Lowell, Mass.	655

Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contract awards for research, development, test, and evaluation work—Continued

SECTION II NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1968—Continued

Rank	Name of contractor and location	Thousands of dollars
352	Lovelace Foundation	613
	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	613
354	Ohio University	608
	Athens, Ohio	608
358	Northwestern University	590
	Evanston, Ill.	590
367	American Institute for Research	569
	Vietnam	26
	Washington, D.C.	62
	Pittsburgh, Pa.	481
370	Mississippi State University	564
	State College, Miss.	564
371	Travelers Research Center	561
	Hartford, Conn.	561
376	North Carolina State University	551
	Raleigh, N.C.	551
388	Massachusetts, University of	511
	Amherst, Mass.	493
	Waltham, Mass.	18
390	Arizona, University of	504
	Tucson, Ariz.	504
396	National Society of Professional Engineers	493
	Washington, D.C.	493
418	Michigan State University	464
	East Lansing, Mich.	464
427	Boston College	455
	Chestnut Hill, Mass.	318
	Weston, Mass.	137
428	South Dakota School of Mines & Technology	454
	Rapid City, S. Dak.	454
444	Nevada, University of	426
	Reno, Nev.	426
446	Flight Safety Foundation	423
	Phoenix, Ariz.	423
462	North Carolina, University of	390
	Chapel Hill, N.C.	390
464	United States Interior Department	387
	Denver, Colo.	50
	Washington, D.C.	37
	Bartlesville, Okla.	85
	Albany, Oreg.	50
	Pittsburgh, Pa.	165
467	Presbyterian Hospital	384
	Chicago, Ill.	384
468	Tufts University	380
	Boston, Mass.	41
	Medford, Mass.	339
478	Arctic Institute of North America	354
	Canada	75
	Washington, D.C.	279
479	Alabama, University of	351
	Birmingham, Ala.	176
	Huntsville, Ala.	102
	University, Ala.	73
483	Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	34
	Bedford, Mass.	162
	Logan, Utah	182
485	Iowa State, University of	342
	Iowa City, Iowa	342
487	Lehigh University	341
	Bethlehem, Pa.	341
	Total	665,365

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today I invite attention to one of the most pressing problems facing mankind; the continued unchecked exploitation and degradation of our human environment.

In the past I have spoken of my concern about the pollution of our water and air, the erosion of our soils, and the damaging effects of thermal discharges and excessive noise. In this congressional session I have introduced legislation which, if passed, would enhance the quality of our environment, and improve

the management of environmental control programs. On March 13, 1969, I again expressed my concern about the problems of human environment by introducing a Senate resolution to call upon the President of the United States to convene an International Conference on Problems of Human Environment in 1970.

Today I again urge Congress, the President, and the American people to support this resolution.

When I speak of the "problems of human environment" I mean the uncontrolled destructive changes in our natural environment, brought about without adequate controls or knowledge of the

consequences, by the scientific and technological advances of our society. Human environmental problems includes water and air pollution, thermal pollution, depletion of the soils, and the indiscriminate use of pesticides. Also, human environmental problems refers to our crowded—strangled urban environment, transportation problems, excess noise, slums, family disorganization, and crime and violence.

Most of man's history has been marked by a struggle to survive in a hostile environment. Now, due to advances in science and technology man is able to adjust to his environment in most of the world. Yet, instead of living in harmony with our environment man is guilty of nature's unpardonable sin, the sin of environmental waste and exploitation. Man has abused the land, sea, and air on which life depends. He has degraded it rather than treating it as the blessing it is.

We are guilty, as no other living being on earth is, of bringing about the extinction of species of animals and birds for no just cause. We are also guilty of allowing our cities to become unfit to live in. The medical journals are filled with studies supporting the theory that air pollution is a major cause of lung diseases such as cancer, emphysema, and chronic bronchial conditions. In other words we are blindly contributing to the reduction of the quality of life on earth for man. Recently scientists have informed us that the negative effects of DDT spraying may be far greater than the benefits derived from killing insects. For example, there is a rising concern over recent information that excess amounts of DDT in our oceans may be virtually reducing the production of our oxygen supply. Sweden, recognizing the danger, has prohibited the use of this pesticide.

Perhaps no greater strain, however, has been placed on man's environment than the rapid increase in human population. The present world population of 3.5 billion will at least double to 7 billion by the year 2000 if present growth rates continue. This will place a tremendous burden upon our natural resources.

Fortunately, this country and others are beginning to recognize the gravity of the situation, and have started to take modest steps to preserve our natural resources. International organizations also are contributing their efforts to resolve the many and complex human environmental problems. However, the resolution of these problems will be impossible without a major effort by those countries most able to contribute the human and economic resources necessary to mobilize a global war on environmental pollution and exploitation. One country able to contribute is the United States.

The United Nations has adopted a Swedish resolution, signed by more than 40 member nations, to convene an international conference in 1972 on problems of the human environment. I am most gratified by this development and believe that the United States should do all within its power to contribute to the value of such a conference.

I believe the United States should be host to a similar conference in 1970. The

United States should invite the nations of the world to send representatives to discuss and exchange views and information on human environment problems. The purpose of this conference would be for the participating countries to contribute their recommendations to a coordinating body, elected by the attending nations, which would prepare a Declaration of Concern. This declaration would include a set of recommendations to be sent to the United Nations Secretary General, for the 1972 United Nations Environmental Conference to consider. For example, the participating nations may decide to propose that the U.N. Conference consider a plan for the development of a United Nations Institute for the Problems of Human Environment. An outline of the Institute, containing its scope and character, would be included. The conference essentially would serve as an action-oriented study group. International organizations now working on environmental matters—the International Labor Organization—ILO, the Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—of the U.N., the World Meteorological Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and others should be invited to attend in addition to all nations of the world.

Nothing is more important than the curtailment of rampant exploitation and waste of the world's nonrenewable natural resources, to develop practical measures for mankind to utilize scientific and technological know-how in restoring the quality of our environment.

So, with these thoughts and concerns in mind I once again urge the President, Congress, and the American public to support my resolution to convene in 1970 an International Conference on Problems of the Human Environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my resolution (S. Res. 166) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. RES. 166

Resolution to provide for an International Conference on Problems of Human Environment

Whereas the relationship between man and his environment is undergoing profound changes due to rapid scientific and technological developments;

Whereas these developments, though they offer unprecedented opportunities to change and shape man's environment to meet his needs, also present grave dangers if not controlled;

Whereas the United States should take the initiative in organizing an international conference for the purpose of mobilizing the knowledge and experiences of human environment problems, and developing a global plan to curtail the occurrence of environmental problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President is requested to invite in 1970 other interested nations of the world to join with the United States in organizing, convening, and participating in, an International Conference on Problems of Human Environment for the purpose of dealing, through international cooperation, with the environmental problems of man.

MILITARIZATION AND THE AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, several weeks ago a southern California businessman, Mr. Harold Willens, delivered an extremely important address at the University of Minnesota.

Mr. Willens was one of the principal organizers of the Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, and he served as that organization's national cochairman until February of this year. He has since resigned and is devoting his time now to formation of a national businessmen's group which intends to examine and resist trends toward the militarization of our society.

His Minnesota speech is a most eloquent summary of the reasons why Americans have cause for concern over the power of the national security establishment. Especially pertinent in my view is his convincing refutation of the notion that American business is universally entangled with and dependent upon an expanding arms budget.

Assuming the need for a continuing counter-constituency to balance the self-interest of those supporting the military-industrial complex, Mr. Willens expresses the belief that—

There are a number of such segments in our society, not just one—comprising many millions of citizens concerned about huge military expenditures which seem excessively beyond the requirements of adequate national defense. And I also believe that there are moments in history when self-interest and altruism intersect. Now is such a moment.

But for the small proportion of American industry directly involved in military production, he suggests that—

Where motivation is concerned, that of the businessmen should be very high. The benefits of being a businessman are extraordinarily great in our society. Conversely, great would be the loss of these benefits. . . . If unbridled militarism poses even a potential threat to the preservation of freedom and possibly the preservation of life itself, enlightened self-interest calls for the American businessman to lead the way in assuring civilian supremacy.

As Mr. Willens indicates, burgeoning military budgets are no more a boon to business than is the war in Vietnam. In each case America's resources are diminished, our currency is weakened, our productivity is retarded, and our civilian needs are denied.

The involvement of businessmen in the expanding examination of our military posture should be widely welcomed. I ask unanimous consent that Harold Willens' address, "Militarization and the American Businessman," be printed in the RECORD.

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

Last January 22 a Los Angeles Times editorial entitled "Bucking the Pentagon 'System'" decried the fact that "two civilian employees of the armed services are in trouble with their superiors and face threats to their job security because they reported to Congress alleged governmental negligence involv-

ing millions of dollars." The editorial concluded with these words: "There are serious implications in the McGee and Fitzgerald cases. They should not be allowed to sink from sight."

But sink from sight they shall, of course. For who is there to see that these indeed serious implications remain in our minds? Who is there to represent and speak for the properly-expressed concern of the Los Angeles Times on the day following its editorial? The answer is: no one. There is no ongoing apparatus or institution devoted to monitoring the Pentagon or in any way at all endeavoring to check its already enormous power. Should there be such an institution or apparatus?

In a recent letter retired Army General William Wallace Ford writes: "While I have an abiding interest in the security and strength of our country, I think the military-industrial complex, with its legislative associates and academic hirelings, has brought us to the edge of disaster."

Another letter from retired Marine Corps General Samuel B. Griffith includes these words: "We are turning into a militarized state. The ABM systems will cost not \$4/5 billion, but \$40/50 billion and mark a new, totally unnecessary, fatuous and futile escalation. The admirals and generals will eat up this country's substance as surely and irrevocably as silkworms eat mulberry leaves."

Finally, in a recent article entitled "The New American Militarism," retired Marine Corps Commandant General David M. Shoup expresses these views: "Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Vietnam reveals that militarism is more of a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom."

These three distinguished military men are among others of my personal acquaintance who strongly believe that somehow the influence and size of our military bureaucracy must be reduced. Their conviction seems to be shared by a growing number of concerned Americans. One such is the president of a mid-western corporation who was born in Germany and (in his own words) "became witness to what happens to a nation when it goes down the path of military solutions." His letter to me goes on to say: "There is no doubt that a trend of this type is present in our country."

There is evidence to suggest, then, that a citizen's effort to monitor the military bureaucracy is desirable, if not imperative. Democracy depends upon an interplay of checks and balances which seems totally absent in this one glaring instance. A continued absence of such check and balance virtually guarantees continued growth of military size, influence, and expenditures. Surely that could well become a prescription for ultimate disaster, as recently pointed out by Harvard's Nobel laureate George Wald in reporting on a conversation with a "distinguished professor of government at Harvard." To quote Mr. Wald: "I asked him, How real is the threat of full-scale nuclear war? 'Oh, he said comfortably, 'I estimate the probability provided that the situation remains about as it is now at 2% per year.'" Wald goes on to say, "That means that the chance of having that war by 1990 is about one in three and by 2000 it is fifty-fifty."

Two additional bits of recent evidence bolster the argument for an ongoing effort to curb not only the Pentagon but what President Eisenhower's words have apparently immortalized as "the military-industrial complex."

The first is a February 21 lead editorial in the *Alaska Empire* expressing shocked dismay upon learning that almost 400 military officers work as lobbyists for the Defense Department in the halls of Congress. The editorial's words are in themselves a moving plea for some kind of permanence in the process of balancing the military: "Although the thoughts of this editorial may be quickly read and even more quickly forgotten, in the long haul of history, the danger of the military-industrial complex may be revealed as the greatest threat the Republic has had to face."

The second is an article by Robert S. Benson who is now with the Urban Coalition but until very recently was employed in the Comptroller's Office of the Defense Department. Out of his personal experience and expertise Benson shows with impressive logic and supporting evidence "how \$9 billion can be cut from the Pentagon budget without reducing our national security or touching those funds ear-marked for the war in Vietnam."

It should be stressed that Benson and the three generals named above, while deeply concerned about existing realities and their grave implications, consider the military-industrial complex dangerous not because of a conspiracy or even the presence of potential conspirators, but rather because of the unchecked growth of its size and influence. As we all know, the complex enjoys the support of various constituencies: the military services and their respective "alumni" associates; the corporations and labor unions who benefit in profits and jobs; the educational institutions who receive research grants and other forms of financial aid; the Congressmen and Senators who act as spokesmen for the military, especially in the armed services committees in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Let us assume at least for the sake of argument that the national interest would be well served by some form of citizen counter-constituency making itself heard and thereby encouraging responsible Congressional action in place of rubber-stamping and handing out blank checks for all military demands. Who can create such a counter-constituency? Those who support the military-industrial complex act out of direct self-interest, and that is powerful motivation. Is there a segment of the American society capable of seeing unchallenged civilian control as so urgent a goal that continuous effort would be expended towards its realization?

I believe there are a number of such segments in our society, not just one—comprising many millions of citizens concerned about huge military expenditures which seem excessively beyond the requirements of adequate national defense. And I also believe that there are moments in history when self-interest and altruism intersect. Now is such a moment. If the alarm can be convincingly sounded, concerned Americans will perceive the clear and present danger: that we stand on the brink of possibly losing forever the underpinning of civilian supremacy upon which American democracy was founded. Thus alerted, these concerned citizens would act out of enlightened self-interest to regain and maintain control of a bureaucratic apparatus whose sheer size and strength could otherwise do irreparable damage.

In the letter mentioned at the outset, General Griffith expresses similar beliefs and then states "A bell doesn't ring 'til you strike it!" The question then is this: Who will strike the bell and arouse the American citizenry not to oppose but to control the military bureaucracy and, in the prophetic words of President Eisenhower, "guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought by the military-industrial complex." For, as he went on to say, "the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."

There are good reasons for which that warning bell should be rung by American

businessmen on whose behalf the Wall Street Journal stated in its March 5 lead editorial: "We do sense a danger in the very momentum of the arms build-up; the bigger it gets, it seems, the still-bigger it tends to get. Undoubtedly it could get too big for the economic and political health of the nation." And on March 19, the Wall Street Journal further warns: "A large, inflexible military organization unchecked by strong civilian review can lead only to a self-perpetuating drain on national treasure, a demoralized citizenry, and foreign policies dangerously irrelevant in a world moving rapidly away from traditional forms of war and diplomacy."

Many businessmen are becoming increasingly aware that festering social ills could affect the body politic like a cancerous infection if real progress is not soon made in desperately needed domestic social programs. They know that such progress depends to a very great extent on large expenditures of money. And since businessmen are accustomed to dealing with balanced priorities within limited resources, they realize that the needed funds can come only from increased taxes or decreased military expenditures.

Also, in the course of their activities, businessmen become used to changing things, adapting to new conditions, and in effect inventing a new future which will include still non-existent products, methods, policies. Therefore, they have the latent capacity to become a source of creative leadership in relation to this potentially apocalyptic problem. Thus, instead of allowing themselves and their country to drift along with the stream of events toward possible disaster, American businessmen would be applying their energetic and creative talents to altering the "channels in which the stream of events takes place."

And no longer do most informed businessmen regard unlimited military spending as the only way to keep the economy sound and healthy. The stock market is a dramatic barometer indicating that peace implies boom instead of bust. A highly qualified economist recently told me that if we addressed ourselves seriously to the solution of domestic problems, we would be faced with an insufficient labor pool—a shortage of people to do the job properly—from now until the year 2000.

It is reasonable to assume that if businessmen respond to the urgent new realities and become an active leading echelon in the effort to regain and/or retain civilian supremacy, the so-called "flight from business" would soon be sharply reduced. The brightest young men often choose other careers largely because they see American business in the unfortunately archaic and irrelevant image projected by such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Without doubt there are many businessmen whose views are not represented by such organizations. But there are as yet no meaningful channels through which they can direct attitudes and energies that would more nearly reflect the legitimate concerns and basic values of the brilliant young people who must be attracted in order for American business constantly to regenerate its own vitality and viability. Such young people would see American businessmen in a different light if they were to discard old myths, accept new realities (as they must do unhesitatingly in their daily operations), and lead the way in monitoring the military colossus.

But perhaps the most compelling reason of all for which businessmen should ring that warning bell is their relative invulnerability to the usual charges of the usual super-patriots. There is no doubt that unchecked military expansion has been furthered by a widely prevalent feeling that it is somehow disloyal to question anything demanded by

the armed services. Against such irrational feelings and the charges they breed, the businessman is well protected. For he cannot be soft-headed and still make the grade in the competitive market place. And he cannot be soft on communism, which is inimical to his very survival.

From the standpoint of motivation in terms of ringing the bell, that of the businessman should be very high. The benefits of being a businessman are extraordinarily great in our society. Conversely, great would be the loss of these benefits. Most businessmen know well that one does not get something for nothing. If unbridled militarism poses even a potential threat to the preservation of freedom and possibly the preservation of life itself, enlightened self-interest calls for the American businessman to lead the way in assuring civilian supremacy. And once he does so, once he breaks the ice, other segments of the society will unquestionably follow.

Will businessmen meet the challenge? There are many skeptics who would immediately answer: "Never!" Don't forget, they would point out, the industrial component in the military-industrial complex. But in relation to overall American business, the proportionate number of firms in the complex is small, even when subcontractors are included along with prime contractors. And if disproportionate military influence results in our spending more money than is actually required for adequate national defense, the vast majority of American businessmen and all other citizens as well are being severely penalized by higher taxes and/or misuse of money that should be invested in pressing domestic requirements rather than in over-feeding the military-industrial complex.

If all this based upon reasonable assumption and businessmen did strike out to achieve balanced national priorities and clear-cut civilian control, those who led the way would probably be bitterly attacked by some despite the obvious fact of being involved in a non-personal, non-partisan, even a non-political mission intended to achieve what our Founding Fathers wanted: checks and balances and avoidance of military supremacy. As the Republican Ripon Society publication recently stated: "It is far more difficult to restrain the military-industrial complex now than it was in 1961. Men who try will suffer all the abuse that a powerful interest group can churn. But the almost certain consequence of failure or inaction will be the gradual assumption of control over major national decisions by the complex." So bitter opposition by those with a vested interest should be either ignored or accepted as reassuring evidence that progress is being made.

The Congressional Record of February 2, 1968, carried a speech of mine made some months earlier. It emphasized a particular contribution I felt businessmen could make to the Vietnam debate then raging. I pointed out that in the world of business self-delusion invites self-destruction. If we lie to ourselves about the excellence of our product, the truth of a non-buying public will soon set us straight. If we pretend that our personnel, our methods, our concepts are better than they really are—the hard realities of competitive efficiency will soon set us straight—or destroy us economically. Survival in business has always demanded this kind of self-honesty. I stated that such self-honesty was badly needed to counteract the obvious self-delusion of Lyndon Johnson and his cohorts in relation to the realities of Vietnam. When I first made that speech, I was viciously attacked by the spoken and written words of quite a few persons.

But last January 21 a Look Magazine article said: "Only stubborn self-delusion can explain our refusal to see that the Vietnamese who fought hardest fought for nationalism and its living symbol, Ho Chi Minh—not for the general of Saigon . . . Self-delusion cost us dearly in blood, treasure, prestige, bitter

dissent, strained alliances and neglected priorities." What a relative few were saying about Vietnam some time ago gradually became widely recognized and accepted.

The same will be true of businessmen endeavoring to create an ongoing method for expressing concern regarding excessive militarization of our society and foreign policy. Even though they stress their concern and desire for rationally adequate national defense while seeking to re-assert firm civilian control, they will be unpopular in the eyes of some. But eventually they—and all Americans who are encouraged to join them—will prevail.

And by leading the way for others to follow, they will have generated a growing momentum toward a better and safer America. At one of those moments in history when self-interest and altruism intersect, American businessmen shall have acted for their own best interests as well as for those of their country.

CAMPUS DISORDERS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last Tuesday, I issued an invitation to Senators to join me during proceedings of the Senate today to continue a discussion of appropriate measures to deal with this serious aspect of student disorders which continue to wreak havoc upon college and university campuses across the land. In previous remarks to the Republican policy committee, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 26 at page 7635, as well as the statement which I delivered before the Senate on Tuesday, April 29, I have attempted to outline the inexorable path of destructive progress which student revolutionaries, such as the SDS, have been making during the current academic year.

Information widely disseminated by the Students for a Democratic Society in Princeton, N.J., indicates a new period of escalating militancy commencing today and continuing until May 7. This new form of protest will be in the nature of a general student strike which according to them will continue "to build from the first day, not just because we have called it, but because of the nature and militancy of the 4-months struggle which has preceded it; posting the nonnegotiability of the demands of the struggle."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield at that point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I say that I am responding to the Senator's invitation to participate in this colloquy today because of my great concern over the growing problem of campus disorders. I have read the two previous addresses to which the Senator has alluded and heard the one he gave before our policy committee.

I want to applaud the Senator for his series of excellent statements on campus disorders and for the efforts he has taken to expose the situation and report to Congress and the country about its magnitude.

I would also like to make it clear that I stand ready to help the Senator, in any way I can, to help clear the air and expose the true purpose of those who claim to be for a democratic society while in truth they violate almost every democratic principle known to history.

In that regard, I hope that Senators will follow closely the hearings of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee which will soon undertake a study and an investigation of this entire subject.

In discussing the subject of campus disorders, I want to make it clear that I do not side with those who label the entire student population as irresponsible.

I know that is equally true of the viewpoint of the Senator from Colorado, with whom I have discussed this problem on different occasions.

On the contrary, I am sure he feels, and I know I feel, that the vast majority of today's students could better be defined as representatives of the finest group of students ever produced by this country.

They unfortunately have not stood up for their rights as individuals as well as students, and have let a small percentage of punks chart the course of student behavior and sully the reputation of an entire age group. I sincerely hope that they will reverse this trend and take back their majority rights.

I have looked with favor on recent newspaper reports that the representatives of the vast majority of students who want to preserve the academic community as a place for study and learning, because of failure on the part of college administrators to follow their functions and faithfully fulfill their duties as administrators, have gone in and on their own rooted out some of the militants who have taken over the property of a university, or have caused classroom disorders and made it impossible for students who are interested in getting an education to go to classes and acquire learning.

It is not, however, the students who must bear most of the blame, in my opinion, for failure to act. That burden falls directly on the administrators of our colleges and universities and the faculties underneath them, and on the boards of governors, the trustees, and even those who contribute to the endowment funds of colleges, without making a careful, meticulous study to determine what kind of institution they are perpetuating, what kind of administration they are supporting and what kind of atmosphere is developing in the academic community as a result of their cooperation in supporting or directing the university or college.

We need more than ever before men and women of courage who are willing to stand up for the established law and regulations that govern every institution of higher education.

That goes not only for the college administrators but also for deans, faculty members, boards of trustees, boards of governors, and boards of regents. It also goes for contributors supplying the endowment funds which maintain the educational institutions without giving even cursory study as to what type of academic environment they are financing or what types of administrators and faculties they are supporting. Thus some who write in or speak up most vociferously from the private sector may in reality actually be accessories to the crimes of the campus disorders which they condemn.

What we very definitely do not need is a repeat of some of the sorry performances of the past few months in which some vapid and indescribable college and university administrators not only failed to enforce their regulations but also capitulated entirely and disgracefully to demands, many of them asinine, both puerile and being made by a tiny, misguided and ill-informed minority.

Mr. President, all of us are aware that the most immediate outcry, for the most part, stems from the sorry spectacle at Cornell which has gotten so much publicity; but it is far deeper and widespread. The "Munich at Ithaca," as one national magazine so aptly described it, is but a symbol of the times. When campus disorders and seizure of buildings becomes so commonplace that the running totals are reported in newspapers like baseball boxscores, we have reached the stage where drastic remedial action is necessary to reverse the trend.

The Senator from Colorado is rendering a useful service and is engaging in courageous activity in helping to alert the country and Congress to the problem; but what bothers me—and I am sure the Senator from Colorado must share this point of view—is that I have a genuine reluctance to see the Federal Government embroiled in campus disputes, but I also feel that Congress will take such action, if it becomes necessary. We have been patient. We have been hoping for able and courageous administrators to put out the fires. It will not be necessary for Congress to take action if those responsible for keeping their academic house in order will do so.

But, I might add that the same individuals who would cry out the loudest if the Federal Government moved in to restore public order and domestic tranquility, are usually the very ones involved in these disgraceful performances or surrendering to them.

Before closing these comments, Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado that there is one legitimate function, in my opinion, that Congress can and should carry out at this time, and that is an investigation of those who foment so much trouble on our college campuses. The material he has read in the RECORD and the speeches he has given on this subject on the floor of the Senate, and also before the Policy Committee, have provided very helpful information in the direction of beginning a congressional exploration of this entire subject.

The Senator from Colorado has started the ball rolling and I want to assure him that it will continue because the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations will give this problem its prompt attention. As a matter of fact, hearings will begin on this very subject before the end of next week.

As the ranking Republican member on that subcommittee, I want to invite the Senator from Colorado to participate in the hearings in any manner he thinks desirable; as a witness, if he wishes, sitting with us, if he has time, at the committee table, where he will be extended the courtesy to ask questions, and where our committee, and the Congress and the country, can benefit from the in-

depth study he has been giving to this very vexing problem.

I congratulate the Senator on his initiative.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his kind remarks and also for his invitation to join with the Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Frankly, I am very, very pleased that this very illustrious committee, which has performed such valuable work for the Senate in the past, is taking up the matter at this time.

I have tried to point out two things from time to time. First, that this is not just a case of exuberant students, with their blood running high in the springtime, swallowing goldfish. This is an organized effort, at least to a certain extent. In its overall pattern, it is certainly well organized. The policy and basis of manipulation are certainly well organized. There is no question as to what their intent is. It is to disrupt, and if possible to destroy, the university system in this country.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. May I finish first?

Mr. MUNDT. Surely.

Mr. ALLOTT. Second, I agree with the Senator that I do not think this group represents the bulk or anywhere near the majority of our fine students in this country. Personally, I have been disappointed that there has not been more of a coalescing of ideas by students who do not agree with this movement and a demonstration of initiative to thwart the illegal action that is taking place in our universities. I know that if I were in a university, and particularly if I were one of those students, of whom there are many here, who worked their way through school, as I did, and I saw myself being deprived of the education which the people of Colorado had supplied to me through my own State university and that I was supplying to myself through my own hard work, and I saw all that being pulled out from under me, I would resist it with every means at my command and I would do all I could to organize resistance to that effort.

There is no reason why students who are opposed to this movement cannot organize and make their voices heard on this sort of thing, instead of sitting by and acquiescing in it.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say that I agree 100 percent with what the Senator has said. I am happy to report that in the University of South Dakota, where we had a small manifestation of militants trying to disrupt orderly procedures on campus, those who did not agree, led primarily by returned veterans from the war in Vietnam, went in and bodily threw out the dissidents. Because dissidents are cowardly at heart, basically, they offered little resistance, and there have been no disruptions since then.

I read recently that in one of the universities in this Nation's capital, those who wanted an education, while demonstrators were trying to prevent that education, threw those dissidents out of their classrooms and their campus

strongholds and let things take their course back to normalcy again. The same thing happened at Howard University, here in Washington when dissidents tried to stop the law college students from taking their bar examination about a year ago. Those who wanted an education went in and threw out those who were trying to desecrate that educational institution and barricade and close down those classrooms.

I feel that the great majority of young Americans who attend college and who, we all know, are right-minded, ought to develop some kind of gumption and activism and determination against that militant minority, and not have to rely entirely on the administrators of colleges and universities.

I rose the second time primarily to point out that I think there is justification for the Federal Government, through its regularly established investigating subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, to dig into those matters, because they have now an impact on our defense establishment in time of war and in time of international peril, because the dissidents move in, with roving and moving targets at times, against the ROTC, under which program we train young officers who are badly needed in the services and against the implementation of defense contracts between the university and the Defense Department.

I was chagrined and disappointed to read in the newspapers today—for example—that a highly regarded American university, MIT, is pulling the flag down to half mast and thinking about replacing it with the white flag of surrender, when they say they are seriously thinking of eliminating any further contracts with the Federal Government dealing with defense. The world will still endure of course, if MIT surrenders. Other institutions will step in when MIT has failed. But it is a rather disgraceful thing to read why MIT has changed its attitude. MIT has been among the most aggressive in seeking such contracts and in urging Congress to increase the amounts it can get for administration purposes and for constructing new buildings, in connection with their contributions to the scientific know-how of the Federal Government.

Of course, MIT has a right to change its mind, but why is it doing so? It is changing its mind because the students are rebelling against having that kind of participation. That capitulation and surrender by such a university makes this a dark day when we read about it in the newspapers.

I sometimes think that the greatest sin in America today is the sin of "capitulationism". Some wish to capitulate because of the clamor against defending ourselves with antiballistic missiles when we are under attack. Some are ready to capitulate in Vietnam. They want to cut and run because things get a little rough, and so they are ready to capitulate. Some are ready to capitulate as world leader because it takes money and takes time. We are urged to go into isolationism, which is developing so fast some have already moved into complete "capitulationism." If there is no such a word as "capitulationism," some term must be coined to identify those who

want America and Americanism to surrender at every turn of the road, including, of all things, the surrender of a great university from its many contributions to the science and art of self-defense, because there is clamor on the campus and those who run the university so totally surrendered to mobocracy that they capitulate. I think that is a disgraceful situation which should call real concern to all supporters of a one great institution like MIT.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has expressed it very well. I could not agree with him more.

I would like to comment about the ROTC. One of the phoniest issues raised has been that of academic freedom. What about the student who wants to go to school and study under the Reserve Officers' Training Corps? Is it academic freedom to remove that program, and not permit it in the school, if that is what the student is interested in?

The fact is that these groups are trying to overcome the basic security in the principles we have always believed in—the principles of morality and of government—and so far they have seemed to be more successful in our schools and universities than I would have liked to see.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, and to compliment them for their forthright approach to a very serious problem.

I have myself spoken in the Senate on this subject several times this year. My view of the overall situation has been that it demands strong and immediate enforcement of the law, on the campus and in the public streets. In fact, I have wondered, as have millions of Americans, how collegiate lawlessness has been allowed to come as far as it has.

Anarchists on the Nation's college campuses—students and nonstudents alike—have got to be denounced for what they are. Based on their past performances over many months and in fomenting strife at 38 colleges and universities in just the month of March alone, it should be plain to everyone by now, including even the most liberal dogooders, that these people are troublemakers of the worst sort. They are lawbreakers bent on destruction that pose a menace to all our society.

They have banded together in the militant and revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society movement, and spread their hate and discord all across the Nation. There are other such organizations that go by other names, but they all fall in the same radical category. Students for a Democratic Society is an extremely leftwing, and probably Communist-oriented organization. I suspect the fact that SDS leans far to the left and is supposed to be liberal is part of the answer as to how and why this movement has come so far. If this movement were rightwing or politically conservative, I believe it would have been crushed long ago by the wrath of American citizens whipped up by the liberal establishment.

If these students demonstrated and stirred up disorder and tried to pull peo-

ple to the right, for example, by calling for more vigorous prosecution of the war in Vietnam in order to protect the lives and the safety of the half million men we have fighting there; or by advocating more and stronger college courses in the American heritage and patriotism, or by pushing for stricter academic and scholastic requirements to improve the quality of higher education, or by demanding more individual responsibility instead of special privileges.

I believe the movement would have been doomed to public disaster long ago. It would have been vilified by the ultra-liberal press, television, and radio. Some Members of the Congress whose names automatically become headlines would have leaped to their feet to join the tirade and called upon the conscience of America to strike this movement from our midst.

Its goals would have been denounced. Its leaders and their lives would be probed all the way back to the cradle. They would be held up to scorn and ridicule in every way possible. There would be a barrage of newspaper series and television documentaries to discredit such a so-called right-wing movement. It no doubt would be branded as un-American and a threat to intellectual and academic freedom. And soon it would fade into obscurity and disrepute.

There are of course conservative elements on our campuses who endeavor to impress their point of view on their fellow students. But they do not riot and demonstrate, which is to their credit. And I might add that I find some of their aims and goals much more desirable than the destructive intent of their opposite numbers in SDS and other such outfits.

But what presently plagues the Nation and its colleges and universities is not a so-called right wing movement. It is left wing. It is supposed to be liberal. Thus, it has gone virtually unscathed. And because it has not been stopped, nor even slowed down, it grows in strength and in violence.

So long as such students persist in lawlessness, I cannot understand how they are permitted to stay on campus. Nor can I understand how professional agitators are immune from prosecution.

We have had rebellious and riotous students being allowed to create havoc, to inflict great property damage, to endanger the well-being of their fellow students, to hold university administrators hostage at gunpoint, and to in fact literally close down educational institutions.

Then what do we see?

Administrators and officials of these colleges bowing down in supine resignation.

There are increasing pressures for Federal intervention and Government sanctions. As I remarked in an earlier address in the Senate, it may come to that. But first we should look to the first line of defense against crime, whether it be crime in the streets or crime on the campus.

This is basically a local responsibility. First, colleges and universities should lay down rules and regulations against illegal demonstrations and enforce them with every resource at their command. Second,

if they cannot do the job, there are State and local police who can.

This is admittedly a hard-line approach. But unless the country plans to turn its colleges and universities over to a bunch of radical hoodlums, this is what it is going to take to restore law and order on campuses.

We have had too much pampering and acquiescence. What we need now is more respect for the law, by students, by professors, and by administrators.

I want there to be no mistake about the kind of student that I am talking about. I do not refer to the youth of America in general. I am convinced that this group of anarchists represents a woefully small percentage of American students. An overwhelming majority of the Nation's college and high school people are loyal, patriotic, and hard-working. Youth today has a deeper sense of responsibility, and they are better educated and more intelligent than any generation in the history of our country. It is the anarchists that need to be dealt with, and not youth in general.

Mr. President, there appeared in this morning's Washington Post a column by Roland Evans and Robert Novak recounting some of the events leading up to the anarchy that prevailed at Cornell University.

This is a revealing and shocking account of the permissiveness of college officials in dealing with lawless students. It tells the story of what has been taking place all across the country as well as anything I have seen yet.

I bring this article to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TALMADGE. Again I compliment the distinguished Senator from Colorado for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I think it is most urgent that the overwhelming majority of Americans, young and old, students and non-students alike, be alerted to the importance of this matter, and that we urge and hope that our college administrators will do what they can to restore tranquility, peace, order, dignity, and education on our college campuses.

EXHIBIT 1

ANARCHY AT CORNELL AND HOW IT GREW FROM MILITANT MOVES OF DECEMBER

ITHACA, N.Y.—The surrender last week of Cornell University's Administration to rifle-toting black militants, a new precedent in the national campus civil war, was no isolated incident but rather the climax of deepening anarchy here.

Despite the official Cornell line congratulating itself on a peaceful escape from bloodshed, there is no doubt that President James A. Perkins accepted the black demands in an atmosphere of coercion. While armed Negroes were occupying a university building, lesser publicized events had so terrorized a majority of the faculty and student body that they were eager for appeasement.

Responding to threats broadcast over the radio, faculty members branded as "racists" were forced to evacuate their homes for the night. One black student who openly opposed the resort to force was spirited across the border into Canada for safekeeping by friends. Unidentified rifle shots fired at a

classroom building aggravated the tension. Moreover, the burning cross which supposedly forced black militants into armed insurrection is widely believed here to have been set by Negroes themselves.

That this lovely upstate New York campus could be so deformed by strife is in part attributable, ironically, to Perkins' well-meaning liberalism in recruiting black students, many of whom were ill-equipped for Cornell's academic demands. This inadequacy led some young Negroes into increasingly more belligerent postures here. Cornell's administration, faculty, and students, bearing an immense guilt complex toward Negroes (freely admitted by Perkins), could not bring themselves to impose discipline.

The watershed event came in the spring of 1968 when three Negro students, infuriated by an economics professor's classroom contentions about the superiority of a Western civilization, seized the offices of the economics department and held the department's chairman prisoner. When the Perkins administration did not press charges against the students, it flashed the green light for anarchy.

Pushing an action campaign for an autonomous black studies program, the militants moved on many fronts last December: The takeover of a university building (actually promised them for a later date) with professors and their belongings dispossessed into the street, the theft of furniture to furnish the building, dancing on dining hall tables, disruption of library stacks.

Perkins' permissiveness and the black militants' contempt were graphically exhibited during these December demonstrations when black militants staged a sit-in outside Perkins' office. Trying to make friends, Perkins sent out doughnuts and milk. The militants responded by smashing the refreshments against the wall.

Even more bizarre was an incident two months later when the Afro-American Society demanded \$2,000 from the administration to buy bongo drums to celebrate Malcolm X day. Within two days, the administration scraped together \$1,700 and dispatched two black student leaders down to New York City in the university plane to purchase the drums.

But pressed by a few faculty members, the administration did reluctantly bring charges against six of the more flagrant December demonstrators. Consequently, once the blacks won their demand for an autonomous black studies program early this year, radicals stepped up direct action around a general theme of amnesty for the six demonstrators.

To the accompaniment of the university-purchased bongo drums, Perkins on Feb. 28 was physically pulled down from a speaker's platform at a conference on South Africa. A few days later, job recruiters from the Chase Manhattan Bank were physically assaulted. In mid-March, three white students were beaten at night on campus—one to the point of death; two of the victims identified their assailants as Negroes while the third was in no condition to identify anybody.

Thus, as spring came to Cornell, wholly non-political students decided it would be prudent not to stroll the quadrangle at night. Simultaneously, Perkins became the open target of derision by the black militants, who wore sheathed knives in their boots during conferences with him. In one such meeting, a leader of the Afro-American Society described Perkins to his own face with an obscenity widely used in the black ghetto.

Behind the scenes, Perkins' lieutenants were quietly prodding the faculty to quash the charges against the six December demonstrators—a surrender the faculty finally agreed to last week in the atmosphere of armed insurrection.

In an interview, Perkins told us he intends to stay on as president of Cornell and feels he has full confidence from the board of

trustees. If he is correct, his method of buying peace on the campus may well become the pattern for college administrators around the country. The implications for Cornell as an educational institution and for liberal education in America generally will be discussed in another column.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia very much. I agree with the point he has made, that if this had been a group of rightwingers, perhaps suspected of being sponsored by the Minutemen of America, or similar rightwing organizations, their presence in the university halls would not have been tolerated for 5 minutes, and all of the great liberals in the country, or so-called liberals, would have been screaming to get those Fascists out of there.

Now we have the same kind of action coming from the other end of the spectrum. I agree with the Senator most heartily that the responsibility is basically a local responsibility, beginning with the university officials; and if it is not assumed, then it will be difficult to stop this movement.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I compliment the Senator from Colorado and join in the remarks of the Senator from Georgia in complimenting and congratulating him.

Mr. President, this is a serious situation that the SDS has precipitated, and I wish to call attention to just two features of it in a very brief way, if I may.

It seems to me that these young people do not realize that they are being given a wonderful opportunity to obtain an education which they are surrendering in part as to their own opportunity. They are given that opportunity either out of public funds largely or out of the contributions of well-intentioned citizens who, having made fortunes under the American system, want to extend some of the benefits of their own opportunity to American youth.

I think that they have not realized that they are the beneficiaries of a fine thing which is happening under the American system. That is that a largely free educational opportunity is being afforded them as individuals. They are forfeiting this opportunity because of their frustration or their bad motives, whichever the case may be.

I think it is even more important that these students constitute only a minority of the total number of students and by their action, they are preventing the majority of students from obtaining the maximum benefit of their opportunity to receive an education in these days when an education is so much more necessary than it has ever been heretofore.

The campus unrests result from acts on the part of SDS activists that are not only senseless so far as they are concerned but are also highly inconsiderate and senseless insofar as deprivation of others is concerned.

It seems to me that it is so clear that every means available must be used—whether it means calling in outside forces of law and order or appealing in the first instance to the faculty which should by

all means respond to the proper sort of appeal from the executive and administrative officials or whether it is a matter of an assertion of the public interest and the interest of the parents and others who are seeking so eagerly to give their youngsters a chance for an education. This thing has got to be stopped.

I was disturbed by some casual comments in the press that came to my attention. The press has given entirely too much comment to the anarchist elements in the SDS itself. One of the governors of Harvard University said that two things disturb them very greatly.

One is that the members of the group, which is large in number but small compared to the entire student body, which had instituted a sit-in and takeover of the dean's office and the files, including the private files of the university, consisted, it was discovered on close checking, of a sizable number of individuals who were unknown to everyone on campus. These individuals were not members of the student body. They were not members of the faculty. They were activists from some outside source. They may have been Communists. I do not know. I could not so charge because I do not know. But they certainly were troublemakers who were willing to tear down and destroy the very foundation of the temple of education. And they are troublemakers of the great magnitude.

Another thing which disturbs the governors of Harvard is that they found in the faculty so many members who were willing to be openly encouraging to the anarchist leaders of the demonstration. This is a matter of the very deepest concern to the head officials of Harvard University.

I do not know what the answer is. But I do know that in the part of the country which I represent in part here in the Senate, we have had very little of this kind of disturbance.

I do know that in the three colleges where I have for a long time served as trustee, and in which I am now the trustee emeritus in each case beginning last year, and the University of Florida where I have been a member of the executive committee of the alumni for some 40 years, we have had no trouble.

I cannot give a reason for this except that the youngsters must be willing to more highly value their own opportunity and be more considerate of those who do value more highly their opportunity for an education, or else they are better disciplined.

In every instance the presidents of those institutions have made it clearly known that anyone who breaks the law and is guilty of violence on the campus will be speedily ejected from the student body or, if necessary, from the faculty, and that there will be no indisposition to call on outside forces to keep law and order.

It is possible that in some instances, at least, the college and university administrators have not been willing to assume responsibility. If that is true, that is something about which our whole public should be concerned.

As far as I am able to say, it seems to me that greater firmness and greater support by the public of the law-abiding

element are required and that the schools should command greater support of the peaceful inclinations of students, on the part of their parents and the communities from which they come. This is absolutely necessary.

Somehow or other we have to cut out of the heart of our system of education this thing which threatens to become a cancer and destroy the whole.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I compliment him for making the speech he has made. I hope that it will be carried far and wide through the media of the country. I think the country needs it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his always helpful remarks. I have no doubt that the healthful situation in Florida has been due to no small extent to his own leadership.

In this respect, last year there was such a sit-in at the University of Denver. The chancellor of that university, Dr. Maurice B. Mitchell, dealt with that matter in a very firm and forthright manner. I think that some 41 or 42 students were promptly expelled from the university.

Last week he received demands which were made upon him in an anonymous letter. Since there was no one to answer and the letter called on the university to meet absurd demands, the chancellor took to the newspapers and answered every one of the demands in a clear and explicit manner.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate that particular university president. As the Senator well knows, we in public life learn to pay little attention to anonymous letters. I am glad that the president of the University of Denver seized the occasion to meet the charges and claims included in the anonymous letter, even though he could not know who sent it.

We have to use every medium we can to meet this threat to higher education. I hope that the Senator will, for me, when he writes to his friend, the president of the University of Denver, congratulate him on what he has done.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the letter was unsigned and contained no address. However, it was reported to be from the Students for a Democratic Society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter to which I have referred, together with the enclosures.

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

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER,
COLORADO SEMINARY,
Denver, Colo., April 28, 1969.

HON. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: We have had a threatened incident at the University of Denver, and I thought you might like to see the demands and ultimatum, together with my response.

My hope is that the response will provide the majority of students and faculty with understandings that will help them deal with any threatened action of an improper kind on the part of those who issued the ultimatum.

We have had a quiet campus since April 30, 1968, when we dealt promptly and vigor-

ously with a sit-in. If any improper action results from this episode, we will again take whatever action is necessary to stop it at once.

As always, your comments, criticisms or suggestions would be welcome.

Sincerely,

MAURICE B. MITCHELL.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER,
April 26, 1969.

To: Students at the University of Denver.
From: Maurice B. Mitchell, Chancellor.

On Friday, April 25, I received a special delivery letter, contained in a plain envelope, bearing no return address or other sender identification. It contained a single sheet of typewritten matter, unsigned, bearing the heading "Declaration of Student Demand." A copy of this message is attached. Before the letter was received in my office, copies were being distributed on campus to individual students and faculty members. Other copies were posted in various places, and several were supplied to news media.

In the absence of any named source to whom a reply can be addressed and in view of the general distribution given this "Declaration of Student Demands", I am making general distribution of these comments in the hope that they may serve a useful purpose at this time.

I do not believe that the authors of the demands and ultimatum of April 25 represent "the students of the University of Denver . . . the community of Denver . . . the people of Colorado." Such a statement is the familiar language of the self-appointed custodians of the rights of others. It is an impertinence to assume that those groups would authorize such a threatening document, and I can only assume that this was done to provide some flimsy justification for improper action on, before, or after April 30.

The letter is, in any event, a gross insult to the student body of the university. Many of them, black students and white students alike, have spent long hours during the current academic year in constructive discussion and action relative to some of the matters mentioned in this list of demands. It is clear to observers of this year's activities that important progress has been made in the areas of principles of student life, the involvement of students in a wide variety of university activities previously not open to them, and in such policy matters as the new disciplinary code and its related procedures. Students, faculty, administration and trustees have joined on countless occasions in hundreds of hours of planning and constructive discussion and action. There has been goodwill, mutual respect and faith in the common goal of building a better university. To fling arbitrary demands and an ultimatum into this situation is to confirm what most students already know about the authors of this letter: their interest is in violence, ruthless destruction and confrontation leading to disaster. It is the same sordid tactic that has brought disaster to other campuses, fanned hatred, destroyed valuable facilities, interrupted the studies, teaching and research activities of thousands of scholars and students, and dissipated millions in tuition fees.

I do not for one moment believe that DU students will permit themselves to be deceived by these tactics, and I am confident that they will again demonstrate their disdain by holding themselves aloof from the present and future activities of the irresponsible few.

With regard to the "demands", the following comments may be useful:

1. *A Black Controlled Black Studies Department.* No such department is contemplated by this university, now or in the future. A number of courses relevant to this area are already listed in the catalog of the university, administered by the departments best equipped to handle them. Some have been taught for several years—the area is

not new to DU. Other courses are in planning, while still others are the subject of study and discussion.

In discussion with some black students this year, the suggestion was made that they visit other universities where special courses in black and other cultures were being taught, with an eye toward bringing back information that would be of value to various departments here. That activity is, to the best of my knowledge, still a firm plan and the study trip is expected to take place shortly. It may well result in improved course content and new offerings in DU's general curriculum.

This university's lack of interest in any special Black Studies Department grows, in part, out of its desire to reduce the number of individual departments. It is increasingly clear that inter-disciplinary studies play a valuable part in a contemporary and relevant university experience. The road to this is not in the development of more isolated cubicles of subject matter, but exactly the reverse. At this university, there are already important inter-disciplinary relationships between sociology and political science, sociology and law, political science and international studies, law and international studies, and business and engineering, for example. In these and other cases, the total value is usually greater than the sum of the individual parts. There will be more development in this direction, and we expect the results to be of benefit to students of all races and origins.

The university understands and respects the great pride felt by minority students in their own cultural backgrounds and history. On the other hand, it believes that there is little to support the belief that an academically sound curriculum or department can be built that is limited to a single racial group. There is the real probability that such a unit would have to be built on shallow and inadequate scholarship which would not permit standards of content and genuine achievement commensurate with university standards. It would be a cruel deception to offer a "black studies program" that did not require intellectual opportunities equal to those required in other areas of study.

DU is and will continue to be intensely interested in opportunities to broaden its offerings to overcome such deficiencies as may have existed over the years in the area of minority cultures. These offerings will be added to its catalog as time goes on. Many other colleges and universities are engaged in similar development, and it may well be that the departmental organization or course structure elsewhere will be more attractive to some students. In such cases, transfers can usually be arranged. It is not unusual for university students to move about in search of studies of special interest to them, and all colleges and universities differ in their emphasis in various study areas.

2. *Second. A Black Controlled Recruiting and Admissions Program.* The university has no present intention of dividing its recruiting and admissions programs into various racial compartments. We recruit in many areas and in many kinds of secondary schools, public and private, predominantly black, Spanish, or white. Admission is based on demonstrated ability to do college-level work or on other evidence that an applicant is likely to be able to earn a degree. The university realizes that there is a greater interest in college enrollment today than ever before on the part of students in the minority areas, and has steadily broadened its recruiting areas to include contacts with such students. The appointment of a black staff member to the admissions staff has been approved and such a staff addition may be announced soon. The advice and guidance of black students in the admissions area will be sought to a greater extent.

Nevertheless, DU is a modestly-endowed, far-from-affluent private university with inadequate means to supply the kind of schol-

arship aid—usually total tuition and housing support—that is generally required by minority-group students. With inadequate scholarship funds from outside sources (unlike many other states, Colorado does not provide any scholarship funds to private colleges and universities), DU allocates 10% of its total tuition income to scholarship aid. More than a third of its students use these funds, loan funds and Federal funds, plus income from part-time jobs, to defray tuition and housing costs. The great majority of its financially-aided students are able to provide some part of these expenses on their own.

Tuition at DU (effective next September) is \$1,875. Housing costs increase this by approximately \$1,100. To add 100 fully-supported students to each class over the next four years would require funds in the amount of at least \$2,875,000—almost three times the existing scholarship funds. One must also consider, in addition to these figures, the loss of \$500 per year—often called the "unrecorded scholarship"—the university bears on every student, full-scholarship or otherwise.

With low-tuition education available in every state at its state colleges and universities, the modestly-endowed university cannot hope to attract or support important numbers of students requiring full support. It can only hope that as incomes and living standards increase in the minority groups, its ability to attract students from such groups will increase. Until this day or until Federal or state funds increase, a kind of economic discrimination seems inevitable—and this is a source of deep concern and great regret.

Despite these seemingly insurmountable problems, a group of interested students and faculty members have been meeting with the admissions staff to plan programs that will attract and serve the special needs of minority-group students. Efforts to obtain funds from new sources are planned, and there is every reason to hope that DU will, to the extent of its ability and a genuine willingness, be able to enlarge its services to these special students.

3. *Three. A Proportional Representation of Black Faculty Members.* The university faculty would, in my opinion, be delighted to welcome black scholars to its ranks. Since it is unlikely that a proportional representation of black scholars actually exists—it will, hopefully, be a reality sometime in the future—it is unrealistic to assume that the nation's universities will be able to reach this goal at this time. A similar situation exists in most professional fields—law, engineering, and medicine, for example. To award faculty status on the basis of sympathy or goodwill would serve no useful purpose to black or white students—and such a policy would simply result in a lowering of the standards of teaching, research, and scholarship.

There are many competent black scholars at work in black colleges and universities throughout the nation, but to "raid" such institutions would be a cynical and destructive practice, designed to improve one segment of the nation's institutions of higher learning at the expense of another. Some black students argue heatedly that the black colleges should be raided and even forced to close, but others seem to want new black colleges to rise within the framework of other colleges. The decisions to be made here are not easy ones, and they are certainly not likely to be made intelligently and constructively as the result of "demands" and threats by extremist groups. The faculties, in their wisdom and sound judgment, will make them and I do not feel that one can charge the DU faculty with prejudice in this regard.

Again, as in so many other areas where great heat has been generated, time works in favor of a solution. As increasing numbers of minority-group students move through our universities, there will be a larger pool of such persons available for faculty assign-

ment. Many of the things happening today contain built-in solutions to the problems that seem so acute. Time now works inexorably in favor of those—all of us, really—who hope for racial balance in faculty as well as students at our universities.

4. *The Immediate Dismissal of Stan Albeck, as Head Basketball Coach.* Mr. Albeck is not about to be dismissed. My observation has been that he is a fine, decent, dedicated athletic specialist with a personal background and history of service in his field that belies any accusation that he is racist. As a new coach, he established his own standards of performance, including a demanding program of physical conditioning. He used his own guides for the evaluation of his team. Not every member of his team agreed, and some resisted his coaching techniques. He dropped some players from his squad, was faced with much dissension (some of it inflamed by outsiders seeking to use this as an issue) and had a poor first season as a result. He has worked hard at recruiting, at increasing student interest in and support for his team, and at rebuilding the university's basketball fortunes.

I do not doubt that Mr. Albeck has made some errors of judgment and execution. These go unnoticed when you have a championship team—they are magnified when you've got a loser. And in the heat of competition, especially as the losses mount, tempers flare and things are said and done by coach and players that are regrettable. When such incidents occur, during games or during training or practice, the university Faculty Committee on Athletics is promptly notified, and the incidents are carefully reviewed. The Director of Athletics is similarly informed and is a close observer of the actions and performance of every coach and intramural leader. These groups have voted their support of Coach Albeck. They have made recommendations with regard to certain policies which Mr. Albeck has been quick to adopt. The university supports this situation.

Because emotions still run high among some basketball players, I have invited them—long before these demands were made—to attend a meeting in my office with Hoyt Brawner, Stan Albeck and members of the Faculty Committee on Athletics. Open and frank discussions will be encouraged and complaints will be heard with close attention. This is the proper procedure for dealing with such matters and I expect all concerned to participate with vigor and a genuine interest in the sports program of this university. Racism will not be tolerated in sports any more than it will be tolerated elsewhere in DU—but I am presently of the opinion that it simply does not exist.

I happen to be a sports fan and a DU sports enthusiast. I've been proud of every DU team I've ever watched—win or lose—and I hope it will always be that way.

Fifth. *The Creation of Additional Departments Relevant to the Needs of Other Third World Peoples, Including Chinese and Orientals.* My comments earlier in this statement, relative to a "black only" department, apply here as well. The university believes that it can serve all students, regardless of race, color, or origin, in a far better fashion by reducing departmental barriers and isolation and by fostering inter-disciplinary studies. Some students may simply want to attend a university to study only their own cultural heritages. For such students, DU will be a poor choice. My belief is that such a choice would, in any event, be a poor use of the facilities generally available to those who seek a truly valuable and broad-based experience in higher education.

Sixth. *Immediate Implementation of the Student Bill of Rights (1968) as the Only Legitimate Document Governing Student Life at the University of Denver.* This is an absurd and exasperating "demand" and

truly reveals the blind and bitter nature of the group that presented this ultimatum. From the very beginning the DU student body has expressed its interest in working with faculty, administration, and trustees toward the creation of a statement that clearly defines the principles of student life on this campus. After almost a year of discussion, conferences and constructive effort, the document now stands ready for general adoption, and it seems clear that this "demand" is a frenzied effort to torpedo all this work and create an artificial issue and crisis in its place.

The fact is that many elements of the earlier "Bill of Rights" necessitated the approval of the faculty. They, too, have their rights and some of these were invaded by the original bill. Accordingly, students and faculty have held extensive discussion and the University Senate—dominated and led by faculty, but with students as ex-officio members and as committee members with full vote—made these matters the subject of serious debate. It is gratifying to note that ultimate agreement was reached on practically every issue, and this is a great tribute to all involved, as well as an indication of the progress that can be made when matters are handled in this way.

The newly-drafted Principles of Students Rights, soon to be offered for approval to students and trustees, is the first of its kind in the history of DU. It is a remarkable statement of the conditions under which students will govern their own student life, enjoy full protection as individuals under "due process", be protected in privacy, and enter into the wide range of activities and decision-making process that affect the entire university. Although many of these principles have existed since the founding of DU, they have not been clearly stated and codified, and all of us who have been engaged in this unprecedented effort view the results as a real step forward in the maturing relationships between the different elements of the university community.

It would be a genuine tragedy if cynical action, designed only to reserve an "issue" in desperation and before it disappears, destroyed all this work and the good will and mutual understanding that has been created. It is, of course, the very purpose of "demands" of this kind to destroy such evidences of progress.

Seven. *An Immediate End to All "Classified Research" on Campus.* This refers to the Denver Research Institute, which is a part of the university and which is conducting some research activities—representing only a single area of its widespread activities—for the government of the United States that are secret. I am personally familiar with these activities. They are not addressed to results that could in any way do harm to individuals, in the military or in the general public, either in this country or elsewhere. Quite the reverse. The research institute will continue to conduct such activities through the life of its contracts and any renewals thereof that seem acceptable to it.

The whole matter of secret research has been the subject of much debate, on and off university campuses, in recent years. Some institutions have allowed themselves to engage in activities that are clearly unsuitable, and not every judgment in this area has been made with the detachment and concern for the advancement of the general state of knowledge that should apply.

Yet the university, whose research staffs and facilities were often provided by the people of this country through their public funds, in exchange for the special values these represent to the nation as a whole, does have an obligation to serve its country. There may always be kinds of research and investigation that can best be done in university research facilities and with its scarce resources in the form of gifted scholars and

scientists. Some of this may, in the public interest, be best conducted in absolute privacy, shared only with the responsible agencies of the government, whose members are, in the end, responsible to the people and their elected representatives. The university and its research agencies have the responsibility, in every case, of deciding whether such work does truly serve the constructive needs of society as well as the interests of its students and faculty.

The activities of the Denver Research Institute of DU have made it possible for students and faculty to engage in a wide range of important research and development activities that would otherwise have been beyond its means. It has brought scientists, mathematicians, and technologists to our campus who would not otherwise have been available. Many of these share their tasks, serving as faculty members engaged in teaching as well as researchers engaged in Institute projects. And even at the Institute, dozens of students engage in research, in the writing of reports and in teaching activities that couldn't have happened otherwise. The very "classified research" referred to in the "demands" has produced a large number of scientific papers that are in general distribution and available to all scholars.

It is not necessarily the case that classified research is evil research. It is not necessarily the case that classified research is concerned with destruction or the instruments of war. Many of the people who denounce secret study are, today, content to let secrecy be the condition under which vital discussions leading to the U.S. retreat from Vietnam take place. As long as the decisions about classified research are made by responsible scholars, scientists, public representatives, and others in a position to judge the validity of the activities—and as long as cynical desire to pump funds into a university at any cost is fully contained—there will probably be a place for research conducted under conditions where the ongoing results are not immediately available as public information.

Eighth. *Students Employed by the University Have a Uniform Wage Scale and Minimum Wages be Paid (sic) to Any Employee of \$1.60 Per Hour.* All students employed by the university are paid in accordance with the legal minimums that are applicable (and many are paid, depending on the kind of jobs they have, at substantially higher rates). If the "demand" suggests that this is not the case, then it is clearly in error and probably deliberately so. To insist that all students earn the same hourly rate is to ignore the great differences in jobs. People don't earn the same hourly rate on the outside either, except perhaps in communist or socialist societies.

Many jobs at DU are deliberately created to help students defray expenses. And some students do far less work than they are paid for (these are, interestingly enough, almost always the ones who complain about hourly rates). Thus, in addition to its large scholarship aid expense, the university often puts substantial funds into "made work" for some students.

If this "demand" would require that any student, doing any kind of work, be paid at a "uniform rate" equal to every other student doing every other kind of job, then the university rejects this as unfair and absurd on its very face. If the "demand" is that DU honor minimum wage laws, I can only reply to the effect that it is my understanding that we are already in conformance. There is nothing to "demand."

It should be noted that some present legal hourly minimums require increasing rates over the next three years, in yearly increments. The university expects to continue to pay these legally-stated rates.

It should be further noted that many students have come to realize that some minimum hourly rates actually mitigate against

their employment in off-campus situations. Some jobs previously available to students have disappeared because they cannot be justified under existing rates.

Nine. *The University and its Employees Stop All Harassment, Intimidation and Threats Made Against any University Employee Who Wishes to Belong to Any Organized Labor or Professional Union.* This is a "when will you stop beating your wife?" type of "demand". It is sheer nonsense. The maintenance employees of the union signed a contract with DU last September, and nobody has harassed, intimidated, or threatened anybody in that regard. I am informed that we have had good relationships with our union employees, whose services we value and for whom we have great respect. In the many months preceding the formation of the union, I have no doubt but that there were differences of opinion, but the differences are long gone, the situation is without tensions, and the "demand" borders on the irrational. More accurately, it is an effort to stir up trouble where none exists.

A number of members of the university faculty belong to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). They play an active role in the university community and have often offered constructive and thoughtful recommendations on vital issues. They would be the first to deny that they have ever been mistreated in any way by reason of their membership in this professional organization. Again, the "demand" is an unfounded effort to inflame.

Ten. *Chancellor Mitchell . . . send a Memo to All University Employees Informing Them of Their Right to Join a Union.* This "demand" is an insult to the intelligence of DU's staff. Their right to join a union or any other organization is clearly protected by law and is, I am sure, quite well known to all.

Most of the students who participated in the preparation of this unsigned "Declaration of Student Demands" are known to me. They, and those from outside who help them, proceed largely from a base of genuinely shocking hatred of other students. It is essentially this hatred of other students, as the real symbols of the university, that drives them to seek violence, bloodshed, the destruction of the university's facilities and the interruption of the ongoing process of higher learning. It is they who refer to students as "too stupid to act", and "apathetic". This justifies, to them, their assumption of the rights of all students. Some of them are simply acting out childish and unrestrained aggression in a world that, in the process of protecting the general right to protest and speak out in criticism, seems to be willing to tolerate their tantrums and unrestrained license.

I have every confidence that the overwhelming majority of students at DU (as well as "the people of the community of Denver and the people of Colorado" and others everywhere) will refuse to be drawn into this incident. The work we are all doing to open up lines of communication and create a better university will continue. Responsible students in every area of DU—white, black, brown, orientals and others—will continue to work with their colleagues and friends in the faculty, administration and Board of Trustees, to lay the foundations and erect the framework of an institution of which we can all be proud for generations to come.

Finally, it is proper for me to say again that this university will not respond to demands, threats, ultimatums, or other forms of intimidation. It will not deal with those who approach it in this manner for any reason and in connection with any issues of any kind. It will meet and deal with any interruption in the ordinary activities of the university and any interference with the freedom of its students, faculty and staff to pursue their proper activities with every instrument at its disposal, promptly and vigorously.

DECLARATION OF STUDENT DEMANDS

We the students of the University of Denver, in order to make this University relevant to the people of Colorado as well as to its students, formulated the demands located below. We hereby present them to the University of Denver and demand that they be met by April 30, 1969, at 9 a.m. If at this time the University has not met these demands, the actions taken by the community of Denver, the people of Colorado and the students to implement these demands, will be determined by the responses of the administration. We demand:

1. We fully support the demands set down by the Black Student Alliance for:

(a) a Black controlled Black studies department.

(b) a Black controlled recruiting and admissions program.

(c) a proportional representation of Black faculty members.

(d) the immediate dismissal of Stan Albeck as Head Basketball Coach.

(e) the creation of additional departments relevant to the needs of other Third World Peoples, including Chicanos and Orientals.

2. Immediate implementation of the Student Bill of Rights (1968) as the only legitimate document governing student life at the University of Denver.

3. An immediate end to all "Classified Research" on campus.

4. We demand that the students employed by the University have a uniform wage scale and that the minimum wage paid to any employee be \$1.60 per hour.

Also that the University and its employees stop all harassment, intimidation and threats made against any university employee who wishes to belong to any organized labor or professional union. Furthermore, that Chancellor Mitchell send a memorandum to all University employees informing them of their right to join a Union.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I want to put a question that has been brought to mind by the remarks of my good friend, the Senator from Florida. However, I point out first that in my State of Arizona we have not had this trouble because several university presidents have plain old guts. They are backed up by the board of regents and the Governor. I think we will see this foolishness stopped when we see college presidents act with courage, such as the Senator related that the president of the University of Denver has.

The Senator from Florida talked about outside influences in these riots. I asked the Governor of California, Governor Reagan, not so long ago about the University of California and the problem there. He told me an astounding thing: that of 1,300 so-called students—of a total enrollment, I think, of approximately 80,000—there were fewer than 600 enrolled in the college, and these were the ones giving all the trouble.

The question I want to put to my able friend the Senator from Colorado—he is a lawyer and I am not—is to the point of these young people, and older people, I might say, because some of them look a little old, to me, to be going to college. Do we not have a law on the books of our Government that applies to people crossing State lines to incite riots?

Mr. ALLOTT. We do, and later in my remarks I shall discuss that and ask that the text of it be printed in the RECORD. It is in the 1968 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thought I recalled that being in the act, although I was not a Member of the Senate at that time and did not act upon it.

It would seem to me that the Attorney General of the United States—and I have reason to feel that he is pursuing this—can make a very needed contribution, as a first step, by bringing Federal action against the people who cross State lines to incite riots.

It has been my privilege to have been on over 200 campuses in this country during the past 10 or 12 years, and I have observed nothing but proper decorum, decent dress, decent young people—not that they agree, but when they disagree, they do it in an agreeable way. I have begged the news media of this country to visit these colleges and report what they see from the rostrums on which I have stood, speaking with these people who are decent and well mannered, even though they do not agree.

I am afraid that the press, the radio, and television of this country have overexaggerated the size of this. They have made it appear that every student in America is some kind of hoodlum, bent upon destroying the college system. This is not so. And again, so many times in the past, I think the press of America are missing an opportunity—no, a challenge, I might say—to prevent history from repeating itself.

The Senator from Colorado is close to my generation, and we can certainly remember when in the thirties the same kind of things were going on relative to ROTC. They were able to get ROTC taken out of the high schools, where one could take it at that time. They were able to stop the CMTC, which provided us with officers on a voluntary basis. They were using the same attacks we hear today. They were not students, any more than these people today are students.

These are people who represent a group that John Edgar Hoover has called the only active group he can put his finger on aimed at the destruction of the American system. I think it is time that the news media of this country—I think it is time that the columnists of this country—those people responsible for attempting to generate thought, give some thought to the insidious background of these people who are trying to destroy the Reserve officers training program, which provided almost 95 percent of our officers in World War II, and who are trying to have taken off the campuses the people who represent industry. These young people have to go to work.

To insinuate that everything we do in the universities is adding to the possibilities of war—I might just say that this morning, in the testimony by NASA, we brought out a point that illustrates this. Everybody who flies in an airplane in this country today is threatened, every time he goes up, with a midair collision, not because of the lack of aptitude on the controllers' part or the lack of ability of our radar to seek out, but we have no way of knowing exactly where.

One of the fallouts of a partial study by an institution and a study by NASA is the promise—I can say almost certain promise—that with Xeron lights we now have provided a basis for a system that is inexpensive and which I hope, when developed, can be used to promise safety in the air to every American who flies. This, in itself, if we did nothing else, is worth all the money we have spent to produce this.

I compliment the Senator from Colorado for bringing up a matter on the floor of the Senate that is long due.

To me, it is a national disgrace to hear and see what has gone on at institutions such as Harvard, Cornell, and California. But I just say thank God that we have hundreds of schools in this country whose presidents will not put up with the kind of rubbish and garbage we have seen crossing the halls of Harvard, Cornell, and California.

I am hopeful that the Senator's address today and the remarks which will accompany it will instill in the college presidents who have had weak backs a little stiffening, and will instill in the Governors of our States who have not backed up their college presidents a strength to do this.

It is time that we bring sanity to the campus and sanity to the whole outlook, because this is not a movement to disrupt only college campuses. It is a movement to disrupt high school campuses; it is a movement to disrupt the entire American system. I hope we can stamp out this evil thing, regardless of what law we must use to do it.

I compliment the Senator from Colorado. It is typical of his ever-present courage that he has done this.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank my good friend, the Senator from Arizona. He is eminently correct in his analysis of the situation. There has been an undue emphasis in some of the reporting of these events. I think we have to ask ourselves many questions.

For example, a friend of mine, who happened to be present in Cambridge at the time of the Harvard situation, said that in each group were professors, not just listening to the students, not trying to tell them, "This is the time we ought to have cool heads prevail, and we ought to talk about this," but actually inciting them to go in and take possession.

I am like the Senator from Arizona. I do not believe that these people constitute more than a small percentage of our students in this country.

One of my real purposes in coming at this question was simply this: I believe that we in Congress have the right, have the duty—and it is a moral duty which we cannot escape—to put ourselves and our courage on the line behind law and order in this country.

Certainly, when the pattern is so plain that the aim of these people is the complete disruption and destruction of our moral system and our educational system, I think it is time that we let the public, we let the Governors, and we let the heads of these colleges and universities know where we stand on this matter, clearly and unequivocally.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. Has my colleague from Colorado put in the RECORD the series of demands that were made on the University of Denver and the reply which was given by the chancellor?

Mr. ALLOTT. I did a few moments ago.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think it was an excellent response. Once again, it exhibits the courage of not only the head of the university, Maurice Mitchell, who is a very fine person, but also the courage of the faculty, which has stood behind him in his actions and warnings to the so-called revolutionists who are trying to create these problems.

I had the opportunity of discussing with an assistant dean of Brown University, on an airplane trip I took in February, the problem of the honest dissenters and the revolutionists.

He was particularly concerned about the fact that unless one dealt in a very careful style with those dissenters who have gone to the extreme of violence and physical "takeover," many members of the faculty of the university would jump on the side of those individuals and create an impossible situation for the university administration.

I believe this is part of the major problem we have within the universities—that some members of the faculty, in the so-called interest of academic freedom as opposed to administrative ability, have been going a little bit off base. Actually, they have been taking a position which is antagonistic to free speech, to the free educational process, and to the ability of a university to perform its function of education for all people, regardless of their race, creed, or color.

I thought Maurice Mitchell's memorandum to all students, a copy of which he sent my colleague, and a copy of which he sent to me, was very explicit on the point that the university was there to provide educational opportunity to all people, and that such demands would cut down on the ability of the university to perform that function. Such demands were totally unacceptable in Denver and should be elsewhere.

I hope that the words of the senior Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Arizona, and other Senators will be heard loud and clear on this point throughout the country.

I congratulate my colleague on a very fine statement and for bringing this matter into focus for all of the American people.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague very much. Both of us know the situation at the University of Denver, and we know many individual members of the faculty who have stood so well behind the chancellor. We are very proud of the record he and they have made.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado and other distinguished Senators who have spoken on this subject. I have enjoyed listening to the remarks of the senior Senator from

South Dakota, the junior Senator from Georgia, the senior Senator from Florida, and the junior Senator from Colorado. I wish to commend the senior Senator from Colorado for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time and, more than that, for bringing it to the attention of the country. This is a subject that needs to be discussed, and it is a subject about which the country needs to know how the Senate feels. I am happy to engage in this colloquy with the distinguished Senators who have preceded me.

Mr. President, on April 25 there was printed in the RECORD a newspaper article by Robert Betts. At this time I believe it would be appropriate to read excerpts from that article. Mr. Betts, in an article which was published in the San Diego Union, wrote as follows:

The average American sees only turmoil and shakes his head over the "impetuosity of youth."

Educators tell him—between frequent fires, bombings and other acts of sabotage and terrorism—that the young people have many legitimate grievances and that they need "patience and understanding."

Others oversimplify the problem and play into the hands of these who ridicule "Red-baiters," by attributing all criticism and protest to "the Communist conspiracy."

A bewildering assortment of youth protest movements add to the confusion—the Third World Liberation Front, Progressive Labor Movement, New Left Forum, W.E.B. DuBois clubs, Students for a Democratic Society, Young Socialist Alliance, Young People's Socialist League, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and dozens of others.

Communist activity inside such groups is so subtle and diversified that it is not always easy to distinguish between real enemies and well-meaning, misguided, would-be-reformers.

Whatever the radicals call themselves, democratic-socialist or Marxist-Leninist, progressive-laborite or Trotskyite, Stalinist or Maoist, white Castroite or black militant, so far as the Federal Bureau of Investigation is concerned, they are all the same color underneath—Red.

Distinction between such labels is irrelevant, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation points out, "because the basic objective of both New Left and old-line Communist and their adherents in our society is to completely destroy our form of government."

This matter goes far beyond riots and rebellions on college campuses; it is aimed at the complete overthrow of this Government. A similar observation was made by the Senator from Arizona just a moment ago. We all know these are merely minority groups on the college campuses. However, we should bear in mind that Castro was a member of a minority group at the outset and was able to take over Cuba, and that the Bolsheviks were able to take over Russia with a very small minority of the Russian people. We all know the strength of a dedicated and ruthless minority group.

The article to which I have referred goes on to state:

The leaders of campus violence make no secret of it. They travel from campus to campus making speeches and distributing literature calling for the overthrow of "bourgeois America."

Just as the Senator from Florida said a few moments ago, many of these people are strangers on the campuses they are seeking to take over. They have never been seen on the campuses before these riots and insurrections took place.

We hear a lot of discussion in this country by college administrators about academic freedom. They do not want to take the steps necessary to put down these revolts and rebellions because they think it would damage academic freedom.

I am more interested in the right of the great majority of the students on the campuses and their academic freedom to get the education they are paying for, that the Government is paying for, or that their parents are paying for.

I think that the great majority of the students who do want an education should let it be known that they do not favor these tactics of taking over these schools, and wrecking these schools and colleges; and I think they should take a stand against these tactics.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his remarks. I was aware of the article about which the Senator spoke.

At this point I do not have sufficient documentation to know the exact extent to which communism has infiltrated the Students for Democratic Society. I will say that their methods of operation and the tactics they employ align themselves very closely with Communist techniques and Communist ideology.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield briefly I would like to say further that I hate to see it become necessary to adopt additional Federal legislation at this point. I think we have sufficient Federal legislation already to accomplish a great deal in this area; Federal legislation that is not being used, legislation that would withdraw Federal assistance and Federal grants and loans to students who are participating in these riots and rebellions.

We also have the statute, as pointed out by the Senator from Arizona a few moments ago, making it a Federal offense to go across State lines for the purpose of inciting riots. All of these provisions of law could be used but none of them are being used. It is a local problem. It takes the willingness, the desire, and the determination of college administrators, and I believe that is the first step. Their backbones need to be stiffened. I believe that the speech the distinguished Senator from Colorado is making here today will serve notice on college administrators throughout the country that public opinion in this country is against the cowardly surrender of the campuses to insurgent revolutionaries. I believe that they need to know that. I believe that they need to call in the local police and use the local courts and get injunctions against rioters and revolutionaries. They need to fire disloyal faculty members. I am shocked at the great number of faculty members on campuses throughout the country who are disloyal to their institutions and, in many cases, to their country.

I think that the actions of college administrators, in many cases, have been nothing more or less than cowardly. I

believe that if they had been in the army and had fled or capitulated in the face of enemy attack, as they have done in the face of the onslaught of these revolutionaries, they would be in very serious trouble.

Thus, I feel that at the local level, with determination by local administrators, and by the force of public opinion, this battle can be won. We see the president of the San Francisco State University and the president of Notre Dame University with public opinion solidly behind them in the firm stands they have taken.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator very much for his helpful intervention.

Mr. President, last Tuesday, I issued an invitation to Senators to join me during proceedings of the Senate today to continue a discussion of appropriate measures to deal with this serious aspect of student disorders which continue to wreak havoc upon college and university campuses across the land. In previous remarks to the Republican Policy Committee, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 26 at page 7635, as well as the statement which I delivered before the Senate on Tuesday, April 29, I have attempted to outline the inexorable path of destructive progress which student revolutionaries, such as the SDS, have been making during the current academic year.

Information widely disseminated by the Students for a Democratic Society in Princeton, N.J., indicates a new period of escalating militancy commencing today and continuing until May 7. This new form of protest will be in the nature of a general student strike which according to them will continue "to build from the first day, not just because we have called it, but because of the nature and militancy of the 4-months struggle which has preceded it; posting the non-negotiability of the demands of the struggle."

Thus, Mr. President, it is clear that we have not yet reached the high-water mark of violence and disorder in our American academic institutions. Whatever happens in the future, however, it is clear that the tragic events of the past months presently challenge the thoughtful attention of every American dedicated to the principles of academic freedom. I am gravely concerned, lest the academic freedom to create, animated by tolerance and governed by mutual respect, will soon be irrevocably transformed into an anarchist license to destroy, swept along by tyranny, and dominated by fear.

Members of Congress have been spending a good deal of time discussing this issue with angry constituents, communicating with frustrated college administrators who have recently experienced these disorders, and seeking appropriate measures from the Federal armory of legislation to deal with the subject. As a result, a good deal of legislation has recently been introduced in this session of the Congress. Each of these bills seeks to protect the legitimate Federal interest which this Government has in preserving the integrity of our national investment in education.

In addition, Mr. President, in extemporaneous remarks before the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce here in Washington, President Nixon, while defending the right of students to dissent peaceably, also made it quite clear that the time has come for faculties, administrators, and trustees to demonstrate their capacity for firmness by standing up against these acts of violence. When campus administrators fail to discharge their responsibilities with firmness the obvious victims are those students who are sincerely sacrificing their time, money, and energy to fulfill their educational opportunities. No one weeps for them, of course, and no one seems to show much concern that their rights have been callously disregarded in the revolutionaries mad scramble for "relevant" democracy.

Mr. President, as a result of mounting violence and disorder on college campuses the Congress enacted into law several provisions designed to deal with this problem within the context of federally funded programs providing assistance to students. These provisions were written into section 411 of the Labor Department and Health, Education, and Welfare Department Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1969—Public Law 90-557—and section 504 of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1968—Public Law 90-575.

Recently, Secretary Finch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee to relate some of the practical problems which his Department has encountered in implementing these particular provisions of the law. In this regard, Secretary Finch observed:

I want to suggest three lines of thought in this connection:

First of all, as to present legislation on the termination of Federal assistance to students involved in campus disorders, we lack essential data. We have never maintained records of individual aid recipients and have no capacity to do so. Administratively, it is as difficult to catalog the 1.5 million students receiving benefits as it would be to lay down a uniform code of student conduct—and just as undesirable. We currently do not know much about the nature of those involved in disruptions, the numbers who receive Federal aid, or the numbers whose aid has been or will be terminated by the institutions charged with that responsibility. Both Section 411 and Section 504(a) require court convictions before aid may be terminated, and this may mean months or even years before the legal issues are resolved. These provisions have only been in force since October 1968, and so it is far too early to expect precise data on their practical effect.

Furthermore, some institutions quite properly do not wish to prejudice their positions in pending criminal proceedings by premature disclosure of information. But we are instituting various inquiries and instructions—which I will specify below—and hope, in time, that these will provide us with the hard data we need.

Second, despite this lack of data, I think it has become clear that the serious problems are posed by a tiny minority of students. Many are children of the affluent, of the middle- and upper-classes. Most aid recipients, on the other hand, are too busy maintaining grades and working to supplement their resources to spend much time on the

barricades. Thus, we must focus on the hard-core extremists, not the vast majority of hard-working students, and adapt the appropriate instruments of policy. We want to solve the problem, not to wield an indiscriminate bludgeon.

Finally, I think it is also clear that the problems disturbing our student generation are not entirely those of the university, although this has become the field of battle. Rather, the problems embody many of those burning social and political issues which range at large throughout our society. We cannot realistically demand that our universities resolve those conflicts which our society as a whole has not resolved. Nor can we assume, out of hand, that campus conflict is simply conflict for its own sake; in many instances, it is solidly based in legitimate grievance.

All our attempts to address these problems—the President's statement, my letter, and the enforcement mechanisms embodied in the recently enacted Congressional legislation—have sought to maintain a deeply-felt tradition as to the proper relationship of the Federal Government to institutions of higher learning. Precisely because the issues and problems vary from campus to campus, these institutions are best equipped to invoke the enforcement mechanisms set forth in the legislation, in light of their own judgment and experience. We hold, and we have attempted to express, a true regard for academic freedom.

That is the end of the quotation of Secretary Finch on this particular point.

I think it is clear from the observations of Secretary Finch that prior congressional efforts to deal in this area have not been entirely satisfactory. It was hoped, of course, that the provisions of the law to which I have just alluded might provide a necessary measure of assistance to those campus administrators by assuring them that the Federal Government would cut off Federal support to those students receiving some form of Federal financial assistance if they were subsequently convicted of participating in the disruption or seizure of property of such institutions.

It is no secret that previous officials at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare disagreed with the judgment of Congress in this particular area. Because of this disagreement no guidelines were ever issued by the previous administration to implement this appropriations mandate from the Congress. Instead, we had to wait until the new administration had the opportunity to provide the necessary guidelines for the benefit of college and university administrators.

I ask unanimous consent to have these guidelines, dated March 10, 1969, printed at the conclusion of my remarks today so that Members will be aware of the way in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has sought to implement the provisions of section 504 of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1968.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this point, I would like to point out that Secretary Finch, to his great credit, stated in his testimony before the House Education Subcommittee that he still expects colleges and universities to implement

these provisions of section 504 in good faith. Secretary Finch stated:

I have already observed that Section 504 is one of the tools the Federal government has provided to our institutions of higher learning to supplement—but not undermine—their own procedures for handling campus disorders. The law reflects, I believe, the judgement that the public interest in providing financial assistance also calls for terminating such assistance where there is an abuse of the opportunity provided. By an abuse, I mean the infringement of the rights of others who are part of the academic community, and of the institution's own right to conduct the business of higher education.

As with any provision of law, Section 504 demands compliance in good faith by those to whom it applies. So we expect that colleges and universities will strive in good faith to implement its provisions for aid termination where the facts disclose the "abuse" has taken place. Compliance in this sense is mandatory and, as I have already indicated, we have every good reason to believe educational institutions genuinely intend to comply.

At this point in time, however, Mr. President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not promulgated any guidelines for the implementation of the provisions of section 411 of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1969. It is my understanding that these proposed guidelines have been receiving the active consideration of the General Counsel's office and that we may expect to see them published at an early date. Since Public Law 90-557 will expire on June 30, 1969, I would earnestly hope that Secretary Finch will do everything in his power to be certain that these embattled college administrators and trustees are fully cognizant of the way in which the Congress has sought to provide them with a measure of relief in this particular area.

Mr. President, I think we need to retain a sense of balance here in what we may reasonably expect from these laws and the Health, Education, and Welfare guidelines. It is clear from the information which is being compiled from the conviction records of those who have been participating in these serious campus disorders that those who are receiving Government assistance are in the great minority. Hence, Federal legislation in this particular area at this time may be a little like hitting a tack with a sledge hammer.

For this reason, I believe that the most appropriate and reasonable course of action at this point is to call upon the Attorney General of the United States to request each of the U.S. attorneys in any area which has experienced campus disruption this year, and in any area in which they subsequently occur, to ask the Federal district judge of the appropriate judicial district to convene a grand jury for the purpose of determining whether any of the several Federal laws which are now on the books bearing on this question have been violated. Aside from the antiriot provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which prohibit any person from traveling in interstate commerce with an intent to incite, organize, encourage, or take part in a riot, and the very broad Federal conspiracy statute

under the provisions of title 18, United States Code, 371, I believe that there are many other appropriate Federal statutes which can deal effectively with this question. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks those provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 dealing with these antiriot prohibitions, together with 18 United States Code 371.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ALLOTT. It seems very clear to me, Mr. President, that we are dealing with a much broader issue than individual or isolated instances of student protest at the present time. Documents such as those issued by the SDS clearly indicate, beyond any reasonable doubt, that there is an active, aggressive national conspiracy to destroy by force and violence, including the use of dangerous weapons, the peace and dignity of the academic communities.

I must interpolate here, Mr. President, to say I referred in my remarks last Tuesday to a document which was handed out at East Denver High School. One document entitled a "Sex Relationship Inventory" was handed out to boys and girls in the high school which was so bad that I could not bring myself to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But, in addition, there were extended documents giving us an instructive and detailed course in how to construct destructive and explosive devices to help break down the buildings and other physical government assets that we have in this country.

Prohibitions against this, by the way, are contained in the Civil Rights Act, and I call the Attorney General's attention to this fact, because this particular document was apparently distributed—at least it said so on the face of it—by the SDS of Boulder, Colo.

Therefore, concurrent with my suggestion that the U.S. Attorney General be requested to call upon his U.S. attorneys to initiate grand jury proceedings, I would hope that the various attorneys general of the States would make a similar request of their local district attorneys to be sure that grand juries are convened on a local level for the purpose of determining whether any of the applicable laws of the several States have been violated.

Mr. President, in the great majority of these cases, the decision to prosecute these applicable Federal or local laws has been left to the individual discretion of the U.S. attorney, or his deputy, or the local district attorney. Although the Attorney General has indicated his intention to prosecute to the full measure of the law those professional agitators who are taking advantage of the freedom of this country in order to destroy the land, under the provisions of the applicable antiriot statute, we have seen no evidence to date of any active prosecution by any of the appropriate U.S. attorneys in areas where these riots have occurred.

Mr. President, I would remind Senators of the essential question: The art of violent confrontation is being per-

petrated with impunity upon the laws and dignity of society. It seems patently obvious to me that the time has long since passed for the appropriate Federal, State, and local interests to practice, fully within the law and in conformance with the Constitution, the art of lawful confrontation in return. The only essential difference here is that it is not for the destruction of society that we would confront these anarchists, but for its preservation.

Rather than hastily scrambling about for new Federal laws to deal with this question my suggestion is simply to take firm recourse to the processes of law which have sustained this country through similar periods of turmoil.

The fulcrum of justice in moments like these has always been recourse to the grand jury system. In one of the most unique concepts of Anglo-American jurisprudence the function of the grand jury has been to guard the rights and liberties of the people while at the same time insuring the preservation of the social order which forms the very fabric of safety for the people themselves. One can be certain that if the Minutemen or members of the Ku Klux Klan suddenly appeared at the office of one of these embattled deans and, with force of arms or violence, took over the premises in the name of all the "right thinking Americans" that the hue and cry for their scalps would be deafening. If local prosecution were withheld, or if campus administrators fell prey to their bravado, you can be sure that the more ultraliberal elements in the country would demand these grand jury proceedings. Why then when we see this kind of activity from the other side of the political spectrum, is there this reluctance, this timidity, this fear that we might be trampling upon the rights of a few misguided youths who are suffering from some sense of disillusionment with American society?

It seems obvious to me, Mr. President, that there is an inconsistency of approach here. To insure equal accountability before the bar of justice, the grand jury system has been endured, in order to arm citizens with the essential dignity of the law and the authority of the appropriate courts to assure the preservation and protection of the rights of all of the people and not just a few. Must we sit in helpless silence, and watch criminal anarchy be rewarded by academic amnesty while the momentum of this phenomenon threatens the very lifeblood of our society? Is there not a direct assault here, not only upon the dignity of the university but also upon the dignity of each and every sovereign jurisdiction where this riotous behavior has been allowed to continue?

It seems clear to me, therefore, that the grand jury system provides the unique opportunity for a random cross section of citizens of local communities to investigate and acquaint themselves with the purposes and activities of professional student revolutionaries, such as the SDS. Through their efforts, and the efforts of similar grand juries around the country

investigating such organizations, the essential conspiracy which I believe to exist will rapidly become a matter of wide public knowledge. The people themselves, armed with the right of legitimate inquiry may soon see that we have more here than a festering sore in the heart of our country. They may soon recognize this criminal anarchy as a cancerous growth which is rapidly sapping our national will, and eroding our capacity to resist these destructive influences.

The grand jury system has quite rightfully been called both the sword and a shield. It is a potent weapon in the hands of a vigorous prosecutor against crime or subversion; but it also shields the innocent against trumped-up charges or overzealousness on the part of public officials. The grand jury, discharging its responsibility as an informing and investigatory body, has the duty to inquire and investigate and decide from the evidence offered whether there is a prima facie ground for criminal prosecution as a result of the information brought before it. It certainly does not determine the guilt or innocence of any person accused, and as such cannot discharge heavy-handed justice in derogation of the rights of the accused.

Historically, grand juries flourished in England where there was a conflict between the rights of the crown and the rights of the subject, in order to secure the subject against oppression from unfounded oppressions by the crown. I would submit that today the sovereignty of the people is being unduly oppressed by the flagrant violations of the law from a minority of its members who have sought to take the path of violence and disruptions rather than that of mediation and reason. To this Senator, therefore, this fulcrum of justice can become a bastion of freedom replacing the barricades of tyranny as the arbitrator for the rights of all the people.

EXHIBIT 1

No. 7, MARCH 10, 1969

To: College and University Presidents, Coordinators of Student Financial Aid.
From: James W. Moore, Director, Division of Student Financial Aid, Bureau of Higher Education.
Subject: Student Unrest Provisions.

PART A—REPRINT OF HIGHER EDUCATION REPORTS
JANUARY 28, 1969

(This part of the discussion was prepared by the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare at the request of the Bureau of Higher Education. As noted, the discussion covers only the language of the Amendments, and not the language of the DHEW Appropriation Act, which will be subject of a later issuance.)

Last year as a result of the widespread incidents of violent and disruptive student demonstrations on university and college campuses the Congress enacted into law several provisions designed to deal with this problem within the context of Federally funded programs providing assistance to students. The provisions enacted under Section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-575) which relate only to programs supported by the Office of Education are discussed in greater detail below. Another provision, Section 411 of the Department of

Health, Education and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1969 (P.L. 90-557)* affects programs of the other constituent agencies of the Department as well as the Office of Education and will be discussed in greater detail in a separate issuance which is being developed at the Department level.

Section 504, Public Law 90-575

Section 504(a) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-575) provides in part that:

"If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c)."

If an institution of higher education denies an individual assistance pursuant to the authority described above, then any institution which the individual subsequently attends must deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to or for the direct benefit of such individual under any of the specified programs.

Section 504(b) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 provides:

"If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has wilfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c)."

The "programs specified" are the following:

- (1) The Student Loan Program (Title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958).
- (2) The Educational Opportunity Grants Program (Part A of Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965).
- (3) The Student Loan Insurance Program (Part B of Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965) insofar as loans guaranteed under the program are made by an institution of higher education.
- (4) The College Work-Study Program (Part C of Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965).
- (5) Any fellowship program carried under Title II, III, or V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 or Title IV or VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

* "No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan or a grant to any applicant who has been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction of any crime which involves the use of or the assistance to others in the use of force, trespass or the seizure of property under control of an institution of higher education to prevent officials or students at such an institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies."

In addition, Section 504(d) of the Act includes the following disclaimers:

"(1) Nothing in this Act, or any Act amended by this Act, shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent, disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions."

At the outset it should be noted that the provisions of Section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 operate in an entirely different manner than do the provisions of Section 411 of the DHEW Appropriations Act of the Fiscal Year 1969 even though the scope of the two sections overlap in some respects. The sanctions provided for under Section 504 apply only "if" the institution administering the aid in question decides to bring the appropriate statutory machinery into play. This contrasts with the provisions of Section 411 of the Appropriations Act where the restriction on the use of appropriated funds is automatic if a conviction of the kind described in that section has occurred.

However, once having followed the procedures and made the determinations required under Section 504(a) or 504(b), the sanctions called for by those sections must be imposed. Institutions acting under the authority referred to in section 504(d)(1) on the other hand would retain full control over the nature, extent, and duration of any sanctions which they impose.

The responsibility for the administration of Section 504 of P.L. 90-575 rests in each institution of higher education. Proper records must be maintained which reflect the basis for making any determination to deny assistance and in connection with sanctions imposed under Sections 504(a) or 504(b) the date of the commencement of such sanctions.

It is recognized that a number of questions may arise in connection with the application of Section 504(a) and (b) in a given case. Some questions involving State and local law (such as whether the individual concerned was convicted by a "court of record" and whether an element of the crime was the use of, or the assistance to others in the use of force, disruption, or the seizure of property) might best be discussed with the institution's legal counsel. It should also be noted that administrative determinations will have to be made as to whether the crime (in case of 504(a)) or the refusal to obey a lawful regulation or order of an institution (in the case of 504(b)) "was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution" and whether (in the case of 504(a)) the acts constituting the crime were designed "to prevent officials and students in such institutions from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies."

PART B—ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

For guidance of the college financial aid officer and other institutional officials, it may be helpful to think of the foregoing amendments together with existing law as falling into two general categories. Into the first of these general categories may be placed the various types of disciplinary actions which colleges have historically and traditionally employed in dealing with problems of student behavior. All of the student assistance programs specified under Section 505(c) Higher Education Amendments of 1968 carry a requirement that among other conditions of eligibility, the student recipients must be

in good standing. Thus, suspension, expulsion, or other disciplinary action which results in student removal or exclusion from attending classes, earning credit, and participating in the other aspects of campus life automatically terminates, either temporarily or permanently his eligibility for financial assistance.

Section 504(d)(1) clearly preserves the institution's authority to take such actions, including the right of the institution to determine the nature, extent and duration of such penalties as it may elect to impose.

The second general category contains the procedures set forth under Sections 504 (a) and (b). Generally speaking, these are severe penalties, of more serious nature than those typically imposed on students by institutions of higher education.

There are certain specific characteristics of the language of these two subsections which should be emphasized. For example, once a two-year sanction has been imposed, there is nothing in the statute which provides for revocation or suspension of the sanction even if the institution responsible for the sanction wished to amend it.

In addition, as the concluding paragraph of Part A above points out, there are a number of questions which may arise in connection with the application of Sections 504 (a) and (b). We urge institutions to consult with legal counsel on these and other questions which may arise.

Perhaps most important is the fact that action taken by one institution under Section 504(a) is, in effect, binding on all other institutions. In this situation, information concerning the imposition of a two-year sanction is required to be transmitted from one institution to another, should the student against whom the sanction has been applied elect to transfer.

Since there are no plans in the Office of Education to establish and maintain lists or rosters of persons proscribed under Section 504(a), the exchange of information relating to the imposition of such sanctions is clearly an institutional responsibility. This may be accomplished by one of several means.

Institutions accepting transfer students may wish to make inquiry of those who are applicants for financial assistance as to whether or not the two-year sanction has been imposed by an institution previously attended. Or, for administrative ease, the question may be put to all applicants for financial aid.

Also, it appears that an institution which utilizes the Section 504(a) authority and, as a result, applies a sanction against a student, has a definite responsibility to make this information available to any college or university to which transcripts of record, grades and other academic data about that student may be sent during the two-year period in which the sanction applies.

Under either authority (Section 504 (a) or (b)) appropriate records must be maintained as a basis for making the determination and for establishing the date of the commencement of such sanction.

PART C—SECTION 411, HEW APPROPRIATIONS, OCTOBER 1968

Information concerning the application of separate but parallel authority concerning the withholding of a "loan, guarantee of a loan or a grant" made from funds appropriated under the 1969 Appropriations Act, is being developed as a separate Departmental issuance. For your own advance information, we can tell you that the Division's programs directly affected by this language are, for the current college year:

- National Defense Student Loan Program.
- Cuban Student Loan Program.
- Federally Insured Student Loans.
- State Guarantee Loans.
- Private Non-profit Loans.

The Educational Opportunity Grants Program is not affected until after July 1, 1969,

because funds appropriated in the current fiscal year are not used until 1969-70.

We hope to have detailed information concerning the applicability of Section 411 language in your hands during March.

PART D—REPORTING

The growing concern in many quarters of the Federal government over the incidence of student unrest has led to repeated inquiries concerning actual institutional application of the various provisions of law discussed in the foregoing paragraphs. Accordingly, it is necessary that we include on the 1968-69 fiscal-operations report for the three college programs a brief series of questions which will require each institution to report the following information:

1. Number of students whose Federal student assistance was terminated under provisions of (a) Section 504(a) HEA Amendments of 1968; (b) Section 504(b) HEA Amendments of 1968; (c) Section 504(d)(1) HEA Amendments of 1968; (d) Section 411, HEW Appropriations Act, 1969.

2. Number of students whose Federal student assistance was terminated by reason of suspension or expulsion.

Please note that we will request only a simple head count of the students who have been affected since the passage of these laws of October 1968. We will not ask for descriptive information, nor related data which could lead to identification of particular persons.

In conclusion, it must be understood that at this juncture there is no comprehensive understanding of institutional operating patterns in connection with incidents of student unrest. We have no way of predicting what the information described above will provide on a nationwide basis, except to say that it will go far toward meeting current and projected requirements for information.

EXHIBIT 2

"CHAPTER 102.—RIOTS

"Sec.

"2101. Riots.

"2102. Definitions.

"§ 2101. Riots

"(a)(1) Whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility of interstate or foreign commerce, including, but not limited to, the mail, telegraph, telephone, radio, or television, with intent—

"(A) to incite a riot; or

"(B) to organize, promote, encourage, participate in, or carry on a riot; or

"(C) to commit any act of violence in furtherance of a riot; or

"(D) to aid or abet any person in inciting or participating in or carrying on a riot or committing any act of violence in furtherance of a riot;

and who either during the course of any such travel or use or thereafter performs or attempts to perform any other overt act for any purpose specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of this paragraph—

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) In any prosecution under this section, proof that a defendant engaged or attempted to engage in one or more of the overt acts described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a)(1) has traveled in interstate or foreign commerce, or (2) has use of or used any facility of interstate or foreign commerce, including but not limited to, mail, telegraph, telephone, radio, or television, to communicate with or broadcast to any person or group of persons prior to such overt acts, such travel or use shall be admissible proof to establish that such defendant traveled in or used such facility of interstate or of foreign commerce.

"(c) A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any

State shall be a bar to any prosecution hereunder for the same act or acts.

"(d) Whenever, in the opinion of the Attorney General or of the appropriate officer of the Department of Justice charged by law or under the instructions of the Attorney General with authority, any person shall have violated this chapter, the Department shall proceed as speedily as possible with a prosecution of such person hereunder and with any appeal which may lie from any decision adverse to the Government resulting from such prosecution; or in the alternative shall report in writing, to the respective Houses of the Congress, the Department's reason for not so proceeding.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to make it unlawful for any person to travel in, or use any facility of, interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of pursuing the legitimate objectives of organized labor, through orderly and lawful means.

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to prevent any State, any possession or Commonwealth of the United States, or the District of Columbia, from exercising jurisdiction over any offense over which it would have jurisdiction in the absence of this section; nor shall anything in this section be construed as depriving State and local law enforcement authorities of responsibility for prosecuting acts that may be violations of this section, and that are violations of State and local law.

"§ 2102. Definitions

"(a) As used in this chapter, the term 'riot' means a public disturbance involving (1) an act or acts of violence by one or more persons part of an assemblage of three or more persons, which act or acts shall constitute a clear and present danger of, or shall result in, damage or injury to the property of any other person or to the person of any other individual or (2) a threat or threats of the commission of an act or acts of violence by one or more persons part of an assemblage of three or more persons having, individually or collectively, the ability of immediate execution of such threat or threats, where the performance of the threatened act or acts of violence would constitute a clear and present danger of, or would result in, damage or injury to the property of any other person or to the person of any other individual.

"(b) As used in this chapter, the term 'to incite a riot', or 'to organize, promote, encourage, participate in, or carry on a riot', includes, but is not limited to, urging or instigating other persons to riot, but shall not be deemed to mean the mere oral or written (1) advocacy of ideas or (2) expression of belief, not involving advocacy of any act or acts of violence or assertion of the rightness of, or the right to commit, any such act or acts."

(b) The table of contents to "PART I.—CRIMES" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the following chapter reference:

"101. Records and reports..... 2071"
a new chapter reference as follows:

"102. Riots..... 2101".

TITLE X—CIVIL OBEDIENCE
Short title

SEC. 1001. This title may be cited as the "Civil Obedience Act of 1968".

Criminal penalties for acts committed in civil disorders

SEC. 1002. (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 11 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 12.—CIVIL DISORDERS

"Sec.
"231. Civil disorders.
"232. Definitions.

"233. Preemption.

"§ 231. Civil disorders

"(a) (1) Whoever teaches or demonstrates to any other person the use, application, or making of any firearm or explosive or incendiary device, or technique capable of causing injury or death to persons, knowing or having reason to know or intending that the same will be unlawfully employed for use in, or in furtherance of, a civil disorder which may in any way or degree obstruct, delay, or adversely affect commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce or the conduct or performance of any federally protected function; or

"(2) Whoever transports or manufactures for transportation in commerce any firearm, or explosive or incendiary device, knowing or having reason to know or intending that the same will be used unlawfully in furtherance of a civil disorder; or

"(3) Whoever commits or attempts to commit any act to obstruct, impede, or interfere with any fireman or law enforcement officer lawfully engaged in the lawful performance of his official duties incident to and during the commission of a civil disorder which in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or adversely affects commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce or the conduct or performance of any federally protected function—

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Nothing contained in this section shall make unlawful any act of any law enforcement officer which is performed in the lawful performance of his official duties.

"§ 232. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter:

"(1) The term 'civil disorder' means any public disturbance involving acts of violence by assemblages of three or more persons, which causes an immediate danger of or results in damage or injury to the property or person of any other individual.

"(2) The term 'commerce' means commerce (A) between any State or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; (B) between points within any State or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or (C) wholly within the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'federally protected function' means any function, operation, or action carried out, under the laws of the United States, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or by an officer or employee thereof; and such term shall specifically include, but not be limited to, the collection and distribution of the United States mails.

"(4) The term 'firearm' means any weapon which is designed to or may readily be converted to expel any projectile by the action of an explosive; or the frame or receiver of any such weapon.

"(5) The term 'explosive or incendiary device' means (A) dynamite and all other forms of high explosives, (B) any explosive bomb, grenade, missile, or similar device, and (C) any incendiary bomb or grenade, fire bomb, or similar device, including any device which (i) consists of or includes a breakable container including a flammable liquid or compound, and a wick composed of any material which, when ignited, is capable of igniting such flammable liquid or compound, and (ii) can be carried or thrown by one individual acting alone.

"(6) The term 'fireman' means any member of a fire department (including a volunteer fire department) of any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia.

"(7) The term 'law enforcement officer' means any officer or employee of the United States, any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, while engaged in the enforcement or prosecution of

any of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia; and such term shall specifically include, but shall not be limited to, members of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(9) of title 10, United States Code, members of the organized militia of any State, or territory of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, not included within the definition of National Guard as defined by such section 101(9), and members of the Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in suppressing acts of violence or restoring law and order during a civil disorder.

TITLE 18—UNITED STATES CODE 371: CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE OR TO DEFRAUD THE UNITED STATES

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 701).

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) was unable to be present this afternoon; and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him, entitled "SDS Swings the Hammer and Sickle," be printed in the RECORD.

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

SDS SWINGS THE HAMMER AND SICKLE

The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado deserves praise for his efforts to point out to the fine young people of the United States a great source of danger to their education, their future life, and the lives of their descendants in this Nation.

Investigations which may determine exactly how closely the so-called Students for a Democratic Society are tied to the international Communist conspiracy have not been completed. Regardless of whether the investigations establish conclusively that the SDS takes its orders directly from Moscow, or from Peking, we already know that these few misguided youths swing the hammer and sickle of destruction for the Communists.

The Communists have encouraged the violence of this small minority, and the Communist propaganda machine throughout the World has profited from publicity surrounding the campus lawlessness. Newsfilms of the violent demonstrations are seized with glee by the Communists who would overthrow the system of freedom and free enterprise cherished by Americans. Such films have been used successfully by the Communists to encourage a physically beaten nation to pursue its war of aggression in South Vietnam. The Communists tell their slaves in North Vietnam that these disorderly demonstrations signal a revolution in the United States and the overthrow of our government. Many young Americans have died on the battlefields because the Communists have extended this false ray of hope to the North Vietnamese. Far more North Vietnamese also have died making what their heartless generals have told them would be the final effort for "victory."

The Communist Party in the United States held a national conference in New York City in October, 1967. This is what Henry Winston, the party's national chairman had to say there:

"The Communist Party of the United States, as Communists everywhere, has always affirmed the right of oppressed people to forcibly overthrow an oppressive regime whenever the channels for democratic change are closed to them."

Mr. Winston chose to call the government of the United States an "oppressive regime," and he said "the channels for democratic change are closed." What he meant is the climate in the United States is not conducive to a take-over by the Communists, and that they should seek through violent means to close the open channels for democratic change which make violence unacceptable in the United States.

Here are some of the things the SDS leadership has said:

Gregory Calvert, national secretary: "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. We are actively organizing sedition."

Thomas Hayden, former president: "Urban guerrillas are the only realistic alternative at this time to electoral politics or mass armed resistance."

Dee Jacobsen, assistant national secretary: "We are getting ready for the revolution."

The SDS, in its own publications, has indicated an infiltration by the Communist Party, the Socialist Labor Party, and the Progressive Labor Party.

The Students for a Democratic Society is a new name for the Student League for Industrial Democracy, which was formed around the time of World War I from the Intercollegiate Socialist Society which was established in 1909. The Student League for Industrial Democracy, and subsequently the Students for a Democratic Society, received some support from the AFL-CIO. But in 1965, the AFL-CIO realized that the organization had been substantially infiltrated by Communist cadres, and withdrew its support.

We owe it to the youth of our nation to continue to point out to them the enemies of our country—both without and within. Many students already realize the threat to their educations from the SDS, and the following threat to the nation from such pawns of the Communists.

We must not compromise with lawlessness in any form.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Colorado for the concern he has expressed, and for the direct and incisive analysis that he has made of this grievous situation. Particularly, I invite attention to his practical suggestions involving both the courts and legislation.

I ask the Senator from Colorado if it is not true that if there were grand jury proceedings and prosecutions, at least two problems would be solved. First, orderly judicial procedure would be used; second, the investigation could be made in a manner from which even congressional committees are virtually foreclosed, due to the very lawless spirit that sometimes surrounds the sessions of congressional committees.

In the House of Representatives there was some reluctance to have investigatory committees delve into this subject publicly, because of the danger of being disrupted by demonstrations, protests, and unruly conduct on the part of witnesses and spectators who would take exception to the very holding of hearings.

Is it not true that those two results would be achieved if grand jury proceedings were used for investigation?

Mr. ALLOTT. I think they would. Also, I think it would take some of the heat off of some of the more timid souls who are administrators in the universities. Also there is the added advantage that the precedent of hundreds of years of law is behind this method of procedure.

Mr. HRUSKA. By the very nature of the proceedings the innocent would be protected. Prosecutors would have every opportunity to bring in witnesses and to lay out the full case before the grand jury for its deliberate judgment as to whether an indictment should be returned.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. Another significant aspect is that the power of a grand jury is backed up by the contempt powers of the judicial system.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is a very potent and very forceful advantage which, incidentally, is not inherent in the congressional committees per se.

Mr. HRUSKA. The committees have been frustrated time and again. They have tried to assert the contempt powers which they possess in theory, but which they find they are not able to avail themselves of in practice.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct.

I have received a note which I think I ought to cover in the Record at this point.

An assistant on my staff, Miss Susan Bowman, who attends George Washington University, informs me that the university has announced that, because the SDS has threatened to violently disrupt the Annual Greek Week at George Washington University, the Annual Greek Week will be canceled.

The Greek Week consists of nonpolitical activities during which various sororities and fraternities compete with each other in numerous contests.

Miss Bowman tells me that the SDS has phoned the presidents of various sororities and fraternities and threatened to disrupt the related facilities with Molotov cocktails. In case someone who reads this debate does not know what a Molotov cocktail is, I may state that it does not have anything to do with getting inebriated.

Mr. HRUSKA. Immolated, perhaps, but not inebriated.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. And if anyone does not know what immolated means, it means getting burned up.

The threats were made yesterday, so I am told. The university has canceled Greek Week, and the decision was made today.

I do not know how many students will have their lawful, legitimate, and cultural activities completely disrupted by the actions of a few who have used the threat of force and violence.

If anyone thinks that we in this country are far from a state of anarchism, he had better think twice.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from Colorado, I wish to offer my observations on the problem of disorder on the campuses of the United States. I speak against the background of my membership on the National Commission on Causes and Pre-

vention of Violence, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, and simply as a concerned citizen.

The causes of tensions on the campuses are complex and will require time and good will to unravel. Emotions have been raised and it is easy for intemperate words to lead to an intemperate response, for disorder to lead to violence and violence to counterviolence. It will require a sincere effort on the part of students, faculty, and administrators to break the self-perpetuating cycle. The first step must be, as President Nixon said in his inaugural address, for all of us to lower our voices so we can hear each other.

A few people in our society point to the ample evidence of both legitimate and illegitimate violence in our history and use it as a justification for illegitimate violence to gain their own way. I have always considered history as the place from which we started, not the place to which we are heading.

People clamor for peace because history has taught the horrible price of war. People seek a nonviolent society because history teaches the pain of irrational violence. To our youth, history should be proof of the necessity to search for peaceful means of decision.

Because of the resort to violent and lawless methods, the Nation is faced with a threat to the freedom and independence of the university. Clearly this threat to higher education, to our youth, and therefore to the future of our country, is very serious. However, we must be careful not to aggravate the problem even more by allowing rhetoric to distort the facts.

There has been trouble—serious trouble—at Berkeley, San Francisco State, Columbia, and elsewhere. The rollcall of leading centers of higher education reveals that almost all have been subject to varying degrees of direct student action. The fact remains, despite the frightening publicity, that the great majority of our campuses have remained peaceful, classes have not been disrupted, and students and faculty have carried on their normal work. It is from this perspective, then, that we must consider the problem.

The rights and freedoms we enjoy in our democratic system of government require both order and equal protection for all in the peaceful exercise of those rights. "Order" is not a code word for license to suppress dissenting ideas. "Exercise of rights" does not include unlawful or violent interference with others.

Our campuses, as reflections of our larger society, are testing grounds for the durability of this society. If there are complaints about the university—and clearly there are valid complaints—then they should be heard. If there are different viewpoints, they should be aired.

We of the older generation have a built-in resistance to change. We know what has worked and we tend to be comfortable with it. But our young people were born in a different time, they have grown up in a different environment, and they have different perspectives. It is people with new ideas that provide a necessary ingredient for progress.

The students in our colleges and universities today are better educated than

ever before. They are more sensitive to the potential of our Nation and more keenly aware of its problems. This is why they must be listened to, and this is why our young people deserve respect.

It is essential to a reasoning society, and a reasoning university, that we learn from, as well as teach, our young. But the few who break—or threaten to break—the law and to trample on the rights of others forfeit their right to respect and attention.

There is nothing inherent in the character of an intelligent, progressive professor, administrator or trustee that means he must excuse violence and unlawful conduct. On the contrary, a reasonable man will recognize the need for order in a just society.

The failure of some faculty members, and even some administrators, to condemn violence has been dangerously shortsighted. Some dissenters, notably members of the Students for a Democratic Society, have been engaged in a campaign that is both anti-intellectual and antieducational. Sympathetic support or silence on the part of the intellectual community added momentum to this campaign. Writing in the April 19 issue of the Saturday Review, Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy at New York University, observed:

The Trojan horse in American higher education is the rickety structure of doctrinaire thought that shelters the SDS even when it takes official responsibility for violent actions, gives it a free field for operation, retreats before the politics of confrontation, and either shrinks from applying fairly and firmly the rules of reason that should bind the academic community, or interprets them as if they had no more restraining force in times of crisis than ropes of sand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Hook's article, "Who is Responsible for Campus Violence?" which examines the activities of the dedicated agitators and the university response, be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, also let me call attention to one of the conclusions of the Cox Commission which investigated the 1968 disturbances at Columbia University. The commission said:

The essence of our finding is that one of the causes of the April disturbances was the failure of the academic community to think out the implication of many forms of political demonstration and to build a firm consensus of moral opinion concerning the limits upon morally acceptable methods of expressing dissent.

By these words, I do not intend to condemn all educators and administrators. In the first place, a great many have spoken out. Second, the onslaught of disorder and violence caught us all by surprise. Many people were confused by the source and meaning of the incendiary chain of events that brought bloodshed to campuses in all different parts of the country.

I particularly applaud a recent statement of the American Council on Education, entitled "A Declaration on Campus Unrest." It bears the names of such leaders in education as Nathan Pusey of

Harvard, Kingman Brewster of Yale, Reverend Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame, Columbia, Vassar, Wayne State, Wisconsin, California, Arizona State, Colorado State, Pittsburgh, and many others are represented in this statement. Despite the diversity of views and experience, these educators were able to agree on this important subject.

This document establishes a good perspective. It examines several of the critical ingredients involved in the controversy, and it clearly condemns violence. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I think it is recognized by most educators that, in some cases, the fact that students have felt compelled to carry on their cause outside the traditional channels of dissent is in itself a warning that these channels may be inadequate to the needs of today. Meaningful communication between responsible students and responsible administrators is the essence of restoring order and respect to the campuses.

The problem of communication with our youth has been examined in an excellent article by Dr. Walter Menninger, a member of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. In order to share Dr. Menninger's thoughts with my colleagues, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his article in the spring issue of the Menninger Quarterly entitled "Student Demonstrations and Confrontations," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in all the excitement generated in the national press by the disturbances at Cornell University, Mr. President, I am sure that most Senators were not aware that there were demonstrations at the University of Nebraska, in Lincoln.

For several days in a row, the Afro-American Collegiate Society held demonstrations. To my knowledge, they were at all times peaceful and lawful. The administration met with the students for discussion. The discussion revolved around "concerns;" there were no "demands." Several leaders of the society then were invited to attend the next meeting of the board of regents. At that meeting, the regents voted to accept some of the student requests. Clearly, there was a meaningful dialog.

The board of regents also took a clear position on campus disorders. The following statement was approved by the student government, the faculty senate, and the board of regents:

The heritage of academic freedom at the University of Nebraska is reflected in the statement of principles by the Board of Regents: "The right to uphold, to discuss and dissent are the moral fiber of America's greatness. . . . (demonstrations which) coerce individuals or which constitute a hazard to the safety of any individuals or which threaten destruction of property are not protected by freedom of speech provisions

and will not be tolerated. Similarly, a hostile audience will not be allowed to interfere with a peaceful demonstration."

This statement was issued not as a threat, but as a statement of policy which all are entitled to know. It is a sensible, balanced statement, which recognizes the rights of all students and the necessity for order. I commend the students, faculty, and the regents for this statement.

Mr. President, the goal of our institutions of higher learning must be to prove that reason and the rule of law can make students partners in self-government built on nonviolent progress and mutual consent. Irrational and destructive forces must not be allowed to kill academic freedom.

I have the highest regard for the young people on the campuses of this Nation. They are responsible individuals who recognize the threat to freedom of expression and to their own educations posed by recent events.

In the past we have looked to our young people to lead our country in the future. But that has changed. Now we must look to them to help lead the Nation today.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Colorado for his very fine demonstration of leadership here and for his thoughtful in-depth discussion of the subject at hand.

EXHIBIT 1 STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS AND CONFRONTATIONS

(By W. Walter Menninger, M.D.)

Student demonstrations and confrontations can be approached from the standpoint of communications, for such behavior does represent communication. And as such, if we identify some elements of the process of communications, we may be better able to understand what the students are trying to tell us with their actions.

A great achievement of man was the development of a refined means of communication, by words, in order to share ideas. In psychiatric practice, the task of understanding communication is a vital responsibility. Indeed, the psychiatrist's job is to help people replace ineffective or provocative attempts at communication, which prompt their referral for help, with less destructive ways to communicate their strivings and hopes and fears. Consistently, a goal of psychotherapy is to help a patient express himself in words instead of actions.

Of course, words can be a potent and provocative force—this fact was clearly shown again at the Chicago demonstrations last summer. But, actions do speak louder than words; they are often irreversible and embarrassing in ways that words are not.

When someone seeks to communicate a message in a reasonable and quiet way and the message, for whatever reasons, is not received or not understood or not acknowledged, the sender must make greater efforts to communicate his message: He must do so with more emphasis, more intensity, and in such a way as to demand attention. Words give way to actions, and the ultimate result is a breakdown in "civilized" communications—violence.

In studying the process of communications, we can examine the component parts. There is the sender. There is the receiver. And there is the interactive process which takes place between the two.

THE SENDERS: THE STUDENTS

When we talk about student demonstrations and confrontations, the sender—the

initiator of the communication—is the student, either singly, or collectively through a leader. It is important to note in this context that the students—our children—are the product of the educational system. And it is appropriate to keep in mind their value to us as “products” and our opinion of them.

What are the characteristics of these students? One recent assessment is that of the fact-finding commission—the so-called Cox Commission—appointed to investigate disturbances at Columbia University last year. Their summation:

The present generation of young people in our universities is the best informed, the most intelligent, and the most idealistic this country has ever known. This is the experience of teachers everywhere.

It is also the most sensitive to public issues and the most sophisticated in political tactics. Perhaps because they enjoy the affluence to support their ideals, today's undergraduate and graduate students exhibit, as a group, a higher level of social conscience than preceding generations.

These are the college students who were yesterday's high school students; and there is no reason to assume that today's high school students are any less deserving of such a description.

But students, particularly high school students, have some other special characteristics. They are involved in the natural struggle of the adolescent to come to grips with becoming an adult. They manifest a drive for growth and change, and a striving—at times quite ambivalent—to be independent, to be in on the action, to “do their own thing.” What complicates matters is that they still at times very much want direction and security, somebody telling them what to do.

THE RECEIVER-RESPONDER: THE SCHOOL

Before considering what happens when this Sender attempts to communicate, some words are in order about the special characteristics of the Receiver-Responder.

The schools, and especially school boards, are getting messages from a lot of sources in this day and age. And with so many people telling the schools what's wrong with them or what they ought to be doing, we don't usually think of the students as being among the significant communicators. Children are to be seen and not heard. They are supposed to know that we are doing things in their best interests. They should just do their assignments and “leave the driving to us.” At the same time more and more parents seem to be abdicationing responsibility for important training of their youth, acting as if the school should handle discipline and training, as well as education in reading, writing and new math.

There is plenty of criticism about the failure of the school system to educate everyone effectively; there are concerns about the poor and the deprived; there is distress when the bright children are not fully challenged, etc. There is also criticism that the schools are requiring more and more money—as though somehow it shouldn't cost so much more, and people shouldn't have to keep paying more taxes to educate more children in an inflationary world.

Clearly, the school boards and school administrators are busy receiving a lot of messages. So what does happen when the students attempt to say something?

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN THE PROCESS

How can the students—who aren't supposed to say anything anyway, much less have ideas about how the school ought to be run—get themselves taken seriously, especially when they haven't had any voice before? They have to intrude, and they have to out-shout other voices which are already loudly proclaiming their interests. And then when the student, who is the recipient of all

this service and expenditure, has the gall to complain or be critical . . . just who does he think he is? How much does he know? And why does he have to be so provocative?

Students are hard to listen to! They aren't always clear in what they are seeking or what they want to say, but they clearly want to be heard now. And they have their own struggle in finding the best way to relate themselves to their elders. Erik Erikson observed in his book *Childhood and Society*, that, “In their search for a new sense . . . adolescents have to refigure many of the battles of earlier years, even though to do so they must artificially appoint perfectly well-meaning people to play the roles of adversaries.”

When they start to express themselves, if you're over 30, it is hard not to turn them off, to feel you've heard it before, and to disregard or diminish their words. This was evident in the hearings of the Violence Commission when we asked some leaders of youth movements to tell us what they thought. Clearly, the Commissioners had to work to tune in—and some didn't at all like what they heard.

Let me share with you some words we heard, words which are important because they represent a strong undercurrent of feelings in a sizeable proportion of young people.

Henry Mayer is a graduate student at the University of California. He was very much involved in the initial efforts at Berkeley to gain some greater flexibility in the university policy of speakers invited to make addresses on the campus, what came to be known as the “Free Speech Movement.” As a representative of youth, here's what he told us:

Student activists are not the trouble-makers. They are responding as outraged human beings to all the brutalizing and irrational conditions—racism, poverty, militaristic anti-communism, bureaucratic and technological inhumanity—that disfigure and trouble this country and diminish the quality of human life. . . .

I must confess to both amusement and annoyance when I consider the discrepancies in popular American attitudes toward student demonstrations. There seems to be widespread praise, e.g., for students who actively defend liberty in Czechoslovakia, but substantial condemnation of the students who attempt to march for democracy and peace in Chicago.

Students demonstrate because, in the words of a very popular song, they “can't get no satisfaction” from the callous, arrogant, and hostile people who run this society—the people who neglect the issues and deny the tension, who first ignore protestors, then discredit them, and then beat them up or put them in jail.

Confrontations are always necessary to secure fundamental changes in this country, and such changes are what students—and others—are seeking today. Those who say—in the best tradition of colonial administrators—that they will not be bullied or threatened or coerced into change, actually mean that they do not want any change at all. They display the fatal arrogance of power which insures that the next series of confrontations will be angrier and more coercive than the last.

In the vernacular, how does that grab you? What do you think of that view of student demonstrations? Perhaps I should have quoted some of the less well organized and more highly charged observations and opinions of Tom Hayden, one of the founders of the SDS, who also appeared before us. But my point in citing these remarks is to test your own capacity to listen and to keep an open line to such ideas, however distasteful you may find them to be.

It is the response of the “receivers” of this kind of student message which plays a vital role in determining subsequent student communications, and which will go a long way

toward escalating or de-escalating any propensities to disturbance. John D. Rockefeller III recently wrote in the *Presbyterian Life* magazine of his efforts to “tune in” to youth. His conclusion was the “crucial issue is not the revolt of youth but the nature of the older generation's response to it.” His conclusion was that he should address his thoughts not to the young people about whom he initially felt concerned, but to, as he described it, “that large minority group of persons over the age of forty.”

He acknowledges that there is much in the behavior of youth to irritate and disturb the older generation. But he submits that we have let ourselves be distracted by the colorful fringes to the point where we miss the central meanings of today's youthful protest. And it is important to note that in nearly every instance of a student disturbance, the overwhelming majority of students will disavow extreme measures of disturbance, though they may be sympathetic to some of the issues at hand.

KINDS OF RESPONSES

The responses which student demonstrations provoke in educational leaders are important to note—especially the extremes. It is vital to understand that many of these responses are primarily the function of our own emotional reactions.

Some simply tune out the whole matter, much like a parent who is preoccupied with something important and who nods when his child says something to him, but who really doesn't hear, and thus disregards the communication.

If there is a reaction, all too often the first reaction and sometimes the only reaction, is a resentful irritation at students for not keeping their place. Or there is scapegoating—an attempt to blame others for provoking this problem, a denial of real grievances by calling it communist-instigated or the like. Confrontation and demonstration are clearly acts which are critical of administrators and what they are doing; they imply the administrator has done a bad job, and nobody likes to be told that—to say nothing of having it expressed in public.

Student demonstrators often provoke two extreme responses: either the response of repression, to put the lid firmly on any further attempts, to “show 'em we won't put up with any nonsense”; or the opposite response of giving in, feeling guilty about some mistake to the degree that an excessive permissiveness is the result. If a boiler has a head of steam and is about to blow up, indeed, the immediate crisis may be staved off by quickly applying a stronger boiler plate, or by opening up all the stops to let off the steam. But neither of these extreme reactions is efficient over the long haul.

If we consistently take a repressive line, we don't encourage growth or prompt development of more constructive outlets for the energy of youth. In our excessive response, we can stifle peaceful change and thus increase the odds for violent change.

At the same time, letting people do anything they want is equally unhealthy. If we are truly concerned about someone, we don't let them do just anything. I don't let my children play with matches or in the street; my doing so would not be a sign of love or caring for them, but of just the opposite. Excessive permissiveness is as destructive to growth and maturation in our children as is excessive restriction and control.

SOME GUIDING PRINCIPLES

So what should be the response to these challenges from youth? What principles or guidelines can we note which will help in tackling the problems? First it is important to acknowledge the existence of the problem. In any school system, the key persons affected are the administrators and the executive leaders of the school system. It is

the superintendent who will have the greatest impact, and his principals beneath him. Thus the role of the school board in selecting that leadership is vital; and the selection should be of leadership which attempts to understand, that can listen and not feel threatened by conflict.

And there are some key principles to be noted in examining any conflict or issue. First, it is imperative to try to understand the message, the communication from the students, and to look for latent issues. We shouldn't be misled by the surface issues and assume that's the whole story. In medicine, we all too often find the chief complaint that brings the patient to us is a kind of "red herring," and only a "ticket of admission" to get our attention and concern, so that we will then respond to a more basic problem that becomes evident.

A second principle in responding to the challenge of the students is to recognize the importance of expectations and of mutual respect. An adversary system tends to encourage the development of adversaries. And there has been a good bit of experimental work done that demonstrates the degree to which our expectations prompt self-fulfilling hypotheses. It is as if we communicate in some subliminal manner what we expect to happen—and all too often it does; yet we remain oblivious of the degree to which we are responsible for what happens, and instead blame it on others. There were elements of this process which took place in Chicago. The same process takes place in many other settings. You may be aware of the classroom research where some teachers were told that certain students showed particular promise, when such was not truly the case. Yet the teachers' expectations and efforts did result in improved performance by those students.

Expectation work in both a positive and negative way. If you expect students to be unreasonable, the odds are you will deal with them in such a way as to make it inevitable that they prove your hypothesis. Similarly, if you deal with students as adults, you are likely to find them more often responding as adults.

A third principle: Acknowledge the inevitability of change. The tide of history is moving in certain directions, and clearly the energy and drive and creation of our children will outlast us. We can wear ourselves out trying to fight the tide; or we can turn that inexorable force to our advantage, and attempt to harness it for our—and their—benefit.

It is vital to realize and acknowledge the struggle of the student, the adolescent with his aspirations. And we must also acknowledge mirror struggle of our generation. It is no small psychological problem to spend many years of one's life trying to achieve a position of responsibility and decisionmaking, only to realize that the time is short. It is easy to forget that we were children; and that our perception of the world still reflects, in some significant ways, the biases we had as children.

SOME SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

Another of the persons we were privileged to hear in the Violence Commission hearings was the president of Yale University, Kingman Brewster. He had some specific suggestions with regard to coping with the potential for violence. He offered four suggestions:

First: Protect and encourage peaceful dissent.

Second: Protect and encourage participation of the governed in the determination of the policies and actions which govern them.

Third: Make every effort to open access to meaningful channels of communication.

Fourth: Bend every energy to recreate the fact and the feeling of individual choice and self-determination within organizations.

President Brewster observed that "These are not prescriptions, they are simply invitations for energetic and ingenious efforts to re-establish a credible, open, voluntary society in which a person feels that what happens to him is in large part his own fault, not the fault of the 'system.'" President Brewster thus focused on another and perhaps crucial factor of this whole problem: to an increasing degree in our society, the individual is getting lost in a maze of numbers and computers and bureaucracy. And it is not surprising to see lost individuals unite into groups in order to find some new and identifiable character.

It therefore becomes imperative for us to keep the value of the individual high, in spite of the population explosion and the complications of modern society. As we restore the worth of the individual, we will find less intense the need to seek redemption in groups. Groups are made up of individuals, and they are led by individuals, each of whom has aspirations the same as you and I for concern, attention, love, recognition—for a place in the sun.

We have difficulty in dealing with problems like student demonstrations and confrontations because of our emotional reaction, a reaction which may reflect our discomfort in acknowledging that we, too, have not yet created the "perfect" world. Without emotions, this world would certainly be a dull place; and even if it were possible, I would not urge that we abandon our emotions. But we do need to be alert to them and to the degree that they cause problems for us or interfere with our rational resolution of conflicts with others.

Individually, we must come to acknowledge that the place to begin dealing with the problems we have with others is within ourselves—to be a little less self-righteous and so sure that we have the right answers. No matter how sophisticated or suave a manner we present to the world, we do have within us childish pressures and reactions.

We don't like to be wrong. We don't like to be challenged, especially by people who are younger or in some way "inferior" to us. Yet if we are to cope effectively with our children, and with students in our educational system, we must be humble. We must be prepared to consider the possibility of being wrong, or that there might be a better way, without feeling we are destroyed if that is so. If we are so insecure as to feel we are worthless if we make a mistake or are improved upon, if we cannot courageously acknowledge our mistakes and acknowledge the fact that our offspring might surpass us even now, then we are in deep trouble. We must be open enough to listen, to "tune in." And we must keep open enough to accept constructive criticism, with some pride in the fact that these suggestions are coming from "our most important products"—our students—who thus prove the ultimate worth of the system.

EXHIBIT 2

A DECLARATION ON CAMPUS UNREST

This statement was formulated by a group of educational administrators, trustees, and foundation officers who met April 4-5, 1969 in Chicago under Council auspices. Those present were three Council officers—President Logan Wilson, Vice-President Kenneth D. Roose, and David C. Nichols II, assistant to President Wilson—and the following:

Louis T. Benezet, president, Claremont Graduate Center; Landrum R. Bolling, president, Earlham College; Herman R. Branson, president, Central State University; Robert D. Clark, president, San Jose State College; Fairfax M. Cone, trustee, University of Chicago; Thomas H. Elliot, chancellor, Washington University; Robben W. Fleming, president, University of Michigan; David D. Henry, president, University of Illinois; Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame; James M. Hester, presi-

dent, New York University; Ralph Hetzel, trustee, Pennsylvania State University; Roger W. Heyns, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley; Joseph F. Kauffman, president, Rhode Island College; William R. Keast, president, Wayne State University; Malcolm Moos, president, University of Minnesota; Mrs. Henry Owen, trustee, Washington State University; Harvey Picker, trustee, Colgate University; Alan Pifer, president, Carnegie Corporation of New York; Wesley Posvar, chancellor, University of Pittsburgh; Nathan M. Pusey, president, Harvard University; John Ritchie, dean, Law School, Northwestern University; John S. Toll, president, State University of New York at Stony Brook; Edmund A. Stephan, trustee, University of Notre Dame; F. Champion Ward, vice-president, The Ford Foundation; Herman B. Wells, chancellor, Indiana University; Charles E. Young, chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles; and Edwin Young, chancellor, University of Wisconsin, Madison Campus.

The statement was subsequently approved by the Council's Board of Directors, comprised of the following individuals:

Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers—The State University, chairman; Anne G. Pannell, president of Sweet Briar College, vice-chairman; Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., secretary; Fred Harvey Harrington, president, University of Wisconsin; Grayson Kirk, president emeritus, Columbia University; Frederic W. Ness, president, Fresno State College; Alan Simpson, president, Vassar College; Thomas A. Spragens, president, Centre College of Kentucky; Sharpy G. Umbeck, president, Knox College; Kingman Brewster, Jr., president, Yale University; G. Homer Durham, president, Arizona State University; Samuel B. Gould, chancellor, State University of New York at Albany; Darrell Holmes, president, Colorado State College; Kenneth S. Pitzer, president, Stanford University; Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., president, University of Virginia; Joseph P. Cosand, president, Junior College District of St. Louis; Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame; Roger W. Heyns, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley; Martha E. Peterson, president, Barnard College; Calvin H. Pilmpton, president, Amherst College; and Willis M. Tate, president, Southern Methodist University.

The unprecedented, comprehensive, and often unpredictable changes that are taking place in this age both disturb and alarm large segments of our society. Most of the changes and attendant alarms affect the operations of our institutions of higher learning. They are also related to the values, concerns, and behavior of our young people. In coming to grips with the compelling issues, all who would think seriously about them must recognize that present-day society—in America and in many foreign lands—is in serious trouble on many fronts. We see around us racial conflict, continued poverty, and malnutrition midst unparalleled prosperity and seemingly unlimited promise. We are confronted by pollution of our environment, decay of our cities, the continuation of wars and the threat of war, and everywhere a vague but widespread discontent with the general quality of life.

These problems affect all of society, not the university alone or the young alone. We must all be concerned to deal intelligently and responsibly with these problems that are neither the exclusive discovery, nor the sole responsibility of the young. Yet the depth of feeling among young people in many countries today about the issues, their general dissatisfaction with the slow-moving ways of society, and the extreme behavior of a small minority of students are evidence of the profound crisis that involves our entire society and, specifically, the university community.

The university itself has often become the immediate target of student discontent,

sometimes couched as legitimate complaints about the deficiencies of the universities, sometimes devised as a softening-up exercise for assault on the wider society.

How to deal with campus crises arising from the widespread protests has become a major public issue and the cause of confused and angry debate. That there should be deep anxiety about the course of the conflict and its possible outcome is understandable. No social, racial, or age group that perceives itself and its values to be seriously threatened will fall to strike back. Increasingly there are backlash temptations to enact strong, often ill-considered, and largely futile measures to cope with a youth rebellion that none of us fully comprehends, not even the youth themselves.

Certain balanced judgments are proper to make, however, as we search for understanding and solutions:

1. It is important for the public to understand that, despite the nationwide publicity given to student disorders, the great majority of American campuses have remained peaceful. On campuses where conspicuous disorders have occurred, educational programs generally have gone along their normal ways. Most students and faculty have continued to carry on their regular work. In the main, good teaching and good research, as traditionally defined, have been uninterrupted.

2. On the undisturbed campuses and among the majority of orderly students, however, there are widely shared discontents which extremists are at times able to manipulate to destructive ends. Moreover, even in the absence of violence, there has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strains attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communication. Within this cult there is a minute group of destroyers who have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university, and in the processes of orderly discussion and negotiation to secure significant change. Students and faculty are increasingly aware of the true nature of this group and are moving to deal with its destructive tactics. The necessity to deal with extremists, however, is placing an extraordinary burden upon the whole educational enterprise and upon those who man it. Consequently, universities are having to divert their energies and resources from central educational tasks in order to deal with student unrest in its various forms.

3. The spectacular events precipitated by the extremists should not be allowed to obscure the recent accomplishments of those students, faculty, and administrators who have serious interest in constructive changes in society and in the university. They have broadened the curriculum and improved teaching. They have moved toward a more open and participating pattern for university governance. And they have begun to make the work of universities more meaningful in dealing with the problems of society. Those efforts must continue. Reform and self-renewal in higher education are ongoing imperatives.

4. Meanwhile, the speed and scale of social change have imposed many kinds of demands upon educational institutions for which their programs, their capabilities, and their funding are not always adequate. Moreover, universities are increasingly asked to perform functions for society, particularly in reshaping the behavior, values, and life-styles of the young, on which the family and other social institutions have already had major influence—or lack of influence. Some of society's expectations for universities are quite unrealistic. Insofar as these expectations can be dealt with, they involve a sharing of responsibilities among diverse social institutions. Many of society's demands require new resources and fresh approaches to old and new problems.

5. Recognizing the right of and even the necessity for constructive dissent—and allowing for inevitable arguments over what is in fact constructive—certain axioms must be accepted as basic to the operation of any university:

a. Disruption and violence have no place on any campus. The academic community has the responsibility to deal promptly and directly with disruptions. If universities will not govern themselves, they will be governed by others. This elementary reality is increasingly becoming understood by all components of the university community. Student and faculty groups, including the American Association of University Professors and the National Student Association, have recently joined in efforts to improve disciplinary procedures and to formulate clear and realistic codes for dealing with misconduct, and more particularly with violence and disruption. Also, by involving students and faculty effectively in the governance of the university, it can be demonstrated that there are better ways of getting views considered and decisions made than by disruption.

b. The historic concern of the university community with academic freedom needs to be restated, reaffirmed, and vigorously defended against all, within or without the university, who would obstruct the right of scholars to investigate, teachers to teach, or students to learn. This reiteration is not to claim for the university special privileges that put it above the law or that free it from critical public appraisal—rather it affirms that the university must maintain a basic institutional integrity to function as a university.

c. Violations of criminal law must be dealt with through the ordinary processes of the law—and universities must attempt to deal with disruptive situations firmly before they reach the stage of police action. Governmental attempts to deal with these problems through special, punitive legislation will almost certainly be counter-productive. Meanwhile, students and faculty whose consciences demand that they express dissent through law violation must be prepared to accept the due processes and the penalties of the law. They should not be encouraged to expect amnesty from the effects of the law. Such an expectation would be the ultimate use of the *in loco parentis* concept against which many young activists passionately protest. Nor should they expect amnesty from academic discipline, which is the most effective sanction in disruptive incidents.

6. The education community needs to undertake a far more comprehensive effort than ever before attempted to study the underlying bases of youthful discontent and alienation and the broad social problems to which they are related. As social critic, the university must help society understand and solve such problems.

7. All universities should give particular attention to a continuing search for ways, including new social inventions, by which the life of rationality and civility, shared concern, and mutual respect may be supported and strengthened within the university community. The survival of the university and its long-term contribution to society depend upon the ability of the institutions to make their everyday life reflect that spirit and pattern.

EXHIBIT 3

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CAMPUS VIOLENCE? (By Sidney Hook)

Wherever American educators meet today, there is one theme of overriding concern that shadows their deliberations even when it is not on the agenda of discussion. This is the mounting wave of lawlessness, often cresting into violence, that has swept so many campuses. Shortly after the riotous events at

the University of California at Berkeley in 1964, I predicted that in consequence of the faculty's refusal to condemn the student seizure of Sproul Hall, the administration building, American higher education would never be the same again, that a turning point had been reached in the pattern of its development. I confess, however, to surprise at the rapidity of the change, if not its direction, and by the escalation of the violence accompanying it.

Equally significant in determining the changing intellectual climate of our universities are some of the secondary consequences of the accelerating disorders. Among them are infectious, sometimes paralyzing, fear in administrative ranks lest their campuses erupt; confusion, bewilderment, and divided loyalties among faculties, together with some *Schaden-freude* over the humiliation of their administrations at the hand of disrespectful student militants; outright encouragement of student violence by disaffected, younger members of teaching staffs; sustained apathy among the majority of students whose education has been interrupted by radical activists; and the mixture of rage and disgust among the general public whose political repercussions already have been damaging to the cause of higher education.

In California, the indignation of citizens over campus violence has brought Governor Reagan to the peak of his popularity. More alarming, proposed bonds for educational expansion have been voted down. Of approximately 186,000 communications received to date by the trustees and colleges in the state system more than 98 per cent were against campus disruption. More than seventy separate bills, some of dubious wisdom, have been introduced in the Senate and Assembly to deal with disruption of campus activities by students and faculty. Similar bills are in the hoppers of other state legislatures, twenty in Wisconsin alone.

The situation in the East, although not marked by the same degree of physical violence (arson, bombings, beatings), educationally is equally grave. Some recent incidents at New York University, and its sister institution in New York City, Columbia, mark the extent to which violence has invaded the university and rational disciplinary restraints have been eroded.

At Columbia, Acting President Andrew W. Cordier had petitioned the courts through the Dean of the Law School to dismiss the criminal charges against the Columbia students arrested for serious offenses last spring. The court was assured that the University would apply appropriate disciplinary measures to those guilty. The cases were therefore dismissed. In December, a Columbia College disciplinary tribunal of two teachers—one of them an instructor serving as chairman—two students, and an administrator decided to impose no penalties on the students whatsoever, despite the fact that the students proudly admitted violating University regulations and, to boot, denied the authority of the tribunal to judge them. This incredible decision was taken in order "to re-establish student relationship to the university." These students had won complete amnesty for actions that had been deemed worthy of criminal prosecution when they occurred. Twice hearings in the Law School were violently disrupted by invading SDS students, and the faculty members of the panel were insulted with gutter obscenities. No one even dared to suggest that disciplinary action be taken against this new wave of disruption. The administrators and many of the faculty of Columbia University for months were deeply distraught. It appeared to some observers as if the University petition to have the criminal charges dropped against the students was a ruse by the administration to ingratiate itself with the militant

students, to prove its "good will" toward them and, in this way, buy some campus peace. If so, the strategy failed. It provoked only contempt, jeers, and a stream of foul, four-letter epithets from the militants who held out for complete amnesty from the outset.

Encouraged by the amnesty, the Columbia SDS, with aid from outsiders, began to disrupt classes; a leaflet was distributed to justify such "classroom intervention." In some instances, students tore the notes out of their teachers' hands; in others, they shouted them down. By December, according to one source, as many as thirteen "interventions" had been perpetrated. No action was taken either by the faculty or by the administration. An inquiry from an education editor, who had gotten wind of the situation, went unanswered. No one on campus would talk for publication.

Their appetites whetted by the complaisance of timidity of their victims, the students of the SDS escalated the scale of their disruption. *The Columbia Spectator* of February 27 reported that "Members of the SDS yesterday interrupted nearly forty classes in six University buildings."

Last December, Nguyen Huu Chi, the Ambassador of South Vietnam, visited New York University as an invited guest speaker. At a given signal, members of the Students for a Democratic Society from NYU and Columbia invaded the hall, stormed the stage, physically assaulted the Ambassador, and completely disrupted the meeting. Thereupon, they proceeded to another floor, battered down the doors leading to the podium of a meeting-hall where James Reston, executive editor of *The New York Times*, was about to deliver the annual Homer Watts Lecture before an audience of 600 under the auspices of the Alumni Association. The rampaging students spurned an invitation for Mr. Reston to state their objections to what they thought he was going to say, and by threats of violence forced the cancellation of the meeting.

Two students were suspended pending action by the University Senate, and after a careful hearing, at which they refused to appear, were expelled in March. The leaders of the SDS publicly applauded the disruptions, declaring that they disapproved of the positions of the government of South Vietnam and *The New York Times* on the Vietnam war. Most shocking of all, nine members of the faculty at Washington Square in a letter to the student paper endorsed the breaking up of the meeting of the South Vietnamese Ambassador. Although they called the disruption of Mr. Reston's meeting "unfortunate" (as if it were an accident!), they strongly condemned President James M. Hester on the ground that, "we do not believe that the disruption of the Reston speech warrants suspension of the students." They had not a single word of forthright or vigorous criticism of the SDS attack on Chi. The effect of their letter can only be to incite further student violence. It is noteworthy that many meetings and rallies in support of the Vietcong and North Vietnam have been held without incident.

Finally, on March 10, a public statement in response to these outrages was issued by a hundred, mostly senior, professors. In it they declared that the University had an obligation to defend itself against hooliganism. Referring to the policy of amnesty, they criticized the abandonment of disciplinary proceedings for previous serious infractions. President Cordier immediately rushed to endorse the statement taking care, at the same time, to minimize the number of class disruptions, but failing to explain why he had remained silent about the breaking up of classes in December, although he was aware of it, and why he had welcomed the abandonment of disciplinary proceedings.

Punitive legislation, either federal or state, would be undesirable in this situation for

many reasons. It would tie the Government too closely to campus events and discipline at a time when a section of the academic community believes that governmental presence is already too obtrusive. Further, the effectiveness of such legislation would depend upon the cooperation of administration and faculty in enforcing it. Most important, existing statutes of the University, and the criminal law, already provide sufficient penalties (suspension, expulsion, fines, and jail for trespassing and assault) to meet disruption, if they were enforced.

Why have they not been enforced? Why has the defense of faculties against these brazen attempts to violate their academic freedom, not only by disruption, but by demands to control the content and personnel of instruction, been so feeble and long-delayed? Why, as one professor observed who had helped the Berkeley rebels triumph in 1964, have administrations and faculties behaved like buffalos being shot, "looking on with interest when another of their number goes down, without seriously thinking, that they may be next"?

Although the major causes of student unrest are outside the universities (Vietnam, the urban crisis, the black revolution) and cannot be solved by them alone, the way in which unrest is expressed, whether creatively or violently, can be influenced by the ideas and attitudes brought to it. This is particularly true today. For although comparatively few institutions have been the scene of violent demonstrations as serious as those at Columbia, Berkeley, and San Francisco State, there is hardly a college or university in the country in which there is not some marked uneasiness, some movement among students toward direct action on the verge of exploding into sit-downs, sit-ins, and other forms of mass violations of rules and regulations suddenly discovered to be as silly, anachronistic, or authoritarian as some of them undoubtedly are. But what struck me about the mood of the students in scores of colleges I visited is that even when these rules and regulations were not being enforced, and student conduct was as free and uninhibited as on campuses not subject to these objectionable rules, there was an insistence on their abolition—despite evidence that the formal abolition was likely to stir up a hornet's nest among alumni or townfolk or state legislatures. This testified partly to student impatience with the "hypocrisy" of tolerating laws that were not being enforced, but even more to the presence of a desire to precipitate a showdown with authority, to be where the action is, to have the nation's television cameras focused on the local scene and on the local leaders of dissent. One of the undoubted effects of the kind of coverage given campus disorders by the mass media in their alleged desire merely to report these occurrences is to encourage them by exaggerating their scope and glorifying the heroes of the moment.

Frenzy and excitement among student bodies have always been contagious. Last year, events on some campuses, even chants and slogans, broadcast at once, had a direct influence on happenings on other campuses. That is why the universities of this country are in this "all together," and why capitulation to extremism anywhere weakens resistance to extremism everywhere.

To an already volatile situation must be added the Students for a Democratic Society, an explosive element which claims tens of thousands of militant activists in hundreds of chapters. The SDS is an openly social revolutionary organization, dedicated not to educational reform wherever needed, but to a strategy of politicalization of a university by the tactics of physically violent confrontation. Its operating maxim could well be, "the bloodier the confrontation, the better for our cause, and the worse for the Establishment." Its presence is sufficient to convert a situa-

tion in which problems exist into a permanent educational crisis. The members of the SDS are ideologically confused but they constitute a hard, fanatical core of highly politicalized individuals among student bodies, extremely skillful in the arts of generating conflicts and disruption through agitation and manipulation of mass organizations. They and their congeners among the New Left, including their faculty allies, would be hard to contain by wise and enlightened administrators and faculties. Unfortunately, these traits have not been conspicuously in evidence even in places where one would expect them. This is suggested by the fact that the worst excesses on our campuses have occurred at the most liberal institutions. The University of California, San Francisco State College, the University of Colorado, Roosevelt College, Columbia University, and New York University—these read like the beginning of a roll call of the centers of intellectual dissent, experiment, and even educational permissiveness in American life. Events on these campuses, as well as at Swarthmore and Oberlin, reveal the absurdity of the claim that the student revolution has been the consequence of dissatisfaction with the educational curriculum.

Educational changes are often desirable, but it was not a failure to introduce them that provoked the recent outbreaks of student violence, or encouraged continuance of these outbreaks. Much more warranted, as an explanation of the failure to meet the initial challenge of student disruption and to stem its growth, is a mistaken theory of liberalism, a reliance upon what I call *ritualistic* rather than realistic liberalism—a doctrinaire view which does not recognize the difference between belief or doctrine and behavior, and which refuses to grasp the fact, obvious in law and common sense, that incitement to violence is a form of behavior. It is a view which does not realize that although order is possible without justice, justice is impossible without order.

The realistic liberal outlook in education cannot be strictly identified with the liberal outlook in politics because the academic community cannot be equated with the political community. Although we may recognize the autonomy of the academic community, such autonomy cannot be complete since the political community in many ways underwrites its operation. But what both communities have in common is the centrality of the notion of due process.

Due process in the political community is spelled out in terms of specific mechanisms through which, out of the clash of public opinions, public policy is forged. Where due process is violated, consent is coerced, and cannot be freely given. The unlimited spectrum of ideas remains unabridged in the political community up to the point of advocacy, but not to the point of violent action or the incitement of violence. The forces of the state, the whole apparatus of restraint and punishment, enter the scene where the freedom of choice of the citizenry is threatened by extralegal activity.

Due process in the academic community is reliant upon the process of rationality. It cannot be the same as due process in the political community as far as the *mechanisms* of determining the outcome of rational activity. For what controls the nature and direction of due process in the academic community is derived from its educational goal—the effective pursuit, discovery, publication, and teaching of the truth. In the political community all men are equal as citizens not only as participants in, and contributors to, the political process, but as voters and decision-makers on the primary level. Not so in the academic community. What qualifies a man to enjoy equal human or political rights does not qualify him to teach equally with others or even to study equally

on every level. There is an authoritative, not authoritarian, aspect of the process of teaching and learning that depends not upon the person or power of the teacher, but upon the authority of his knowledge, the cogency of his method, the scope and depth of his experience. But whatever the differences in the power of making decisions flowing from legitimate differences in educational authority, there is an equality of learners, whether of teachers or students, in the rational processes by which knowledge is won, methods developed, and experience enriched.

In a liberal educational regimen, everything is subject to the rule of reason, and all are equals as questioners and participants. Whoever interferes with academic due process either by violence or threat of violence places himself outside the academic community, and incurs the sanctions appropriate to the gravity of his offense from censure to suspension to expulsion. The peculiar deficiency of the ritualistic liberal educational establishments is the failure to meet violations of rational due process with appropriate sanctions or to meet them in a timely and intelligent manner. There is a tendency to close an eye to expressions of lawless behavior on the part of students who, in the name of freedom, deprive their fellow students of the freedom to pursue their studies. It is as if the liberal administration sought to appease the challenge to its continued existence by treating such incidents as if they had never happened.

There is no panacea that can be applied to all situations. It is not a question of a hard line or a soft line, but of an intelligent line. It is easy to give advice from hindsight, to be wise and cocksure after the event. But it is always helpful for the faculty to promulgate in advance fair guidelines for action, so that students will know what to expect. In general, no negotiations should be conducted under threat of coercion, or when administrators or faculty are held captive. In general, no amnesty for lawlessness or violence should be offered. In general, organizations that refuse to accept disciplinary principles worked out by official representatives of the student body and faculty should be denied recognition and the use of university facilities.

As a rule, it is the first step which is *not* taken that costs so much. Both at Berkeley and Columbia, failure to act decisively at the first disruption of university functions undoubtedly contributed to the students' expectation that they could escalate their lawlessness with impunity. Sometimes the attempt to retrieve a failure to meet student disruption promptly and fairly results in a greater failure.

When student defiance of reasonable rules and regulations is pointedly and continuously ignored, and then subsequently disciplined, the consequence may be worse than if the first infraction had been totally amnestied. Unnecessary delay in initiating the disciplinary measures, however mild, incurred by the infraction of rules, can make it appear to large numbers of the uninformed that these students are the innocent victims of vindictive and gratuitous punishment.

The fourth and largest illegal trespass at Berkeley—the seizure of Sproul Hall—came as a consequence of the summons to four student leaders to appear before the Disciplinary Committee several weeks after they had committed the violations for which they were being called to account. There was a similar situation at Columbia. The first action which presaged the events of 1968 occurred in 1965 when students forcibly prevented the NROTC award ceremony. In 1967, “the administration canceled the ceremony citing insufficient time to prepare against violence” (*The Cox Report*). Violence seemed to pay off. A handful of students had forced their will on the University at the cost of seven letters of censure. After the ban on indoor demonstrations had been promulgated

at Columbia—both because it interfered with the teaching of classes and because of the dangers of violence between opposing groups of demonstrating students—it was not enforced on three important occasions where it was clearly violated. When the ban was finally invoked, it seemed to many who were unaware of the past history of student provocation and university restraint that the disciplinary action, even if feeble, was arbitrary. It is widely believed, even by some of the SDS members, that if the Columbia University authorities had moved vigorously to enforce existing regulations against the lawless trespass and destruction of property by the small group that sparked the seizure of buildings on the first day, subsequent developments would have been avoided. For campus sentiment was overwhelmingly hostile to the student rebels at the outset.

The ironical aspect of the situation is that despite the liberal character of the institutions in question, a false view of what it means to be liberal seems to provoke or to exacerbate disturbances on the campus. In certain faculty quarters especially, it is believed that the very nature of a liberal educational community necessitates, independent of any student action, an absolute taboo against physical or police sanctions. At a large metropolitan university during a student strike called by a small and rabidly fanatical minority to protest the dismissal of an administrator guilty of vicious anti-semitic incitement, a faculty group tried to get a resolution adopted pledging the university “not to call upon the police *under any circumstances*.” Had such a resolution been adopted it would have given those who made a cult of violence assurances in advance that they could carry on as they pleased no matter what the cost to life, limb, and university property. It would have encouraged the very violence those who favored the resolution professed to deplore. “What’s so tragic about the destruction of a little property?” one professor inquired. He only shrugged when a colleague sardonically added, “Or a little fire?” In the academy as elsewhere there is no substitute for common sense. As it was, fire hoses were cut, elevators jammed to a point where their operation was dangerous to life and limb and their operation temporarily suspended, and the auditorium in the student center set afire.

Some faculty members see truly, in the words of a perceptive member of the Columbia staff, that “the authority of a university is not a civil authority, but a moral one.” But he mistakenly concludes that the disruptive activities of students “can only be contained by faculty and by other students, not by the police.” This is a morality not of this world but of the hand-wringing, ineffectual spirit that leaves this world and its universities in possession of callow, ruthless fanatics prepared to threaten or use violence.

“Confrontation politics” in the moral academic community “is inadmissible,” we are assured by those who love everybody and want to be loved by everybody. Excellent! But what if some students do what is inadmissible? What if they resort to pillage, vandalism, personal assault? What if the torch of learning in some hands becomes a torch of arson? To say that only other students can contain them, and not the police, is to forget that once we leave the world of the spirit, this is an invitation to civil war.

Wars of containment, as we know, can be quite bloody. The police may have to be called in to prevent students from containing (and maiming) each other. And like all sentimentalizing in this cruel world, the fear of relying on the police in *any* circumstances to resist the militant politics of confrontation, which brutally scorns the rationalities of academic due process, is to rely upon the politics of capitulation. It is administrative and/or faculty cowardice masquerading as educational statesmanship. It receives and deserves the contempt with which the storm troopers

of the SDS greet it as they prepare for the next phase in the escalating cycle of disruption and violence.

In the light of recent events on campuses and the reactions they have inspired, it should be obvious that the SDS is *not* a Trojan horse in American higher education. It is today the “armed warrior” of anti-education. It makes no secret of its desire to destroy American democracy and the universities that it considers as a faithful replica of that iniquitous society. No, the Trojan horse in American higher education is the rickety structure of doctrinaire thought that shelters the SDS even when it takes official responsibility for violent actions, gives it a free field for operation, retreats before the politics of confrontation, and either shrinks from applying fairly and firmly the rules of reason that should bind the academic community, or interprets them as if they had no more restraining force in times of crisis than ropes of sand.

The facts about the SDS are well known. It has the virtues of openness as well as courage. It takes public responsibility for its action of violence, and promises more to come. For it, the campuses are the front-line barricades in total war against American society. Persistent refusal to recognize these facts has prevented administrators and faculties from preparing proper defensive measures to keep the universities free. This refusal is sometimes undergirded by the odd belief that disciplinary action against an organization that officially organizes violence on campus is incompatible with the conception of a university as a “free market place of ideas.” The conjunction of attitude and belief is a forerunner of educational disaster. This is illustrated by the pattern of events within the last two years at the University of Colorado. It culminated early this March in the most violent outbreak in the history of the University, when a guest of the University, President S. I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State College, was almost mobbed by bottle-throwing members of the SDS and their Black Nationalist allies to prevent him from speaking. Despite its previous actions of violence and the absence of any pledge to forswear violence in the future, the SDS had been reinstated on the campus on the ground that the University must serve “as a free market of ideas.” The SDS promptly showed that its purpose was precisely to destroy the University as a free market of ideas.

The detailed story is too long to relate here, but it can serve as a paradigm case of high-minded blunder, panicky ineptitude, and self-righteous obtuseness on the part of some regents, administrators, and faculty members who are convinced that true tolerance requires that we tolerate the actively intolerant.

In the last analysis, it is the faculties who are responsible for the present state of American universities—responsible because of their apathy for what has developed in the past, and for missed educational opportunities. Despite what is said by outsiders, the faculties of most universities possess great powers which they have so far been reluctant to use. No policy in education can succeed without their support. Theirs is the primary responsibility for upholding academic freedom. Now that American higher education is at bay, challenged as it has never been before by forces *within* the academic community, the faculties must marshal the courage to put freedom first, and to defend it accordingly.

At the same time, as they move to safeguard the integrity of the educational process, faculties should, wherever they are not already doing so, undertake a critical review of all aspects of the curriculum and university life. Provisions should be made for the airing and public discussion of all student grievances. Students should be invited to assess existing courses, methods of teaching,

the effectiveness of their teachers, and to make proposals for new courses.

It is a libel on American educators to imply that they are hostile to educational change. Most past criticism has inveighed against them for making curricular revisions too readily at the first cries of "relevance" by pressure groups. Educational crackpots, including some headline-hunting administrators, are now rushing to claim that had their curricular panaceas been adopted, student violence would have been avoided. They assiduously ignore the fact that the extremist student groups are trying to bring down bigger game.

John Dewey was fond of saying that in the modern world there is no such thing as the "status quo." Change in education as in society, is inescapable. The only questions are whether the direction and content of change are sound, and what the rate and magnitude of change should be. Men of good will may differ about the answers. But no matter how profound the differences, they do not justify the resort to violence and the threat of violence to impose solutions. In a secular society, the places where human beings assemble to inquire and to reason together should be regarded as sacred ground. Whoever desecrates it, should feel the disapproval of the entire community.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. I compliment him on the brilliant statement he has just made. It is quite understandable to me why the members of the Committee on the Judiciary look to the Senator from Nebraska, and always have, with such respect. Everyone knows of his great legal qualifications.

Mr. President, a person with his legal qualifications can be of immense help, as he always has been and will be.

In the peculiar situation in which those upon whom the responsibility to act has been placed, a few have proven to be reluctant dragons. Therefore, we have to look to new means. I appreciate the support of the Senator on the grand jury approach to the matter. I think this could help every State in the Union to stop some of the violence and anarchy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Colorado for his diligence in calling to the attention of the Senate and the American people the activities both past and potential, for the future, of the Students for a Democratic Society. The American Republic has always been slow to react to a threat, either domestic or foreign. Perhaps that is a virtue of representative government, because in the process, irresponsible dissent and abuse of constitutional freedoms, tolerated and suffered by the general public until a very late hour, eventually create the necessary reaction by an aroused public opinion necessary to restoring order.

I think the time is now at hand when the American people are waking up to realize that we have in this country, a small, well-trained and dedicated group of people seeking to destroy the very institution from which we derive our spiritual, cultural, and intellectual strength. I think it is clear, at this point, that the SDS is making a coordinated effort to tear down the American colleges and universities. May I point out a glaring, but sad example. In a recent press account, it was pointed out that many of the prominent faculty members at Berkeley had left that institution for other

teaching opportunities because of the disruption that had occurred there. I submit that the strength of any teaching institution lies in its faculty, and when faculty members become so disturbed that they go elsewhere to serve, the institution itself cannot help but be damaged.

I commend the Senator from Colorado for pointing out the coordination which seems to be very evident in the SDS movement. A case in point and very close to home are the attacks made upon Washington area colleges last week. I think it is no accident that George Washington University, American University, and Maryland University were all attacked within a 36-hour period. I should like to point out something that clearly corroborates what the Senator from Colorado has stated. In his report on SDS activities, he quoted the objectives of SDS leaders as they were formulated at a recent regional meeting at Princeton University. He states that among the nine objectives of SDS is no war or counterinsurgency research, no ROTC in the colleges and universities, and no military role for the American college. Should the SDS or any group opposed to university research in support of the military succeed in terminating this research, it will have a triple-barreled adverse effect: first, the universities will lose this income; second, it will force the government to build and staff its own inhouse research facilities, thus increasing the cost and size to the Government; and, third, it will possibly destroy much of the spillover effect into the civilian sector and economy which now comes from defense research. Finally, I wish to point out that if and when these Government funds dry up, these scientists who are now protesting will probably be the first to complain about the loss of Government money and Government research. After the SDS seized the Sino-Soviet Institute Building at G.W., the SDS leaders were invited to speak before a law class, and I have firsthand reports that these three goals were put forth by the SDS leaders as part of their objectives. Also during the remarks of the SDS leader, a question was asked about how the damage should be paid. He said and I quote:

We are not concerned with how capitalist institutions get their money since we are a communist group.

It may be that we are now facing in this country the initial stages of a revolution. We have clearly passed the point of talking by those who are advocating the destruction of the American system and are now seeing action on their part. Over the past few years we have seen attempts to prevent railroad transportation as it relates to the Vietnam war. We have seen student groups seize and hold university buildings. We have witnessed an armed takeover of a building at Cornell University, and in the process, those who are guilty were not punished. This I find incredible. We have seen property belonging to the State, to individuals, and to private institutions, destroyed. We have unfortunately seen a university administrator die of a heart attack while being involved in this kind of disorder.

I submit therefore, that we are not talking about the Communists of the 1950's whom the Supreme Court said were not guilty, merely because they only verbally advocated the overthrow of the American Government. We are now talking about young revolutionaries who have actually begun to carry out in deeds what they have been saying with words for the past several years.

I should also like to raise the issue of the finances of SDS. If necessary, I think Congress should subpoena these leaders to determine how they receive money and from what sources. I think that is completely justified under the circumstances. We should determine if this money is being supplied to these young people from outside the United States, or from any foreign country which might have an interest in domestic strife in our Nation.

I am confident that the American people will rise to this threat, not in the way it was done in 1942 against the fine Japanese-Americans who were not guilty of anything, nor through the witch-hunting tactics of the 1950's.

Democracy is strong, the American people are patient, our institutions are not easily destroyed, but a new threat is upon us and I think it is time that we realize the seriousness of the threat that is now upon us. I think the American people should watch very carefully the efforts in May as described by the Senator from Colorado.

I further wish to endorse the President's message of this week, wherein he called upon college presidents and State authorities to be firm in dealing with this kind of crisis.

I cannot close my remarks without commenting on the fact that Notre Dame University has to date been unaffected, and I think the reason is that the president of that great institution made it clear that he would not tolerate student riots or disorders. I would point out, also, that the colleges of Utah thus far have avoided this kind of disruption and most of them have also made it clear to students that it will not be tolerated. In fact, a special note of praise is to be given to the student leaders of Utah's colleges and universities who have repudiated the tactics and objectives of the student rioters. I should like also to commend the vast majority of American college students who realize that change is possible within the system, who have adhered to the laws and rules, and who by so doing have again anchored our faith in American youth.

I feel there is room within the context of any university administration, for tolerance, negotiations, and compromise. I do not feel, however, there is room for intimidation, blackmail, or capitulation. I call upon our university administrators, both private and State, to expel from their campuses any student who advocates, leads, or participates in any activity that violates Federal, State, or university laws.

I want to pay a special tribute to those students at American University and Maryland, in our own community, who threw out the SDS rebels and who prevented their occupation. As I close, I repeat my commendations of the Senator

from Colorado for the great service he is performing for the American people.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Utah for his very helpful and thought-provoking discussion of the matter we have been discussing this afternoon.

I think it is important that the Senate, by this means, say in a very loud voice, that we are concerned about the disruptions in our society; that we do not want to deny anyone the right to dissent; but that this dissent must be carried on within the bounds of law and order. To the extent that all those who have participated here this afternoon have done that, I think it will be helpful. It will be helpful to our Attorney General and it will be helpful to the college administrators, and, where it is necessary, to the law enforcement officials all over the country.

I do thank the Senator very much for his intervention and his assistance.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of my friend from Colorado.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to second the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from Colorado and others on this important question of violence and disruption on our university, college, and high school campuses. There can be little doubt for anyone who reads the newspapers that the wave of violence in our educational institutions is the result of an organized movement led by the SDS, the Black Panthers, and other militant groups.

However, the violence could not continue if it were not tolerated by the administrators, faculty, and trustees of the affected institutions. I think that many of these authorities are derelict in their duty. We have seen cases where the administration has given in to violence and blackmail. Yet, once the violence has subsided, these same administrators have failed to discipline the affected students. The students have been kept on the college rolls, where they continue their agitation and wait for another moment to strike.

Although the students must take the responsibility for their actions, it is the administrators who are to blame for allowing these conditions to continue.

Yesterday's New York Daily News cracks down on the college administrators whose actions are aiding and abetting the student militants. The Daily News, for example, cites City College of New York. The News says:

City College President Buell C. Gallagher, with faculty support, decrees a total shut-down of City College of New York until peace is arranged with students holding South Campus by force.

The rebels number some 200. Total CCNY enrollment: about 18,000.

Thus, Gallagher aids and abets about 200 students in depriving about 17,800 of education for an indefinite time.

Mr. President, the administrators have also been sharply criticized in a syndicated newspaper column released today by Gen. Thomas A. Lane. General Lane

is well known in the District of Columbia since he was formerly one of the District of Columbia Commissioners under the old-style government. He is noted for his temperate yet firm approach to the question of maintaining public order.

I would like to read some pointed excerpts from this column. General Lane says:

Blame must be placed first on the university trustees. These men and women accepted a responsibility for giving policy direction to the university. When campus life is disrupted by a handful of student militants, these officers have failed their trust. This is the harvest of their error or neglect. If they were sensitive citizens, they would resign.

The trustees must be blamed for their selection of inept college presidents. When the president is selected for his personal grace or his fund-raising talents, the university is put in jeopardy. Against such leadership, the SDS can attack with every confidence in success. We have seen these presidents condone criminal behavior on the campus and retain the offending students on the college rolls. Students regard such leaders with contempt.

Trustees are responsible also for the dispersion of authority which has occurred in some institutions. Under cover of specious argument that the university is a democratic institution which must be governed by its faculty, militant professors have obtained a share of the administrative authority. In some institutions, the authority of the president to act summarily when summary action is required has been superseded by requirements of faculty approval.

It is very bad organization which involves members of the faculty in matters of university administration not directly related to their academic disciplines. Professors lack both competence and temperament for the work. Their unfitness for combat invites the revolutionary violence which they abhor.

Of course, General Lane does not criticize all university authorities. He singles out for praise the order which prevails on most campuses today. He says:

The validity of this criticism is demonstrated by the order which prevails on most of the campuses of America. Where the trustees have selected a president who maintains good relations with the faculty and preserves clear lines of responsibility, there are no disorders. Students know they will be dismissed for serious breaches of university discipline. When students face officers who fulfill their duties without fear or favor, students do not break the law.

Misguided officials who think that in surrender to militant students they have achieved some new triumph of peace-making are rationalizing defeat. They are in fact undermining the moral and academic standards of the institution. They should be removed from office before the university is destroyed by their policy of progressive surrender. It is the clear responsibility of the trustees to take action.

There could be no SDS without these weak and inept officials. Students are doing only what officials on some campuses will tolerate. Their success shows how keenly they have appraised officers and faculty. They measured the institutional structure and decided it could be pushed over. On other campuses where the administration is in firm hands, students have not challenged the established order.

Mr. President, it is for this reason that last week I introduced legislation to be known as the Academic Freedom Protection Act of 1969 (S. 1988). The rights of the majority must be protected and cer-

tainly the majority are peaceful and law-abiding in their actions. In my view, the college administrators have the first responsibility for maintaining order in their institutions; but we have seen so many cases where the administrators are too weak to act that there must be clear authority for the Federal Government to protect its vast and growing interest in education. For example, the National Science Foundation on April 11 issued its annual report on Federal support to universities and colleges. This report covered fiscal year 1967 and is the most complete summary of its kind, including all agencies that finance education in the Federal Government. This report shows that Federal support to universities and colleges increased from \$1.4 billion in 1963 to \$3.3 billion in 1967. In 1967, a total of 2,056 universities and colleges received Federal support from eight Federal agencies. This was over 80 percent of the Nation's institutions of higher education receiving Federal support. In 1963, less than half received Federal support. Of the 1,190 institutions that awarded degrees in the sciences and engineering fields in 1965-66, over 97 percent received Federal support in 1967. It is thus clear that the Federal Government has a big stake in the educational picture.

But, of course, it is not just the Federal Government which has such a stake, and it is not merely the institutions themselves which the Federal Government assists. The Federal Government has many programs of direct aid to students; for example, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has just approved awards for institutions participating in the college work-study program. These funds go directly to students to help them pay their way. Under this program, the students work at the schools so that they earn their way. Such students are obviously worthy of support when they are willing to work to get an education. Federal funds are provided for 80 percent of these payrolls, with the remaining 20 percent provided by the institution or off-campus agency. In fiscal 1970, Health, Education, and Welfare has approved a total of 1,842 institutional programs which are estimated to benefit 210,994 students. Total cost for 6 months is \$75,744,315. Now, here we have a program, a Federal program, which is helping students who want to help themselves and are sacrificing to get an education. Yet, many of the same institutions have had their academic work disrupted by the demonstrations of a few. Clearly, the Federal Government has an interest in seeing that these deserving students have their academic rights protected and not disrupted by militants.

According to another Health, Education, and Welfare report issued on April 17, the educational opportunity grants program will benefit 1,900 institutions, awarding \$143,650,366 to 262,013 students. These grants, ranging from \$200 to \$1,000 for each academic year of study, up to a maximum of 4 years, are awarded by participating institutions of higher education to students of exceptional financial need who are eligible for the program. Again, this is obviously a deserving group of students who are seeing the

promise of a good education cut short because of academic disruption.

I would also like to call attention to a special publication put out by Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Where the Money Is," American education's annual guide to the U.S. Office of Education programs. This pamphlet lists 118 programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education alone.

Thus, it is clear that the Federal Government has a direct interest in seeing that these programs operate in an orderly manner. If the college administrators will not take steps to see that order prevails, the Federal Government must step in to protect its investment and to protect the academic freedom of those students and faculty members who do not wish to participate in disruptions.

It is not enough to hold out the threat of cutting off these programs to the individuals who cause disruption or to institutions which permit it. The difficulties of administering such steps are obvious, as well as questions of seeing whether justice is done in each particular case. It is especially obvious that cutting off aid to institutions will harm many innocent people. Therefore, the Academic Freedom Protective Act takes the approach of making it a crime to interfere with the orderly administration or operation of a federally assisted institution. This will immediately bring the established judicial system of the United States into play so that the rights of both the accused and innocent sufferers will be protected. There are various approaches which can be taken in making such disruption a crime. My legislation takes the internal security approach and adds a new title to the Internal Security Act. It would make it a crime to interfere with the operation of a federally assisted institution by, first committing an act of force or violence or uttering a threat to do so; second, obstructing access to egress from or the use of any part of the school's premises; third entering or remaining in any structure or upon the premises with the intention of obstruction; and, fourth, committing any overt act in violation of any provision of law or any duly adopted regulation of the school.

In addition, anyone who conspires with any other person to violate these prohibitions will also be guilty of a crime.

Thus, the approach of this bill is aimed expressly at the techniques used by the demonstrators. It would apply to anyone—student, teaching fellow, faculty member or administrator or outside agitator who performed any of the prohibitive acts or conspired to do so. It is, I think, a more workable and more effective approach than simply making it a crime to damage the property of a federally assisted institution or denying the right of any person to participate in any class or program of such an institution.

Mr. President, again I commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for leading off in speaking on this important topic, which is one of paramount importance to the American people.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, unfortunately today, as on so many occasions, the busy schedule of a Senator from a

big State keeps him moving in and out of the Chamber, attending committee meetings and meeting with constituents. I am sorry to say that I have not been privileged to be present during the entire debate today which was begun by the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) and was participated in by, among others, the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and lately by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND).

I join with all of them in hopefully calling general attention to the facts and conditions that have been so well recited here today. There is growing evidence that there is a plot to disrupt our universities as a means of eventually disrupting our system of government.

Having had the privilege of living in this great Nation for more than a half century, I know that our system is not perfect. Many things need to be done. That is our purpose in being here. However, insofar as I have been able to find out in my travels around the world, we have achieved a greater degree of perfection in a free society than any other system ever devised by mankind.

Therefore, I say that those who would destroy it without having proof of a proper, progressive replacement will be opposed by me, as I know they will be opposed by my colleagues.

I think that the operations and activities that have occurred on the college campuses have been shocking, to say the least. I am discouraged that the vast majority of the students seem indifferent to the disruptive actions of a small percentage of students who seem bent on knocking down our education structure, not improving it. I am also concerned that our faculties and administrators have generally failed to come to grips with the college disturbance. Firm but fair action is needed in response to this challenge to our universities and colleges. Academic institutions are supposed to be centers where ideas and truth prevail, not where brute force reigns. The complete lack of discipline and commonsense frightens me to the point that I wonder about the future of our country, not because of forces on the outside that would destroy it, but because those who are in charge of our schools are not in general doing what is necessary to protect their educational institutions. It is the disappearance of discipline, if you will. Discipline is the first order. It is the first word that must be learned in the academic community—discipline of mind, discipline of study, the use of one's time, the application of the brain that is God-given. Discipline has been completely and disastrously swept away. Everyone talks of freedom. They do not mention the word "responsibility," yet, the two are inextricably linked.

I should like to join Senators in the statements made today. I see evidence this movement is organized. I believe it is organized, and I also believe that many of the young people do not realize they are being used, just as years ago, in the industry in which I was formerly engaged, in Hollywood, many good people became involved because they believed in slogans, half truths, and prop-

aganda saying, without taking the time to find out the real facts.

I recall the trouble which started at the great university at Berkeley, one of the outstanding universities in the world, and then the troublemakers came in. There was something called the free speech movement. Free speech—free speech for themselves. Anybody else who wanted the right to speak would be hooted down, booed down. Realizing their positions could not stand exposure to the light of reason and debate they resorted to the picket line and to violence and destruction.

We had a similar experience recently at San Francisco University.

Governor Reagan, of California, told me that the admission of the troublemakers there started when a group came into the dean's office with knives in their hands and made certain demands.

Mr. President, we have had too much of the use of force in place of reason in my lifetime. We have seen two world wars. I recall the first one. That was the war to end wars to destroy the fallacious saying that might made right. I have opposed that all my life. I oppose it in labor unions. I oppose it in my activities in the Senate. Reason is the approach, and we have wise people.

I was glad to hear a reference today to the unfortunate emphasis on the part of the news media. I know it makes a better picture in the newspapers to see somebody jeering or yelling. It is a much more exciting story than to tell the story of the good, run-of-the-mill student, of the good, ordinary student.

I know something about this. In my former vocation as an actor in Hollywood, some of my friends of the press would come to me and say, "Murphy, why don't you get into some trouble, so that we can give you some publicity?"

I always said that I was not interested in getting into trouble; that I was more interested in doing my job to the best of my ability. I believe that that is the feeling of the great majority of students in the universities today. I see no reason why the 1 or 2 percent should be permitted to interrupt the intellectual advance of the other 98 or 99 percent who want to go to school and learn and get on with the job of helping to make this a better Nation and a better world in which to live. Do not the vast majority of the students deserve the opportunity to go to classes and secure an education without being exposed to the destructive and dangerous disturbances of a small minority?

Dr. Hayakawa has done a magnificent job at San Francisco University. We say it is magnificent because he did what was obvious. He demanded that the rules be obeyed; and, with the help of the great Governor of California, he has made a nationwide reputation.

Father Hesburgh, my good friend from Notre Dame, made a statement in which he said:

Fellows, if you want to obey the rules, take 15 minutes and think it over. If you don't want to obey the rules, pack and go some place else.

That is what is needed today.

I have asked a simple question of 10 reputable lawyers. I am not a lawyer, but

I know something about the law. I have asked 10 reputable lawyers, "Is there a special set of laws that applies only to people who are outside the campus, who are not part of the academic community; or are the people on the campus supposed to live by the same laws that apply to the rest of us ordinary citizens?"

They all have answered that there are not two sets of laws; that if I, outside the campus, break a window or throw a molotov cocktail or forcibly hold a man against his will, certain rules and laws apply. I recommend that the same laws should be applied to those on the campus, unless I have been misled, unless there are special restrictions of which I know nothing.

So I hope that the widest publicity can be given, first, to the true character of the American youth today—not to the freak, not to the odd-ball, not to the fellow who is living a charade. He is trying to make every day Halloween.

I once said, when I saw the hippies on the Sunset Strip, "What would they put on for Halloween?" They could not go any further than the ridiculous costumes they wore merely to attract attention to themselves.

I saw two on a campus in Washington, sitting in their filthy, ragged clothes, holding face masks of Mao Tse-tung over their faces in order to attract the attention of people who were passing by. This was really ridiculous.

Dr. Hayakawa has told me, also, that the students are not completely to blame; that, in his experience, members of the faculties have told the students to go out and join in the mischiefmaking, join in the troublemaking, join in the disruption, and, "If you don't you'll flunk the course." This is shocking.

Were I the head of a university, any faculty member who recommended breaking the rules or breaking the law in such a manner would be fired.

Mr. President, we have had them before the Committee on Armed Services. We have had them in executive hearings and we have had them in public hearings. They have been absolutely in opposition. We had one man the other day who enjoys great publicity. He was an adviser to former President Kennedy. He has received great publicity. I asked him in my examination whether he knew the Russians had an ABM. He said he did. I asked him if he knew that it had been deployed for some 3 years. He said he knew that. I asked him if he knew that they had experience we do not have. He said yes.

I said, "What about their ABM?"

He said, "It is a bunch of junk."

I said, "Do you know that for a fact?"

He said, "No; but that is my opinion."

I asked, "Is that based on scientific knowledge?"

He said, "No; it is not." He said it was based on his opinion.

Mr. President, this is dangerous and from now on, as long as I am a Member of the Senate, I intend to point out these fallacies and these preposterously self-opinionated people who attempt to sway the opinion and knowledge of better and

wiser men who have the full responsibility for this Nation.

This is a part of the same confusion in which we find ourselves. It is only part of this same misplaced emphasis. It is the same problem that makes it difficult for those of us who want to find the truth of the situation and bring the truth to the American people and thereby let the people, who still control the Government, determine the way they want our system of government to flow in the future.

Mr. President, I commend Senators who have spoken on this matter today. I am glad to see that the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) has returned to the Chamber. I hope they see fit to carry on the discussion with reference to this most important matter affecting our universities and colleges. I am hopeful that today's discussion will prod those in authority to put an end to these disturbances that have plagued our colleges.

SENATE RESOLUTION 192—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF CAMPUS DISORDERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for months now the great learning institutions of this country have been wracked by violence that at times bordered on anarchy. Colleges and universities have been forced to close in some instances, in others there has been such a disruption of normal routine that for all practical purposes whole semesters have been literally wasted. In some few instances university authorities have been able to restore order and regain control of their institutions but more often they have not. What we have witnessed by college officials is surrender of authority to militant and often armed groups of insurgents who often have been led by individuals who were not students of the university.

Millions of students, in fact an overwhelming percentage, have not supported these outrageous disruptions. They are opposed to them for such disorders seriously interfere with their desire to pursue their college courses. Also the millions of parents, who at some considerable sacrifice have been able to send their sons and daughters to college, resent this unlawful interference with the students' education. But the protests continue and the colleges and most of the students suffer.

Behind all of these protests there seems to emerge something of a pattern. Certain individuals appear all too often at the same college at the same time, either just before a student demonstration begins or just after it has started. Many are members of the SDS, a group whose objectives are open and well known. In fact, a copy of one of their publications outlining their objectives was placed in the RECORD on Monday by a Member of the other body. The article begins on page 10538 of the RECORD of that date.

What does all of this mean so far as our internal security is concerned? Does

this campus violence and do these attacks on our educational institutions pose a threat to our internal security? I am not sure but I am determined that we find out. To that end I send to the desk a proposed Senate resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee to make a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of these campus disorders and to report back no later than the end of next January with its findings and recommendations.

Mr. President, this will not be an easy investigation but I am confident that the Subcommittee on Internal Security can get to the bottom of this problem. I know of their past investigations from firsthand, and I know of no other committee or subcommittee more admirably equipped to do this job that needs so much to be done. I do hope that the resolution is referred to the Subcommittee on Internal Security. It will be in good hands.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the resolution be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 192) which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 192

Resolved, That (a) the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete comprehensive study and investigation of the threat to the internal security of the United States arising from widespread disorders and disturbances accompanied by acts of violence which have occurred and are occurring in and in the vicinity of educational institutions within the United States.

(b) It shall be the purpose of such study and investigation to determine as fully as possible—

(1) the extent, causes, elements, and effects of such disorders and disturbances;

(2) the identities of the perpetrators of and participants in such disorders and disturbances, and the nature and extent of criminal offenses committed in the course thereof;

(3) the identities, leadership, purposes, and sources of funds of organizations engaged in the perpetration, conduct or furtherance of such disorders and disturbances;

(4) the extent to which such disorders and disturbances are or have been incited or supported through conspiratorial activities of the movement referred to in section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 or any of the organizations described in section 3 of that Act, or any other organizations inimical to the security of the Government of the United States;

(5) the extent to which such disorders and disturbances have been or may be directed toward the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of any State, or the creation of a state of anarchy within the United States; and

(6) the adequacy of existing Federal, State, and local laws and law enforcement agencies, procedures, methods, and facilities for the restoration of peace and order in educational institutions within the United States.

SEC. 2. The Committee shall report its findings and conclusions, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, to

the Senate at the earliest practicable time not later than January 31, 1970; and may file one or more partial or interim reports at any time prior to such date.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from the date of enactment hereof to January 31, 1970, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$300,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 5, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE AND REFER MESSAGES AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following the completion of business today until noon on Monday next, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives, and that they may be appropriately referred; and that all committees of the Senate be permitted to file reports during the same period together with any individual, minority, or supplemental views.

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

TRIBUTES TO JEREMIAH A. O'LEARY, SR.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to express my sense of personal loss in the passing of Jeremiah A. O'Leary, Sr.

Jerry O'Leary was one of the outstanding Washington reporters. He covered the Senate and the House of Representatives with distinction, integrity, and fairness. He was an official attached to the Senate at the time of his passing. He was a man of great understanding and great compassion, and I will miss him as a friend, as I missed him as a reporter upon his retirement.

It is a deep personal loss for me that Jerry has passed on, and I express the hope that his soul will rest in peace.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to Jerry O'Leary, a fine reporter and a wonderful human being.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to those of the majority leader and the Senator from Wisconsin in memory of a good friend and a wonderful reporter of the affairs of Congress, Jerry O'Leary. We have missed his writings lately, and now we are saddened to realize that we will miss his presence.

NAVY SHOTS DOWN TAXPAYER'S HERO

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in March of 1968, Mr. John McGee, who was then a Navy fuel inspector in Thailand, wrote to me alleging that there were serious deficiencies in the procedures for the delivery and receipt of fuel—petroleum, oils, and lubricants—POL—to American military installations in Thailand. He noted that shortages, thefts, and serious improprieties had resulted.

After determining that Mr. McGee was serious in his allegations and that he had independent evidence to support them, in line with my responsibilities as a U.S. Senator, I asked the General Accounting Office to investigate the charges.

GAO REPORT SUPPORTS ALLEGATIONS

In a report made to me in January 1969, the General Accounting Office supported Mr. McGee's allegations—the same allegations which he repeatedly had tried to make through official channels, but which were stifled by his immediate superior as well as the U.S. Navy Fuel Supply Office in Alexandria. He did this at an early date—in June 1967—and again more formally through the grievance procedures. The reply to the latter was that the issues he raised were irrelevant.

But the General Accounting Office said that:

The control system for distribution of POL (petroleum, oils, and lubricants) and the processing of Government documents for POL payments were deficient and did not adequately protect the interests of the Government.

The GAO found, with respect to verifying the delivery of fuel supplies to vehicles under service station contracts, one of the three main methods of distributing fuel in Thailand, that—

We found no evidence that verification (of fuel deliveries) had been made between January and October 1967.

The period January to October 1967 was the period of time the GAO audited.

The GAO said, as Mr. McGee had alleged, that—

The Sub-Area Petroleum Office in Thailand and the Inspector of Petroleum in Bangkok did not receive independent and documented verifications of the receipt of fuel supplies from the receiving bases prior to signing the Orders for Supplies or Services . . .

The report also said:

The responsible officers acted imprudently in not obtaining documented verifications from the receiving activities that the fuel shown on the contractors delivery documents had actually been received.

MILLIONS OF GALLONS STOLEN

The GAO made an investigation of a representative period in 1967. For this period alone it was found that at least 5.5 million gallons of fuel were stolen or unaccounted for. This total was composed of the following items:

First, there are the GAO audited service station contracts in Thailand for the period January through October 1967. Of the 1,128,700 gallons allegedly delivered, over 52 percent or 590,000 gallons was either stolen or not received.

Second, the GAO made a random audit of diesel fuels. In the year 1967 it found that of 7,400,000 gallons of diesel fuel said to be delivered to the Udorn Air Force Base in Thailand, some 3 million gallons or 40 percent were not received.

Third, the military itself acknowledged that an additional 2 million gallons of fuel had been delivered but not received during 1967. This total included some 371,000 gallons delivered to a fictitious unit named "COMM. U.S. Air Force." It included 220,000 gallons of fuel stolen under service station contracts. It included 378 truckloads of fuel totaling over 1,200,000 gallons wholly or partially stolen. It included 338 truckloads of J-4 jet fuel which was stolen or not delivered at various times from April 1967 through June of 1968.

The GAO investigation, which sampled some deliveries in a representative period, gives us some judgment as to the extent of the massive corruption and thievery of American fuel which was going on in Thailand during the period.

This is the corruption which Mr. McGee exposed.

OFFICIALS ATTACK M'GEE, NOT PROBLEM

But, as so often happens, the officials who were lax attacked Mr. McGee instead of attacking the fundamental problems.

Mr. McGee, who brought the problem to my attention, was reprimanded. This was done after his superiors, including his immediate superior, not only failed to act but made it impossible for Mr. McGee to help rectify the situation.

Mr. McGee was denied a routine, in-grade promotion, a promotion which is ordinarily automatic.

Official attempts were made to remove Mr. McGee from his post by the commanding officer, U.S. Navy Fuel Supply Center.

Other steps to fire him were proposed. All in all, instead of attacking the wrongdoing, the Navy attacked the man who blew the whistle.

McGee said the system did not protect the Government's interests. The Navy reprimanded him.

When he tried to make his case through channels, he was turned down. When he persisted, the Navy accused him of being a difficult employee to supervise in Thailand.

Yet, both the GAO and the Civil Service Commission found that McGee's superiors contributed to the conditions which made possible the thefts of petroleum in Thailand through their negligence and their imprudent action.

When Mr. McGee exposed a system which contributed to massive corruption, the Navy called "foot faults" on him. Their zeal in digging up irrelevant details

of his past was matched only by their failure to change their lax inspection system.

REVIEW ASKED FOR

In January 1969, I therefore asked the Secretary of the Navy to make an independent review of the circumstances, for I believed that Mr. McGee was the subject of punitive action because of his courageous actions.

The Secretary, Mr. Paul R. Ignatius, in turn asked the Civil Service Commission to make an impartial investigation of the personnel actions against Mr. McGee. This they did. They reported to the Secretary of the Navy, but made no recommendations.

On April 18, 1969, the new Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Chafee, made a decision with respect to Mr. McGee and released a statement concerning it as well as a letter to Mr. McGee.

NAVY'S GRUDGING ACTION

The Navy's action is best characterized as "dog in the manger." They withdrew the reprimand against Mr. McGee. He was also granted the long overdue and routine in-grade promotion. These two acts were welcome but should never have been necessary.

But, at best the Navy's action in removing the reprimand and in granting the belated step increase was both grudging and backhanded.

In certain other respects, what the Navy had to say was clearly wrong.

I had urged that Mr. McGee be commended, not reprimanded. The Navy says that they found no basis for commending him:

Insomuch as the disclosure of improper fuel operations was not initiated by Mr. McGee but had been reported earlier by others.

NAVY ERROR NO. 1

Mr. President, in that statement the Navy is wrong. The point is misleading. A strawman is set up and then bowled over. Let me explain why.

Some isolated cases of theft in Thailand were known and some minor actions against specific individuals had been taken at the time Mr. McGee arrived in Thailand in May 1967.

What Mr. McGee spotted almost immediately was a system whereby the only fuel inspector in Thailand certified to the receipt of hundreds of thousands of gallons of fuel on the basis of documents which he did not check out or verify.

What Mr. McGee alleged was that this system made it possible for the thefts and the wrongdoing both to exist and to continue.

BELATED CHANGES

In this Mr. McGee was proven correct by the GAO report which confirmed his charges. It also confirmed that the massive thefts continued to take place for months after Mr. McGee first raised this fundamental issue with his superiors.

In addition, not until September 1968—or 15 months after Mr. McGee first brought the problem to the attention of his superiors—were changes made in the procedure with respect to ground fuels, which was one of the three major categories of fuels delivered in Thailand.

In other words, without Mr. McGee's actions, the GAO investigation, and report would not have been made. Except for his action and the GAO report, the basic system would no doubt still continue to be used—a system which the GAO called both deficient and imprudent, and said failed to protect the interests of the United States of America.

NAVY MISSES POINT

So, when the Navy says they found no basis to commend Mr. McGee inasmuch as the disclosure of improper fuel operations was not initiated by Mr. McGee, they miss the point by at least 180 degrees.

Mr. McGee has never claimed to have invented the hydrogen bomb. He has never said he scored six touchdowns in a single game against the Green Bay Packers or hit four home runs in 1 day against the Yankees. And Mr. McGee never claimed he made the original disclosure of wrongdoing. What he did was to oppose the continuation of the system which provided the opportunity for wrongdoing to exist.

The Navy has a genius for confusing the point.

But Mr. McGee should be commended for doing what he did. Without his courageous action the Navy would never have changed its ways. And it is no compliment to the Navy that they changed only reluctantly and belatedly much later when the GAO was breathing down its neck.

So that is error number one concerning the most recent Navy action against Mr. McGee.

NAVY ERROR NO. 2

Let me turn to error No. 2 in the Navy release. The Navy says that their extensive study of the matter "revealed no evidence to support McGee's charges that his supervisor had fraudulently received for fuel deliveries in Thailand."

The Navy's allegation against McGee in this statement is wrong. I assert that without qualification. Let us look at the facts.

Mr. McGee alleged, quite correctly, that his supervisor had certified that many fraudulent receipts were correct. Mr. McGee did not allege that the supervisor himself had signed the original fraudulent receipts.

This is one more example of how the Navy strains at a gnat. What happened was this: Fuel was shipped out from Bangkok to bases or stations all over Thailand. As the GAO found out, hundreds of truckloads were never delivered. Sometimes receipts were made out for fictitious bases. At times false names were used. At other times the receipts were illegible.

SUPERVISOR CERTIFIED FOR DELIVERY NOT CHECKED

Mr. McGee's supervisor was in Bangkok. Without ever seeing the receipts for deliveries of hundreds of truckloads and millions of gallons of fuel, Mr. McGee's superior signed a statement on Form DD 250 that he had confirmed the shipment information with the receiving activity and that he was signing for the receipt of the fuel on their behalf.

I have one such document. It is form DD 250. It is a form covering hundreds of shipments totaling 2,548,680 gallons of jet fuel, grade JP4. The cost is given as \$230,553.59.

Attached to this form are 23 pages giving the facts about each shipment. This includes the dates when the fuel was shipped and received, the number of the truck delivering the fuel, and the receipt numbers for the shipments.

Without checking them out, Mr. McGee's supervisor certified that the receipts were accurate, that the fuel had been delivered, and that the contractors should be paid.

CONTRACTORS PAID FOR FUEL NOT DELIVERED

On this basis the contractors were paid for deliveries which were never made to U.S. bases. And it was this practice on the part of his supervisor to which Mr. McGee objected, and properly objected.

It is only by twisting the meaning of words that the Navy can say that the GAO study revealed no evidence to support Mr. McGee's charges that his supervisor had "fraudulently received" for fuel deliveries in Thailand. There was no evidence of that because that is not what Mr. McGee charged. What he charged was that his supervisor certified to deliveries which were never made and which he did not check out.

The Navy's action in other ways is out of step with the genteel tradition of the Navy—a tradition which those who respect that institution had come to expect.

Let me cite one example.

NAVY ERROR NO. 3

The Navy did cancel its pending letter of reprimand against McGee. That was the letter charging him with "alleged falsification on an employment application."

But did they cancel the letter because they were wrong? No, not at all.

Instead they gave two other reasons for canceling it. First, they said they did so because of procedural errors in prosecuting its disciplinary action against McGee. Second, they said they did it because they had failed to move promptly or properly in other respects.

But the charges were wrong and improper. The way the Navy puts it, one is led to think that their charges were true but that only procedural delays led them to withdraw the reprimand.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I am most interested in the disclosure that the Senator is making. May I ask him, was the supervisor military or civilian personnel?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The supervisor was a civilian employed by the Navy Department.

Mr. MURPHY. In the Navy Department. Is the supervisor still in the Navy Department?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The supervisor is. The supervisor was promoted.

Mr. MURPHY. Does it not generally hold that if a man signs a receipt, he takes the responsibility for the truth and

the fact of the actuality that the goods for which he signs have been delivered?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. It was his complete responsibility at that time if the goods were not delivered; is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from California is right. He certified that the receipts were correct.

Mr. MURPHY. Then it is a matter of record and fact that the fuel oil in question was not delivered, never reached the proper destination, and was not actually in receipt when the supervisor certified to its receipt; is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is right.

Mr. MURPHY. I see. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Do I further understand from my distinguished colleague that he said the supervisor was promoted?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. On what basis? Was there any basis for the promotion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We did not check into that particular promotion.

Mr. MURPHY. Would my distinguished colleague be disturbed if I checked into it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish the distinguished Senator from California would do so.

Mr. MURPHY. I assure the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I will do so and I will report to him on it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will be delighted to cooperate with the distinguished Senator from California in providing all the information we have in connection with this subject.

Mr. MURPHY. I think that the Senator is performing an excellent service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, so the punitive charges against Mr. McGee, that he falsified an employment application, essentially stand even though the reprimand based on that false charge is withdrawn.

CHARGE IS FALSE

But the charge that Mr. McGee falsified an employment application is totally false. After McGee blew the whistle the Navy investigated all of his records. They dredged up an incident which was over 10 years old. They charged McGee instead of charging those who were imprudent and whose actions led to vast corruption.

Since this employment application charge is important to Mr. McGee, the point should be detailed now.

On August 16, 1968, the commanding officer of the U.S. Navy Fuel Supply Office gave Mr. McGee a "notice of proposed removal" from his job in Bangkok. Under the specifications the notice charged that Mr. McGee's standard form 57, which he submitted when he was hired in April 1966, contained "false information." It was said that he concealed the fact that he had been employed by the Air Force previously in the period 1955-56.

This is an example of how far the Navy went to find some way of removing Mr. McGee. The Navy's charges on this point are absolutely false, and they know it.

OVERWHELMING PROOF OF FALSE CHARGE

First of all, on page one, item 16 of that very same form 57, Mr. McGee specifically listed his employment in 1955 and 1956. Far from concealing this matter, it is listed on the very form on which the Navy charged he concealed the matter.

Second, at the time of his employment, he was interviewed and the point of his previous employment was brought up, discussed, and had an important bearing on his new status.

Third, when he went to work for the Navy in 1966, he was officially "reinstated" as a Government employee. His official forms—those forms which every employee receives when there is any personnel action taken about him—indicated that his employment was a "reinstatement." This condition came about only because of the previous employment—which the Navy falsely charged he concealed—and which the Navy had to be aware of in order to reemploy him.

Fourth and finally, Mr. McGee has a letter dated April 1966 from the Civil Service Commission signed by John Macy, then the Chairman, referring to his "reinstatement."

I have a copy of the letter from Chairman Macy. It reads in part:

The records show that on the basis of your former Federal employment and your veterans preference you have unlimited time eligibility for reinstatement to any position in the competitive service for which you can meet the requirements.

In view of this letter, sent prior to the time Mr. McGee entered on Government service for the second time, it was absurd for the Navy to charge that McGee "concealed" his former employment. Mr. Macy refers to it directly.

I also have a copy of a letter sent to Mr. McGee by the recruiting representative, a Mr. Harry N. Ogilvie, dated April 29, 1969.

Remember that Mr. McGee was charged with concealing his prior employment when submitting his form 57 application for employment.

But Mr. Ogilvie wrote to Mr. McGee at a time before he was reemployed:

We received your SF 57 from Cdr. Tinney today.

Upon review, I noted that you indicate that you were previously employed by the Federal Government as a GS-4 Clerk, Security Patrol.

That certainly does not sound like concealment.

There were other similar instances in the list of "charges." One involved some credit difficulties over car payments when he was 21 years of age and employed at the Kirkland Air Force Base.

But the fact is he paid off his debts in a very short period of time and has had an excellent credit rating ever since.

This is the kind of "small potatoes" the Navy dredged up against him over 12 years after the event.

DIGGING UP THE PAST

The charge made against Mr. McGee by the Navy in 1968 that he concealed his previous employment could have been for no other purpose than to retaliate against him for bringing the truthful allegations about the lax system in Thailand which led to massive theft.

I want to draw the point again. It bears repetition.

Mr. McGee uncovered a system which resulted in vast corruption. Instead of commending him, the Navy went after McGee. They tried to fire him. But when one examines the charges the Navy belatedly brought against Mr. McGee after examining the details of his life, the points against him are so minor or petty or wrong that Mr. McGee comes out as a "model citizen."

This is what is called digging up the past. It is one of the oldest ploys in the world. It is irrelevant to the corruption which took place. In the case of John McGee, it did not work.

NEW SPEAK AND AN ORWELLIAN WORLD

What we have is an Orwellian world where courageous actions are condemned and straightforward language is corrupted into a modern version of "new speak."

What Mr. McGee's superiors and the Navy have tried to do since Mr. McGee first attempted to change a lax system, is to divert attention from the wrongdoing and corruption in Thailand to the alleged petty mistakes of Mr. McGee. In fact, merely by answering them we are, in a sense, falling into this trap. They would much rather divert attention from the millions of stolen gallons of fuel in Thailand to whether or not the man who exposed the lax system properly reported a period of Government employment 10 years ago.

MAN WHO BLEW WHISTLE ATTACKED

So let us put this matter into perspective.

In Thailand, there was vast theft of American fuel. The inspection system was lax and, if it was not the cause of the problem, it did not help prevent it and contributed to it. This was apparent to Mr. McGee from almost the day he arrived. He pressed for changes. He tried to go through channels. Instead of acting, his superiors prevented him from carrying out his duties as an inspector. They put him in mothballs. And his immediate superior had also improperly, if not illegally, received services and gratuities—meals, entertainment, pleasure—from the companies which profited from the lax system. And that man was defended, supported, and promoted by the Navy.

Then, instead of changing the system, both McGee's immediate superiors and, to their shame, those at much higher levels, reprimanded McGee; refused to grant him routine, in-grade promotions; tried to remove him from his post in Thailand; and, tried to fire him from the Navy.

But the GAO report proved that the allegations McGee brought were correct. But not until 15 months after McGee's original allegations, and only after the GAO was concluding its investigation,

did the Navy finally change the system of inspection for its "ground fuels" which the GAO called deficient.

M'GEE'S ROLE CRUCIAL

If it had not been for Mr. McGee, there would have been no GAO report.

If it had not been for Mr. McGee, there would have been no change in the system which resulted in massive thievery.

Instead of a reprimand to those who were lax and imprudent, the Navy tried to fire the man who brought the condition forcefully to their attention.

What the Navy has now said, loud and clear, in its grudging letter to Mr. McGee is to get along, go along. Don't report any wrongdoing. If methods are lax. If officials act imprudently. If no one will act. Do not do anything about it.

If you do, you may well be reprimanded. Instead of investigating the problem, we will investigate you. Your life for the past decade will be gone into. Your old forms will be examined for any minor error.

You can expect no automatic in-grade promotions. In fact, we will try to fire you.

You will be told, as Mr. McGee has now been told, that you should be given a full opportunity to perform satisfactorily in a new assignment.

You may well be told, as Mr. McGee was told, that your association with the Navy has not fully met desirable standards.

Instead of commending you for a job well done, you will be looked upon as a maverick and ostracized from the system.

That, I am unhappy to say, is the real meaning of the case of John McGee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the GAO summary of the report it presented to me, which gives the GAO findings and conclusions, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

INVESTIGATION IN THAILAND OF THE SYSTEMS FOR DISTRIBUTING PETROLEUM, OIL, AND LUBRICANTS AND FOR PROCESSING RELATED DOCUMENTATION—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE B-163928

(Comptroller General's report to Senator PROXMIRE)

WHY THE INVESTIGATION WAS MADE

By letter dated March 27, 1968, Senator William Proxmire requested the General Accounting Office (GAO) to investigate the operations of the Navy Fuel Supply Office in Bangkok, Thailand, and any relevant matters. This request was based upon data furnished to Senator Proxmire by an inspector assigned to the Navy Fuel Supply Office in Bangkok, which stated that theft of petroleum, oil, and lubricants (POL) in Thailand was widespread and indicated that this was due to weaknesses in the systems for distributing fuel and for processing documents which initiated payment for fuel and related services.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of this investigation, GAO is of the opinion that the control systems for distribution of POL and the processing of Government documents for POL payments were deficient and did not adequately protect the interests of the Government. (See p. 29.) With respect to fuel supplied to vehicles under service station contracts, procedures required that verification of the fuel

supplied be made with the using military units. We found no evidence that verification had been made between January and October 1967. (See pp. 13 and 14.)

The principal weakness shown by the investigation was that the Sub-Area Petroleum Office in Thailand and the Inspector of Petroleum in Bangkok did not receive independent and documented verifications of the receipt of fuel supplies from the receiving bases prior to signing the Orders for Supplies or Services (DD Forms 1155) and the Material Inspection and Receiving Reports for POL and related services, respectively. (See p. 29.)

It seems clear that the responsible officials acted imprudently in not obtaining documented verifications from the receiving activities that the fuel shown on the contractors' delivery documents had actually been received. (See p. 31.)

The theft of fuel, as far as has been detected, was perpetrated primarily by collusion and forgery; it is possible, therefore, that a more sophisticated system, properly implemented, may not have detected such irregularities. (See p. 31.)

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

In a letter dated September 9, 1968 (see pp. 43 and 44), GAO proposed to the Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Thailand:

That all procedures currently in effect in Thailand for controlling receipt of, and payment for, bulk aviation fuel also be extended to deliveries of bulk ground fuel.

That a system be established at a reasonably high level of responsibility for monitoring the full implementation of all prescribed procedures for both aviation and ground fuels at all levels of responsibility.

GAO also proposed that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Secretary of the Army arrange to include reviews of the distribution and management of POL in future audits of the activities of the Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Thailand, and the 9th Logistics Command—a component of the U.S. Army Support Element—Thailand. (See p. 32.)

AGENCY ACTIONS

Changes in procedures effected as of November 1, 1967, provided improved controls over supplies of aviation fuel and fuel supplied by service stations. (See pp. 15 to 17.) By letter dated October 24, 1968, the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Thailand, furnished data showing that action had been taken in line with the recommendations included in GAO's letter of September 9, 1968. (See pp. 45 to 47.)

In addition the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), by letter dated December 24, 1968, stated that appropriate action would be taken to ensure that POL distribution and management would be included in future audits of Military Assistance and Service activities in Thailand. He stated that, as a result of investigations made by the Office of Special Investigations, Department of the Air Force, punitive action had been taken against U.S. personnel where proof of wrongdoing was established. (See pp. 49 and 50.)

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I endorse the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). An apparent effort of the Navy to cover up corruption and the unwarranted harassment and reprimand of Mr. John McGee are most discouraging. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. President, our Government cannot afford nor tolerate corruption. When an employee makes an honest and dedicated effort to eliminate corruption, he should be given recognition, not a reprimand. It is my hope that the Navy and other agencies of Government will take a lesson from this dreadful experience. Officials absolutely must not try to cover up mistakes, nor punish those who attempt to uncover mistakes.

Mr. President, I have associated myself with the GAO's investigation of this matter. I congratulate the GAO for uncovering all the facts. I would hope that the Navy will now take further corrective action and completely exonerate Mr. McGee. I appreciate Senator PROXMIRE's effort, and the good work of the GAO, and I plan to inform my constituents who were shocked at this corruption and inform them of the facts in this case.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I very much appreciate the excellent statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I think we all recognize in this body that the Senator from South Carolina is a real military expert; he understands the importance of discipline, order, and cooperation, and of submission to the greater mission of the military force. We have to have that, if a military force is to work. The Senator from South Carolina perhaps appreciates that fact as much as or more than any other Member of this body, because he has been a distinguished soldier and is an outstanding general in the Armed Forces right now. So, coming from him, I think this kind of criticism of the unfortunate action of the Navy is most important and most significant, and I deeply appreciate it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his kind remarks.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IN SUPPORT OF THE ABM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening, April 29, the American Physical Society presented a symposium on the technical aspects of the anti-ballistic-missile system here in Washington.

Two of the panel of four speakers are opposed to the proposed ABM "safeguard" system. These are Prof. Hans A. Bethe, Nobel Laureate of Cornell University, and Prof. George Rathjens, former director of the Weapons System Evaluation Division, Institute for Defense Analysis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The other two speakers are in favor of the proposed "safeguard" system. These are Prof. Eugene P. Wigner, Nobel Laureate of Princeton University and

Dr. Donald Brennan of the Hudson Institute.

Professor Bethe stated the same position which I criticized in my speech to the Senate last March 20; namely, he concedes that the system may be needed sometime in the future and that it could be effective, particularly insofar as the area defense provided by the Sprint missiles is concerned. My point is that it would be imprudent to wait until the requirement actually exists, when it would be too late. It seems to me more prudent to begin to implement the system at a time which would, if international developments—especially in the Soviet Union—continue in line with capabilities, enable us to be prepared when the requirement is present; further, if international developments become favorable, there will be plenty of time to change our program accordingly.

Professor Rathjens destroyed the effectiveness of his arguments when he suggested that, with 20 to 25 minutes warning, we could launch our ICBM's so that there would be no need to defend them. Such an argument completely overlooks the 5-minute warning which would come from missiles launched from Soviet submarines near our shores. Worse yet, it would provide no option other than massive retaliation on our part. I do not believe our options should be so limited.

The most persuasive statement, to me, came from Professor Wigner—the only physicist who has ever been awarded what are regarded as the “big four”—the highest recognitions a physicist can receive: The Nobel Prize for Physics, the National Medal of Science, the Fermi Award, and the Atoms for Peace Award. Not only does he stand at the pinnacle of his profession, but the powerful logic of his arguments and the accuracy of his facts should appeal to those who take a genuinely intellectual approach to the ABM controversy. I ask unanimous consent that his speech, entitled “Defense Versus Retaliation,” be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEFENSE VERSUS RETALIATION

(By Prof. Eugene Wigner, Nobel Laureate, Princeton University)

When preparing for the present session I was acutely aware of the great difference between tonight's discussion and earlier discussions of our Society in which I participated. Little responsibility was involved when I argued for one physical theory as against another. The great responsibility for whatever I shall say this evening weighs heavily on my mind. It is not pleasant to recall the experiences which brought me to the stand I am adopting tonight; it would be unwise to forget that.

Let me begin by saying that there is no difference between Dr. Bethe and myself in our desire for peace. The question is, rather, whether peace is more likely to derive from a posture in which the U.S. (and also the USSR) have no defense, imperfect as these defenses may be; or whether it is more likely to come from a posture in which a strong defense is one of the national goals. I may interject that my belief in the importance of defense dates back 25 years. At that time,

at the Metallurgical Laboratory, I wrote a memorandum arguing that an at least partially defensive posture is more desirable than a purely offensive one. The intervening years only strengthened this belief.

I now wish to draw attention to two facts. I realize that facts do not decide any issues, and I will devote the last few minutes available to me to the consequences of the facts which I wish to bring to your attention. It is good, however, first, to establish certain facts. The first fact is that the missile strength of the USSR, which has been growing fast in the last two and a half years, is now exceeding that of the United States. The second fact is that there is strong evidence that, after many years in which the offensive weapons were vastly superior to the defensive ones, the present trend is an at least partial reversal of this situation and that the USSR is making use of this reversal of trend.

COMPARISON OF U.S. AND U.S.S.R. MISSILE STRENGTHS

I should like to start with a comparison of the missile strengths of the U.S. and the USSR. The first slide shows, on the left, the total explosive power available in missiles in the USSR and the U.S. This is probably a surprise to you, as it was to me, but it is well known to many in the Defense Department. You see that, before we were forced to subdivide our warheads, we had 40 per cent of the USSR strength; when the conversion to multiple independent reentry vehicles will be completed, our explosive power will be a bit short of 17 per cent of the USSR explosive power. Since the USSR has mainly large warheads, the comparison is less extreme from the point of view of area coverage. The furthest distance from the explosion at which a certain overpressure is created is proportional to the cube root of the magnitude of the explosion—this is one of the rigorously valid scaling laws of explosions in a uniform atmosphere. Hence, the area covered with a certain overpressure is proportional to the $\frac{2}{3}$ power of the size of the explosion. Two 5 Mt explosions cover a wider area with a certain overpressure than one 10 Mt. explosion. In fact, two 3½ Mt explosions have the same area coverage as one 10 Mt explosion. Hence, the advantage of the USSR in area coverage is smaller than in total explosive power and it will increase to a lesser extent when we convert to multiple warheads than their advantage in total explosive power will increase. The total explosive power is, of course, a measure of the radioactivity and fallout that the weapons create; the area coverage is a measure of the instant destruction. Nevertheless, even in the latter category, the USSR's missile strength is higher than ours by almost 20 per cent before our conversion, and will be higher by 30 per cent after we succeed with our conversion program. The conversion will, of course, increase the probability of our missiles penetrating the defenses of the USSR over the present probability of such penetration. Hence, our present power is even smaller than the graph indicates.

The next slide shows the growth of the number of U.S. and of the USSR missile launchers. You note that the graph is not quite up to date. In the last 2½ years, we have hardly increased our missile strength—in fact, though the slide does not show this—its effective strength both with regard to total explosive power and area coverage is now decreasing. The USSR has increased its capability during the same period greatly, by a factor 2½, and is now ahead of us in both these regards. In a way, I am glad that we did virtually nothing in the past 2½ years—had we increased our strength, many people would say that the USSR only responded to our provocation. As matters stand, the reason for the USSR buildup is not discussed.

You will ask me how my data can be reconciled with the statements of our earlier Defense Secretaries, McNamara and Clifford. They gave the impression that our nuclear strength exceeds that of the USSR by a factor of about 4. However, if you read their statements, they say explicitly that they compared numbers of warheads. In this regard, we are really ahead of the USSR. We still are, although the British Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that they will catch up with us by midyear. The number of warheads is much more difficult to establish than the total explosive power or the area coverage because the latter can be judged from the number and size of the launchers. The number of warheads increases when the single warhead in a missile is replaced by a multiple warhead and we do not know when and to what extent the USSR has done this. If the British Institute for Strategic Studies is right, they are doing this to a considerable extent, which would also mean that their advantage in total explosive strength decreases and we may be up to 25 per cent or so of theirs. My slides are based on the assumption that they still use single warheads.

Incidentally, the British estimate conflicts sharply with that of Dr. Lapp which was given so much publicity in the papers. Dr. Lapp estimates that the USSR will not have one thousand deliverable warheads until 1976, that is, 7 years later than the British estimate. He writes about the concern, which is very real, that the USSR will acquire a first strike capability—the Safeguard system now widely discussed is intended to prevent such a capability. Let me draw attention to a few other points of his considerations. He estimates that the USSR will need, on the average, 1.1 warheads to destroy one of our Minutemen; and you realize that, as long as our Minutemen remain undefended, this means that 1.1 warheads of the USSR can destroy in a first strike 3 of our warheads. This is certainly a reasonable estimate; it may be optimistic. However, he then accuses the USSR planners with the unbelievable stupidity to target two of their missiles at each Minuteman site, that is, to send a second missile at a site which has already been destroyed with a 90 per cent probability. He assumes that they will do this in preference to shooting at an untouched site. This, of course, is entirely absurd. What I find even more regrettable (to use Cornell President Perkins' words) is that Lapp talks only about the Russian SS-9 and never mentions the SS-11, of which the USSR now possesses about three times more than it has SS-9. It used to be my hope that responsible statements are not misled by such errors.

I have spoken, perhaps too much, about an erroneous, and even misleading statement, but it is most perturbing to me how many such statements are floating around and are given credence. I always considered Dr. Lapp to be a person of high repute and this is why I illustrated my concern with the misinformation disseminated by his paper. It is more important, however, to discuss what is the significance of the three measures: total explosive power, area coverage, number of warheads.

I shall begin with the significance of the number of warheads. As the preceding discussion shows, this may be decisive for a first strike which should abolish the opponent's retaliatory power. High accuracy has to go hand-in-hand with it, particularly if the missile sites to be destroyed are hardened—as are both the U.S. and the USSR targets. However, the U.S. certainly does not plan such a first strike, and the number of warheads we possess is, therefore, not a measure of our military strength.

How about total explosive power? We have between 16 and 25 percent of that of the USSR. I must hope, therefore, that this is not of decisive importance either. I would

have more justification for this hope if we had at least adequate fallout shelters for everyone, but fallout shelters are opposed just as much, or even more, than is ballistic missile defense. It may not be news to many of you that I would, in fact, prefer civil defense to ballistic missile defense if I had to choose only one, but until recently, the Defense Department has been even more concerned about opposition to civil defense than about opposition to ABM. However, as the preceding discussion indicates, at least fallout shelters are a necessity if we do not want the total deliverable explosive power, of which the USSR has about 5 times more than we do, to have decisive importance.

As for area coverage this might become the decisive factor if we have at least fallout shelters in area coverage we are only 20 to 30 per cent behind the USSR and this would be to some degree reassuring if the defense of the USSR were not much superior to ours. However, before turning to this subject, I should make one further remark. Some will consider the comparison of the U.S. and USSR strengths irrelevant because, they say, both parties have so much overkill that the relative strengths matter little. They say that, even if it were true that the USSR can kill all of us eight times whereas we can kill all of them only three times, this would have little significance. Fortunately, or unfortunately, this argument is not valid. The defensive measures which the USSR has instituted, and is in the course of instituting, have so drastically reduce the fatalities which we can inflict on their people that it is ridiculous by now to speak about an overkill on our part. This is what I shall discuss next. Since we are, in this regard, far behind the USSR, the increase in the effectiveness of defensive measures should perhaps not please me. It does, nevertheless, because the increased power and effectiveness of the defense—both that of the USSR and of this country—promises a more relaxed (that is, less tense) international atmosphere and all of us are surely in need of that. I will discuss this in more detail at the end of my address.

THE RISING POWER OF DEFENSE

The first question that I should discuss here is the effectiveness of the so-called Safeguard system and, more generally, of ballistic missile defense. This is a highly technical question and very difficult to discuss. As Professor Bethe quoted former Defense Secretary McNamara: "It is important to understand that none of the ABM systems at the present or foreseeable state of the art would provide an impenetrable shield over the United States."

Naturally, one must agree with this. There is no impenetrable defense, as there is no irresistible offense. A somewhat penetrable defense may nevertheless be very useful, as was also the armor on our battleships, the cover on the shelters in Hanoi, and one could give an infinity of examples.

That even a missile defense which the opponents of our defense consider very primitive, that even such a defense can be very effective was demonstrated somewhat unintentionally by Secretary Nitze. I am referring to a non-provocative missile defense—that of the USSR. According to the Congressional testimony of Secretary Nitze, it prompts us to replace the 10 Mt warhead of our Titan missiles by 10 warheads, 50 kt each. This is a reduction of the total explosive power by a factor 20, of the area coverage to 29 per cent of its earlier value. I have been told that the multiple warheads have not yet been installed—partly for technical reasons, conceivably also for other reasons. The fact that our contemplated response to the very primitive ABM of the USSR involves such a reduction in the effectiveness of one of our weapons certainly proves that the mere existence of some ballistic missile defense can

provide a high degree of reduction of the damage that the opponent can inflict. One can say, in fact, that the ABM deployment by the USSR has resulted in the most significant limitation of effective armaments that has been achieved so far.

The reduction of our total power by the Russian ABM was not very great because the changes contemplated for the other missiles are less significant than those planned for the Titans. This is because the other missiles were to carry much smaller warheads to begin with. However, most missiles of the USSR have very large warheads and if these were to be modified in the way Secretary Nitze said the Titan missiles are modified, the gain would be, indeed, enormous.

I do not want to deny that Dr. Bethe's discussion of the problems of an effective ballistic missile defense is quite valid. ABM does not provide an impenetrable shield, and the total effectiveness of the shield cannot be foreseen with accuracy. I will not enter a detailed technical discussion, partly because such a discussion would be of little interest to most of the audience, partly because Dr. Bethe would have little opportunity to answer, and partly because I painfully remember a discussion with Professor Bohr about the feasibility of a nuclear chain reaction. He convinced most in his audience that the reaction cannot be established, and did this with very sound reasons.

As I understand Professor Bethe's points, he questions mainly the effectiveness of the area defense, and I concur with him that the hard point defense is simpler and its effectiveness is more easily demonstrable. At the end of his Congressional testimony, Professor Bethe said, "A completely different concept of ABM is to deploy it around Minuteman silos and at command and control centers. This application has gone in and out of Defense Department planning. I am in favor of such a scheme."

The testimony was given before the decision to replace the Sentinel by the Safeguard system and the passage just quoted sounds like an endorsement of the Safeguard system. The passage may, indeed, have influenced the decision to modify the Sentinel into the Safeguard. For this reason, I expected, when writing this address, that Dr. Bethe would endorse the Safeguard. I regret to say that I cannot go along with him in this because I consider our people our greatest asset and their protection imperative—and also, to a very considerable extent, possible.

The greatest progress that the Soviet Union has made toward defense does not lie, however, in the area of antiballistic missiles. It lies in its renewed emphasis and energetic progress toward civil defense.

My assessment of the civil defense in the USSR is based on a rather thorough study of the Soviet literature on the subject undertaken by Mrs. Levey of Oak Ridge Nat'l Laboratory and myself. The Russian literature seems quite open and frank, telling about the shortcomings of the arrangements as well as about its accomplishments. It leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader what the objectives are. Even if they are not yet fully accomplished—and quite likely they are not yet—there is no question that they can be reached and that there can be no opposition to them in the USSR.

Most of the decrease in the number of casualties which we can inflict on the people of the USSR is due to their civil defense arrangements.

To avoid misunderstandings, I quite agree with Kossygin and do not consider the defense of the people to be objectionable or, as it is often put when our own defense measures are considered, provocative. Of the two civil defense measures which the USSR is now implementing with great vigor, I consider the first, the instruction and training

of the people, worth emulating. This training appears to be quite thorough. Grade school children are taught how to use individual means of protection, to take cover in shelters, and how to conduct themselves when they get there. Older children (in grades seven through nine) are taught rescue work and first aid along with methods of protection. Farm children are taught how to protect cattle, forage, food and water supplies as well as themselves. Factory employees learn rescue and reclamation operations and ways of reducing the vulnerability of their shops. All Russians are trained to identify and make the appropriate response to the seven warning signals. The schedule in each of the fifth, sixth and seventh grades allots 15 hours to the teaching of civil defense techniques; and the details of the program are well thought out and commendable. I only wish we would emulate this part of the program.

What I find frightening is their very elaborate plans for the evacuation of their cities. These go into the minutest details. When, in the course of a study, the so-called Little Harbor Study, evacuation of the cities was considered as a possible defense measure, all members objected on the basis that evacuation can be effective only if it is ordered well ahead of the inception of the hostilities. We felt, therefore, that it is useful only as an aggressive move, as an introduction to the initiation of a crisis, or of an attack. Even though, I believe, all the participants in the Little Harbor study were, or became in the course of the study, supporters of an expanded civil defense effort, they all felt that the planning of evacuation is not a proper means toward this, just because it is useful only to the initiator of the conflict. Evacuation is, however, the measure which is now at the center of the Soviet program. It may be, one day, terribly effective. It is true that the evacuation cannot be carried out in secrecy; it is equally true that we could do nothing even if we knew that it was being carried out.

How much would the evacuation of the major cities of the USSR reduce the fatalities in a thermonuclear exchange? We have made tolerably accurate calculations on this; let me give only a crude picture. Moscow and its surroundings have a population of about 6½ million. If these are spread over a circle of 50 radius, the density of people would become 850 per square mile. With the area coverage of our missiles as given in the first slide I showed, we could cover the territory occupied by about 9½ million people with a blast wave of 15 psi overpressure. This assumes the usual attrition rate of 113 and that we use all our missiles, without exception, for this purpose—an unlikely assumption indeed. The midlethal pressure, from lung damage, is much higher than 15 psi, but considering everything 15 psi is a reasonable value. It disregards any damage which an enemy first strike may inflict on our retaliatory force and also the sheltering which their subways provide.

Hence, the actual fatalities would be a good deal below the 9½ million I quoted. Certainly, under no likely circumstances of a conflict can one reasonably speak about overkill on our part.

I spoke about the subways in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, and Baku, and the next slide shows the construction of the subway in one of the satellite capitals. The structure you see is almost exactly the type we are proposing as blast shelters for our own cities. Blast shelters, particularly those planned by us, can be occupied on short notice. They are suited for defense, not only as a prelude to aggression.

I believe I have illustrated my point of the ascendancy of defense, in particular also civil defense, amply. I find it very disturbing that we are so far behind the USSR in recognizing

this ascendancy. I will now come to my last point: the conclusions I am inclined to draw from the facts. I will try to be very brief in this.

CONCLUSIONS

It is not pleasant to have to admit the weakness of our defenses. It is even less pleasant to admit that we are slower than necessary in affording a proper role to the protection of our people and their values and continue to rely solely on retaliation—that is, the threat of revenge. I feel, however, that in this last regard the blame falls heavily on the intellectual community, part of which has a spontaneous revulsion against all innovations in the defense structure, be these for the better or the worse.

I myself consider the possibility of strengthening the true defense, that is, the possibility to protect our people and our installations, one of the most favorable developments that have taken place in the last twenty years. The possibility of mutual annihilation appears to me a most unhappy state of affairs and, if I may repeat myself, I said so in 1944 in a memorandum submitted to the leaders of the Manhattan Project. The U.S. will not start a conflict and, if an enemy destroys our country, what good does it do us to take revenge and destroy his? At the very best, retaliation makes sense only as a threat to deter the enemy attack. But it is not even a very plausible threat because the enemy knows that it would be purposeless to carry it out. The damage that the mutual ability to destroy the other does to mutual good will need not be enlarged upon. I do therefore advocate, and have advocated for some time, a more defense-oriented strategy. I am in favor of not only the ABM but of further measures of defense, including civil defense but excluding preparations for evacuation.

The argument that any innovation on our part will provoke the USSR military is not new to me. My opinion, however, is the opposite. It is difficult to imagine anything more provocative than not to respond to the very rapid increase of the military and defensive might of the USSR. Such lack of response would dangle before the eyes of the more adventurous elements in the USSR the temptation first to shear the United States of discernible influence in international affairs, and then to go on to much more drastic encroachments on our way of life. One may suggest the status of Czechoslovakia or Hungary. It is not pleasant to remember or to remind others of such fateful words as those of Marshal Sokolovski who said "The war will naturally end in the victory for the progressive social-economic system over the reactionary capitalist socio-economic system which is historically doomed to destruction. The guarantee for such an outcome of the war is the real balance between the political, economic and military forces of the two systems which has changed in favor of the socialist camp. However, victory in a future war will not come by itself. It must be thoroughly prepared for and assured, "Do we want to support people with this attitude in the USSR by making their goals attainable?"

No, we must not dangle a temptation in front of the eyes of dictators or their military.

Second, it seems to me that defense measures undertaken on our part will help, rather than hinder, disarmament and accommodation negotiations with the USSR. The leaders of that country are not afraid of their own weapons—why should they make any concession if our armaments are stopped anyway? Could Hungary or Czechoslovakia conduct disarmament negotiations with the USSR successfully even if the U.S. did not exist? If, in the words of Ernest Bevin, we enter the negotiations naked, we will leave them naked.

Third, I do not believe that defensive measures are provocative under any conditions. Whether the opponents of ABM among us agree with this is not very important—they are not the ones who might be provoked. As for the USSR leadership, we have Premier Kosygin's words; he said, "It seems to me that defensive measures do not accelerate the arms race."

The same point of view was expressed even more strongly around 1963-64 in the magazines of the USSR. The discussion in these magazines expressed bewilderment that the United States did not take protective measures. They wondered: do they want to strike first? One could almost claim that the absence of true defense is considered provocative by the USSR. To avoid misunderstandings, let me repeat that I do not consider preparations for evacuation to be part of true defense.

Finally, let me consider the effect of a successful opposition to ABM on our own people and our own defense establishment. Doing nothing in the face of the by now alarming USSR military buildup would give the impression that the leadership of the country does not consider defense to be important. This would make it difficult for all of us to make sacrifices for our defense. And, let us not fool ourselves, such sacrifices will continue to be needed in the future. The effect on the military would be even worse. Not only would their plans be almost hopelessly dislocated; they would feel alienated, repudiated, and discouraged. And this is the last thing that we want. The path to peace is not an easy one; it will continue to require sacrifice, devotion, willingness to adopt to changed circumstances, and an open mind. I hope we have all these.

THE HIGH COST OF DEFENSE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in recent weeks it has been my duty to address the Members of this body in an attempt to bring some perspective and reason to the on-going debate over the alleged influence of a so-called military-industrial complex in this country. On April 15, as may be recalled, I discussed the make-up of this complex at some length and pointed out that many of the questionable aspects involving this Nation's military establishment have been the work of civilians—the work of a "civilian complex" as opposed to the alleged "military-industrial complex."

There can be little doubt that much of the concern throughout this country has been justifiably aroused by skyrocketing defense costs. Much of the criticism of the military-industry complex and many of the charges that this complex has too much power and influence have arisen from this concern. But to say that a gigantic, mutually gratifying military-industrial complex is the cause of our mounting defense costs is too pat an answer. It has a nice rhetorical ring to it, but it does not necessarily ring with truth. My intention is to examine today the question of rising defense expenditures and where the responsibility of this Congress resides in that connection.

Mr. President, it has been stated repeatedly—and I might say headlined in the newspapers on each occasion—that defense expenditures have gotten out of hand and that the military costs of maintaining an adequate defense establishment are out of control. I believe this is a rank exaggeration, but I believe

there is cause for concern in the present level of our defense expenditures. First, let me address myself to the greatest underlying cause of these skyrocketing military costs and my reference, of course, is to the runaway inflation which the Kennedy-Johnson years have saddled us with through gross extravagance in the area of public expenditure. The increases in public spending brought on by new and expanded frills of government, some of them promoted in the name of the New Frontier and many of them in the name of a Great Society, or a war on poverty, have fed the fires of inflation week by week until now the price structure for even the essentials of life is beginning to be mountainous. If the defense expenditures of this country are getting out of hand, they are doing so no more quickly than the Nation's welfare expenditures. Under the auspices of the Johnson administration, the price of everything has gotten out of hand when compared with previous levels. If anyone does not believe me, take a look. Hospital costs are getting out of hand, housing costs are getting out of hand, food costs are getting out of hand, clothing costs are getting out of hand.

How, in an age of runaway inflation, built on 8 years of official Government policy, can we make a special case out of the fact that defense costs are rising, and impute to that fact the hazy idea that there is some kind of conspiracy between the military establishment and the industries which supply its needs?

But this is not all, Mr. President, there are other reasons for the present high level of defense expenditures. Please understand me well. I am not about to deny that there is waste, inefficiency, and extravagance in our military procurement system. These elements are bound to exist in any operation as huge as the one that incorporates the defense of the United States of America and its commitments throughout the world. That, of course, does not make them right. I believe that every possible effort must be exerted to reduce these negative cost factors so that the American people can be given the very best and the very most that their defense dollar can buy.

Be this as it may, I suggest that the policies of the civilian complex, headed by former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, together with their squadrons of "whiz kids" and scientific computer experts, have caused the level of this inefficiency and waste to rise far above acceptable levels. Indeed, the deficiencies of this civilian cadre over the past 8 years can be measured in terms of billions of dollars lost to the American taxpayers.

The irony is in the fact that these faulty practices and policies are coming home to roost after their perpetrators have departed from the public scene. Indeed, to hear some people talk of defense expenditures—particularly when mentioned in connection with the proposed ABM Safeguard system—one would think that the present cost of defense in this country was the sole work of President Nixon and Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. It should be thoroughly

understood in our considerations of defense policies that the present administration is striving mightily to bring some order out of years of chaos. It should be understood that the President and Secretary Laird and their respective helpers cannot overnight make sense out of a near decade of waste, mismanagement and inefficiency in the Pentagon. There is no telling how long it may take to overcome civilian decisions which canceled out major weapons systems programs at a cost of billions of dollars.

Mr. President, let me interject that one of the purposes of my making these remarks today is to make amply sure that this boondoggle, which has been going on in the Pentagon for the past 8 years, is not pinned onto the tail of the elephant. In other words, I do not want my party to wind up being blamed for the mistakes which have been going on for the past 8 years.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I know that the Senator is a general in the Air Force and has had much experience, as well as having served in this Chamber for many years. In his whole experience, has there ever been so much waste comparable to the infamous TFX scandal that so quickly disappeared?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator is picking out one example, I would have to say that we have never had an example so bad. Unfortunately, though, since the Air Force has had control over modifying the aircraft, it is turning into an acceptable type of aircraft. It is not what the Air Force would like to have had, but at least it will fly and will perform its mission.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that the actual cost of the contract, from all the evidence I can find, was made over the objections of military experts, that the aircraft was commissioned at the outset against the objections of many military experts, and the aircraft has cost, I would say, roughly three times the proposed cost and was at least 1 year late in delivery through no fault of the military but rather through the fault of the civilians involved?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is exactly correct. I remember that when I was previously a Member of this body, at the time the weapons design and weapons control board, consisting of scientists, academicians, and military people—people interested in the development of weapons—about 200 in number, if my memory serves me correctly, all preferred the lowest bidder, which was another aircraft company, one man—Secretary of Defense McNamara—made the decision. No military man—not some military men—no military man concurred in that decision, I will say.

Mr. MURPHY. I am very glad to have that clear and unmistakable answer from the Senator from Arizona.

One further question with regard to some of the confusion: Is it not the opinion of the distinguished Senator that, aside from the emotional objections shall

we say, or scientific objections, so-called, to the ABM system which have been advocated by the President, the actual cost under the program as suggested has been greatly exaggerated?

I speak to the point that, as of today, I was asked on a television show what the cost would be and I stated that most of the scientists and most of the objectors, and even those who violently object to the ABM system as proposed by the President, all seem to recommend that research and development continue. I further pointed out that the only difference in cost between continuing the present rate of research and development and the cost of deployment, would be a matter of less than \$400 million. Is that not correct, I ask the Senator?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct, if he approaches it from one side, but if we go in the other direction, it would be \$750 million. The present Safeguard system will cost 50 percent of what the thin system proposed by former Defense Secretary McNamara and President Johnson would cost.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not also true that in the event the President of the United States, in the upcoming arm talks with the Soviets, meets with success, this program can be stopped at any time?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Does it not also provide, even if we continued that at the end of each year, that the commitment would be reassessed and long looks and careful study made to decide whether to continue, to improve, or to go in a different direction?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Under Secretary of Defense Laird, all programs such as the ABM will be looked on in the manner the Senator from California has described.

The present Safeguard system today is a research and development type of program. I will not stand here and categorically state that the Safeguard system will be the one that we will ultimately deploy in 1975 or 1976; but if it is stopped now, as some Senators would like to have done, if we stop research and development, then I think the answer would be the one which Dr. Foster gave me to my question to him, "What would we do in 1975 if we suddenly discovered that we had to have an ABM system without these 5 or 6 years of research and development?" I asked him, further, how long it would take him to put one together.

He replied, "I would guess 5 years—maybe a few months less, but the dangerous thing would be, really, that I could not say it would work."

As to those scientists who have said that our present Safeguard system will not work, I have yet to hear from one of them, or to read any testimony from one of them who will say why it will not work.

For the first time in my life, experienced scientists do not seem to want to say why, but go off on some wild hunt and say, "It will not work."

In my questions, when I ask, "Why will it not work? Why can we not improve it?" the answer comes back, "What would you suggest we do?" They further reply, "Do not do anything."

The scientists who back the ABM system are equally as eminent, and no more numerous, but they will give detailed information as to why they think it will work, and why it is a good carryon until we finally get something we can depend upon.

Mr. MURPHY. I had the good fortune to spend some time the other evening with Dr. Teller, whose reputation, background, and excellent accomplishments are above question. Dr. Teller, in answer to a question I made to him, replied very simply, "This is the best possible system available at the moment and unless we deploy and build a prototype, we will never be able completely to finish the research and development."

He also pointed out that the Russians had had the experience of deployment for some years, and in this area they are far ahead of us. I believe the Senator will agree with me that, under the conditions existing, this is no time to send the President to negotiate from a position of weakness. That has never worked. I think we should do everything possible to give him all the strength we can before he goes to negotiate.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Sending the President or any of his representatives to negotiate from a position of weakness is like calling a card player who has a full house or four aces. One is not particularly intelligent when he does that. This whole problem is going to be developed on the floor of the Senate as we go along. I look forward to speaking on it when the occasion arises.

It is strange that the very scientists and some Members of this body who were for the Test Ban Treaty are now opposed to the ABM. One of the few reasons the scientists will give is that it cannot be tested. That is one reason why I voted against the Test Ban Treaty. We did not have the experience which the Russians had from their very high megaton tests in the air. Some persons, including Professor Wiesner and the rest of them, have opposed anything that would improve this country's military posture.

Mr. MURPHY. I have been told that Professor Wiesner, who has been greatly publicized—I have not had the privilege of knowing him, but I have been told this—opposed the B-52, the B-58, the Atlas missile, the Titan missile, the nuclear submarine, the Poseidon submarine. That would seem to indicate he is a believer in unilateral disarmament.

I certainly do not think the American public believes, at this particular time in history, that this is the time for the United States to be unilaterally disarmed.

I opposed the Nonproliferation Treaty because I thought it was no treaty; that it was a hopeful piece of paper—the same routine I have watched for 30 years. Let America take the first step, and then hope that Russia will fall in line—which never happens. We take one step backward, and they take two steps in our direction, it seems. At the end of the vote on the Nonproliferation Treaty, I recall that one Senator said he hoped that that vote would indicate to the President what the feeling of this Chamber was with regard to the ABM. I thought at that time that

those two matters were not connected, but I have thought about his statement at great length since. I am afraid that what he was talking about was disarmament.

I hope the Senator from Arizona agrees with me that if those people want to talk disarmament, they will talk disarmament on solid, honest facts, not on devious assumptions which one day may confront this country in a situation in which we will be at the mercy of any nation which might decide to bring about a change in our system of government or the destruction of our system.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, just to go back, so we can get into the context again, there is no telling how long it may take to overcome civilian decisions which canceled out major weapons systems programs at a cost of billions of dollars.

Let me run down just a few of these programs I have mentioned, and at a later date we will debate them further:

The Skybolt program was canceled by the Secretary of Defense in December of 1962 after an expenditure of \$414,750,000—a decision, I may say, that was very influential in causing the Royal Air Force almost to disintegrate. Many of their programs were canceled as a result.

The Dyna-Soar program was canceled by the Secretary of Defense in December 1963 after an expenditure of \$409,828,000.

The B-70 program was terminated as a weapons systems development in 1961 after an expenditure of \$1,468,100,000.

The mobile midrange ballistic missile—MMRB—program was canceled in August 1964 because of insufficient funds to proceed with development. That was after a total of \$64,700,000 had been expended.

The F12 program was terminated in January 1968 after the expenditure of \$303,000,000.

I may inject that the F12 was the only fighter interceptor we had in the program—we do not have it yet today; they are all in mothballs—that was a mach 3 aircraft. The Russians have at least two in their inventory in the mach 3 class. The closest we can get to it is about mach 2.3, and that is pushing the state of the art considerably.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the expenditures which went for nothing in the Department of Defense under the policies of the previous administration. I can only ask Senators to allow for inflation and try to imagine how much it would cost us to resume any of these canceled systems should world situations make that necessary.

Who was responsible for these decisions? Not the man in uniform—and I am not saying that the man in uniform should be responsible or have the responsibility. We have the constitutional concept of the civilian man being over the military man. I think it is important to keep that constitutional authority that way, and we should not disturb it. But the man in uniform, I believe, has a more sacred feeling as to what happens than many of our people who wear civilian clothes.

This morning I asked Mr. Whittaker, whose nomination was being considered by the Committee on Armed Services to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, who has this responsibility. He was not able to give the answer, because he has not served there. He said he would submit a paper illustrating where the responsibility was. I can only reach the conclusion, prior to receiving the paper, that it is a civilian responsibility, and not a military one.

I may be criticized for defending the man in the military, the man in uniform, but I shall continue to do it because we have trained him, we have encouraged him to go to school, and we have hired him, because of his know-how, to do a certain job. I know of no training course that prepares one to be a Senator, but I know there are many training courses for those in our military establishment, and I would rather abide by the decisions of the military, mixed with civilian ideas, than depend entirely upon the civilians.

I can only tell Senators that when they add these kinds of decisions to the multi-billion dollar disaster which McNamara's TFX war plane program cost, they begin to get some idea of how costly the last decade has been. And this, of course, does not include the items like bungling on the M16 rifle contract and the pouring of more than \$200,000,000 into a conventional aircraft carrier—the *John F. Kennedy*—in an age of nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. Nor does it take in such items as the civilian decision to purchase the "second best" X-22 vertical takeoff and landing plane from the highest bidders. There can be little doubt, Mr. President, that the past policies of Defense Secretary McNamara have saddled this Nation with a tremendous level of defense expenditures. Today all prices are inflated, and this applies to those for military equipment and the machinery for defense.

And because of this, Mr. President, I believe that the responsibility of Congress to keep a watchful eye on defense contracts is most important. However, this task, I understand, is being grossly complicated by another development that took place during the McNamara era, and for which I am indebted to the *Washington Post* for some of the details. It seems, Mr. President, that the Defense Department was granted a special immunity from an independent scrutiny of its billions of dollars of spending during the McNamara years. The General Accounting Office which has long been regarded as the "congressional watchdog" of governmental expenditures quietly changed its approach to the Pentagon's multi-billion dollar contracts 3 years ago.

Now, according to the *Washington Post* of April 1, the GAO no longer concentrates on hunting down overcharges by arms contractors. It now leaves this task largely to the Pentagon's own auditing arm, the Defense Contract Audit Agency. I suggest that the Department of Defense—especially when it was being operated by McNamara and his "cost-defectiveness" policy—should be the last agency in the Government to be permitted to audit itself.

So we have a situation here where an arrogant civilian complex operated the largest establishment in the world without the usual safeguard of an independent auditing. While I realize that General Accounting officials have insisted that it has not been completely "defanged" by the Pentagon, the fact remains that GAO's influence in the Defense Department has been reduced to an agency which reviews the work of another auditing department.

I believe that these facts may shed new light on the whole idea of what is behind the high cost of maintaining today's defense establishment. The first villain in this piece is the Kennedy-Johnson inflation and the second is the faulty planning, the wasteful decisions and thorough-going incompetence of the civilian complex in the defense establishment under Secretary McNamara.

In conclusion, let me underscore again my deep concern over the irresponsibility being shown by outspoken critics of our military system at this present time in history. Better authorities than I have testified fully and in great detail about the tremendous and rising power of the Soviet Union in all areas of offensive and defensive weaponry. Russian ships are increasing in number and extending the area under their operations over more and more of the earth's ocean surface. Her conventional arms, including tanks, fighter planes, mobile units, and so forth are growing by leaps and bounds. With the help of the Arab nations, Soviet arms are stockpiling high throughout the tense and explosive Middle East. The Institute for Strategic Studies in Britain, that independent and highly authoritative watchdog agency, tells a grim tale about the growing deliverable capacity of the Soviet Union's nuclear weapons. The Russian missile defense system has been abuilding for 5 years and now is in an advanced stage of deployment. There can be no doubt that the Soviet arms as well as her intentions are growing and menacing. I do not believe that their activities and their attitudes automatically foreclose the possibility of arms limitation talks with the United States. I hope they do not. I hope we can negotiate and perhaps come up with a miracle—a meaningful arms limitations treaty with the Russians that incorporates the safeguard of effective and repeated inspection procedures.

However, I believe we must face the facts that the chances of such an agreement, on the basis of past experience, are exceedingly slim. Consequently, commonsense dictates that we look to our defenses and heed the advice of that late, great soldier and statesman, Dwight David Eisenhower, and make sure that our strength is unimpaired. Certainly, this is one of the very worst times in our history for a broad gage, irresponsible attack on the very institutions of our protection and security.

Mr. President, in closing, I feel that I must comment on a very disturbing item I saw in the newspaper a few days ago. It is about Willy Messerschmidt, of World War II fame, whose ME-109 set a world propeller-driven record in 1934 or 1935 that has never been exceeded. It rather

hurt me to see that the NATO forces felt they had to turn to Mr. Messerschmidt to make for NATO a modern superior fighter plane. Why, I wondered, have our great designers in this country been overlooked?

I suggest that they have been overlooked because they have not been allowed, through research and development, to carry on in this field in which we were once predominant. I shudder to think what the world aircraft market is going to be with Mr. Messerschmidt making fighters that, in all probability, are superior to the capabilities of our own, unless our industry is given the opportunity to develop.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several articles dealing with the subject of my talk. They were written by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff and published in the Des Moines Register of April 3 and April 13, 1969.

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

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Apr. 3, 1969]

HINT "FALSE TESTIMONY" BY McNAMARA—
SECRET DOCUMENTS OF PENTAGON BARED
(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Defense Department has delivered formerly secret documents to the McClellan Permanent Investigating subcommittee indicating former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara gave false and misleading testimony before Congress on the TFX contract.

The documents are transcripts of dozens of meetings at the Pentagon attended by McNamara as he sought to correct deficiencies in all three versions of the TFX.

KNEW OF THEM

The transcripts show that McNamara knew of serious deficiencies in all three versions while he was making public statements and giving testimony denying the deficiencies.

Also, records of the Senate Appropriations Committee show that McNamara in January, 1967, gave false and evasive testimony in even denying that he had arranged for regular meetings with General Dynamics Corp. officials and had been a participant in most of those meetings.

The transcripts show that McNamara attended most of those meetings in late 1966, and up to a few days prior to his appearance before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on defense spending.

McNamara arranged the weekly meetings with top officials of General Dynamics, the contracting firm, in August, 1966, after it became apparent that the F-111B, the Navy version of the TFX, was underpowered and deficient in nearly every performance characteristic, and major performance deficiencies were apparent in the Air Force version, the F-111A, and the bomber version, the FB-111.

SERIOUS DOUBTS

In the secret sessions with General Dynamics officials and top-level civilian officials, McNamara expressed serious doubts about whether the various versions of the TFX would be able to perform the missions intended.

This was during a period when McNamara's public comments, his testimony, and the Pentagon press office were giving the most glowing reports on the TFX.

In the secret sessions, McNamara was talking about the "disgraceful" cost of the TFX as estimates increased from an estimated \$2.8 million a plane to \$5 million, \$6 million and eventually more than \$10 million.

Yet, in his testimony and in his public statements, McNamara indicated he did not know the cost increases, but said they were what he considered to be reasonable.

At the time of the Appropriations Committee hearing in January, 1967, Senator John L. McClellan (Dem., Ark.) was aware that McNamara, former Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance and other civilian subordinates were involved in regular meetings with General Dynamics officials to try to bring some order out of what was already being referred to as "McNamara's multi-billion-dollar blunder."

BOEING BID REJECTED

McNamara had overruled the unanimous recommendations of the Pentagon's top source selection board that had said the contract should be awarded to the Boeing Co. on the basis of a "superior" performance rating and a price that was lower by at least \$400 million.

McClellan, a member of the Appropriations subcommittee on defense spending, questioned McNamara extensively over the reports that top Navy officers wanted to cancel the F-111B plane because of deficiencies, including the underpowered P-1 version of the TF-30 engine.

Through a long series of questions, McNamara indicated a lack of specific knowledge of the engine problem.

But the transcripts of the McNamara conferences indicated that he had gone over the engine problem in detail and knew that the P-1 was not satisfactory and that an expensive redesign of the F-111B would be necessary to accommodate the new high-powered P-12 engine.

LOCKED DOOR

Despite an assertion by McNamara that he would make records available, the McClellan subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee ran into a locked door in efforts to obtain any records of the discussions between McNamara and his subordinates and the General Dynamics officials.

Efforts were unsuccessful when McNamara held control of the Pentagon. He contended the records were administratively confidential. Clark Clifford continued to bar McClellan's access to the records after McNamara left office.

President Nixon promised McClellan complete co-operation in completing the TFX investigation, and Defense Secretary Marvin Laird delivered the transcripts of McNamara's TFX conferences and other records.

Congress has cut the funds for the F-111B, the Navy version, after receiving evidence that even after all of the work on a new engine and expensive design changes the plane still fell far below specifications.

The FB-111, the bomber version, has been cut back by Laird to less than 100 planes because the evidence showed the plane is inadequate to carry out the missions of the B-52 and the B-58—the planes it was supposed to replace.

COSTS SKYROCKET

The Defense Department is still moving forward with the F-111A, the Air Force version, despite inadequacies in performance, and skyrocketing costs, and a crash record that has been spectacular.

The Air Force reasons that there is no alternative to the F-111A at this time, and that even an inadequate and expensive plane is better than no plane. However, defense officials are moving quickly to try to get another Air Force plane into development.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Apr. 13, 1969]

A DECADE OF ARMS BLUNDERS—NOW THEY'RE
AN ISSUE IN ABM DEBATE—FOES EMPHASIZE
PAST FAILURES

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A decade of documented cases of waste, mismanagement and

corruption at the Pentagon is plaguing the Nixon administration as it faces the first major political test on the Safeguard antiballistic missile ABM program.

While the United States has constructed and maintained what many call "the most formidable military machine in history," the reports of Congress have documented a decade of multi-billion-dollar blunders that have suddenly become the targets of dozens of major political figures.

The new focus of attention on the "military-industrial complex" is creating alarm in the highest circles in the Nixon administration.

At the White House, at the Pentagon, and in Congress there is real concern that a flaming reaction against instances of Pentagon blunderings and mismanagement under the last two administrations could create serious problems in obtaining public and congressional support for funds the administration feels are necessary to meet American military commitments.

That concern became alarm in the last week, with the highest level White House and Pentagon personnel giving much of their time to the job of smothering the blaze of concern that could seriously harm President Nixon's political future.

Republicans fear that the new President could be the political fall guy for past Pentagon blunders.

Reaction against the military-industrial complex has included speeches by such political figures as Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Dem., Mass.), Senator Edmund S. Muskie (Dem., Maine), Senator George McGovern (Dem., S.D.) and former Vice-President Hubert Humphrey.

The reaction is growing in an inflammable atmosphere of frustration resulting from the high costs and casualties of the long and inconclusive Vietnam war and from new instances of scandalous military buying practices.

"A \$1-BILLION BOO-BOO"

Within the last few months there have been new hearings and reports that have revealed that the Army made what Representative Samuel Stratton (Dem., N.Y.) called a "billion-dollar boo-boo" in construction of the Sheridan tank and its Shillelagh missile and 152-mm. gun-launcher.

The blunder continued for nearly 10 years with high ranking army officers using a secrecy stamp to hide their fumbling from Congress. Correspondence established that even when the lack of reliability of the tank and missile system were obvious to a command using them, the officers put the tank into a production schedule to avoid the possibility of having the budget cut.

The waste in this case has been estimated at \$1.5 billion as a minimum, with some saying it could reach \$5 billion. The blame in this case is almost all with high Army officers who continued to pour funds into a pet project in the face of plentiful evidence that it was a failure.

Likewise, there were high ranking Army officers at fault along with political appointees in the waste of more than \$40 million on contracts for the M-16 rifle.

Under former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, the Pentagon awarded a contract for 240,000 M-16 high-velocity rifles to the Hydra-Matic Division of General Motors for \$56 million—a full \$20 million more than the \$36 million bid of the Maremount Corp. of Saco, Maine.

Other bungling on the M-16 contract included the initial single-source award to the Colt Manufacturing Co. that permitted that firm to make profits of from 13.4 per cent to 19.6 per cent on a negotiated contract.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A Senate armed services subcommittee saw a "conflict of interest" problem for former Navy Secretary Fred Korth in the purchase of the X-22 vertical take-off and landing plane from the Bell Corp. Korth, a former

director of Bell, couldn't get his own subordinates to award the contract so he turned it over to his superior, Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric.

Gilpatric then consulted with Korth, and made the decision to overrule recommendations for Douglas Aircraft, according to the committee report.

The result was that Bell got the contract despite the views of highest ranking Navy officers that Douglas had the best plane, and at a price that was at least \$350,000 to \$1 million lower than Bell's.

It took a threat of public hearings by Senator John McClellan's (Dem., Ark.) permanent investigating subcommittee to stop Air Force Secretary Harold Brown, one of the so-called McNamara Whiz Kids, from awarding a \$60 million computer contract to the high bidder, IBM. All three other competing firms, RCA, Honeywell and Burroughs—were well qualified and had bid about half of IBM's bid on this \$120 million contract.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in several unanimous reports criticized McNamara for pouring more than \$200 million into a conventional aircraft carrier, the John F. Kennedy, rather than into a nuclear-powered carrier. The committee charged that the John F. Kennedy was obsolete in a nuclear age.

TFX CONTROVERSY

Senator McClellan has dubbed the TFX warplane "a multi-million-dollar disaster." After waste of \$1 billion or more, the Navy version, the F-111B, was canceled as too heavy, too costly and inadequate to meet Navy mission requirements.

The bomber version is reported nearly as inadequate for its mission, and it has been sharply cut back. The plane has only 70 per cent of the range of present B-52s and B-58s, and failed to meet the bomb-load performance and speed criteria.

The Air Force is going ahead with purchase of F-111A planes because there is no alternative, despite the fact that the cost of the plane has jumped from \$2.8 million to about \$10 million each and does not meet original performance specifications.

Also, it was noted by such critics as Senator John J. Williams (Rep., Del.) and Representative H. R. Gross (Rep., Ia.) that there were serious "conflicts of interests" by two of McNamara's top subordinates—Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric and Navy Secretary Korth.

Gilpatric, a former lawyer for General Dynamics, took a full role in making the TFX decisions for General Dynamics.

LOAN TO FIRM

Korth, former president of Continental National Bank of Fort Worth, Tex., counted General Dynamics among his bank's best customers. Only a few months before he became Navy secretary, Korth personally had approved a \$400,000 loan to General Dynamics.

Senator Stuart Symington (Dem., Mo.), originally a defender of the TFX contract, now calls it a blunder and declares that all versions of the contract should be canceled to let the Air Force move into a long-sought Advanced Manned Weapons System—a long-range, high-speed, manned bomber.

Symington, a former secretary of the Air Force, has become a strong critic of a whole range of past decisions. He told the Senate that the U.S. has spent over \$23 billion on missile systems deployed and then abandoned.

Senator William Proxmire (Dem., Wis.) has been critical of the cost overruns of about \$2 million on the C-5A, the world's largest aircraft. That contract was a McNamara decision.

It has been pointed out by Senator Edward Kennedy that there have been studies of 13 major aircraft and missile programs that show "only four programs, totaling \$5 billion,

could be relied upon to perform at more than 75 per cent of their specifications."

"Five, costing \$13 billion, failed 25 per cent more often than promised," Kennedy told the Detroit Economic Club last week. "Two, costing \$10 billion, were dropped within three years because of low reliability; and two, after an outlay of \$2 billion, were dropped outright because they performed so ineffectively.

"This same study revealed that complex electronic systems generally cost 200 to 300 per cent more than the Pentagon predicts, and are generally delivered to the military two years later than promised," Kennedy said.

CITIES NEED AID

Kennedy contrasted the waste at the Pentagon with the need for more billions for the poverty areas in American cities, and he pictured the "Safeguard" ABM as likely to be more of the same waste.

President Nixon and Defense Secretary Melvin Laird are concerned that they may appear to be defenders of the military-industrial complex with all of its worst implications of favoritism and impropriety.

The critics of Mr. Nixon's ABM decision lean heavily upon quotations from the late General Dwight D. Eisenhower warning that "We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

White House officials say that those pushing for sharp cuts in the military budget seldom note that, in the same speech, General Eisenhower also said: "Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

One high ranking military officer said last week that "The critics from the scientific and academic field seldom note that the Eisenhower warning on the military-industrial complex was coupled with a warning against becoming 'the captive of a scientific-technological elite.'"

These will be points that President Nixon and Defense Secretary Laird will stress as they campaign actively in the next few weeks for the \$800 million in ABM funds they will need for next fiscal year as a part of the \$7 billion ABM program planned.

NO SCHEDULE

White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler would give no schedule on President Nixon's campaign for the ABM nor for the \$77 billion defense budget.

Laird also plans a major presentation before the American Society of Newspaper Editors (A.S.N.E.) late this week.

From the administration as well as from the Republicans in Congress there is expected to be a strong effort to point up that the series of scandals involving waste and corruption flow from the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Also, some special attention is expected to be given to Gilpatric, whose activities for General Dynamics and whose role in the TFX contract represent one of the documented problems of the "military-industrial complex."

He has turned up as a member of Kennedy's Ad Hoc Committee of New Yorkers Against ABM. This is regarded by the Nixon administration as a fortunate occurrence since it presents the possibility for dramatically planting the "military-industrial complex" label on one of those closest to a man they regard as the most likely Democratic candidate in 1972.

In the fight over the ABM and the defense budget, the Nixon administration will be supported by such influential Senate Democrats as Richard Russell (Dem., Ga.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, McClellan, and Henry M. Jackson (Dem., Wash.), a high-ranking member of the Sen-

ate Armed Services Committee as well as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Nixon administration is seeking to keep the ABM and defense appropriations fights away from the past problems of waste, mismanagement and corruption in the last decade, and place the blame for those scandals on McNamara or the military or civilian subordinates who made the decisions.

"If the ABM fight is settled on its merits, I am sure the President can convince the people that this is only an advanced research and development project and it is the minimum we can do in the light of the Soviet's SS-9," a White House aide said last week.

MILLER'S VIEW

Senator Jack Miller (Rep., Ia.) said he is hopeful that the discussions of defense spending and the military-industrial complex "will be kept in perspective."

Miller declared that we need a great industrial complex to build today's weapons, and we need a well trained military corps to use them.

"The real point of concern is that this power be managed in such a way as to meet our security requirements without allowing it to lead to excesses and abuses—well-intentioned or otherwise—which jeopardize our society," he said.

He declared that much of the problem arises because "those with little or no experience with the military are often so overwhelmed by the immensity of our requirements as to feel helpless."

Miller said the U.S. cannot expect all right decisions by the military or civilian leaders in the Pentagon in dealing with highly sophisticated weapons systems. But he noted that Congress has provided a continuing review, has focused attention on the major blunders of the past, and has forced the Defense Department to correct some wrong decisions.

Representative Gross declared that "there are dangers inherent in having high ranking military officers being recruited for defense industry, and in having executives of defense industries working at the Pentagon."

"Congressional committees and the General Accounting Office must be constantly alert to the possible conflicts of interest. A few prosecutions by the Justice Department would straighten out much of the outright dishonesty in this area," Gross said.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROBLEMS FACING THE ADMINISTRATION—VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I was unable to be present in the Chamber earlier today when the senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) spoke on the war in Vietnam; but I do want to add my commendation to what has already been said about this important speech by the senior Republican Member of this body, a man who has spoken thoughtfully and I think wisely on the issue of Vietnam for a number of years.

I especially endorse the Senator's conclusion, which I read on page 10 of his prepared text:

So it is my belief that the United States would do well to advise the South Viet-

name government immediately of our intentions and then start an orderly withdrawal of our military personnel, turning that country and that war back to its rightful owners.

It has seemed to me for many months that this is the proper course for the United States to follow, and I hope that this recommendation by the Senator from Vermont will be given the most careful possible consideration by our policymakers—the President, the Secretary of State, the Department of Defense, and others—who are forming American policy with reference to Southeast Asia.

I think it is fair to say that as time moves along, there will be increasing insistence on the part of the American people that, at long last, we bring this war to an end. It has been more than a year since former President Johnson made a statement, on March 31, 1968, indicating that he would not be a candidate for reelection, was devoting his full effort to bringing the war to an early conclusion, and that we were changing the military conduct of the war toward that end.

Since that time more than 12,000 young Americans have died. And I think that what is ahead are continued casualties with no apparent improvement in our position or in the position of the government of South Vietnam.

I welcome the thoughtful recommendation of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) and the statements of the other Senators who have spoken today. I expect to read their remarks in the RECORD tomorrow.

Apropos what I said of the growing urgency in the country about bringing the war to an end, I think it is highly significant that a few days ago some 250 college student presidents and editors across the country took what would seem to be an extreme and dramatic step when they announced that they could not be true to conscience and participate in the war. I think that is a far-reaching step. Without trying to advise any young man faced with the problem of participating in the war or suffering the legal consequences, one cannot escape an admiration for the courage of these young men who are willing to jeopardize their careers and undergo the criticism they will undoubtedly receive in some quarters for the action they have taken.

Mr. President, it was my privilege and pleasure to have a delegation of these young men call at my office yesterday. I was most impressed with their thoughtfulness and their genuine love for their country. It is because of the high ideals and hopes they hold for the United States and their beliefs in the fundamental concepts of our country that they have placed their convictions and consciences above what they believe to be the mistaken course our country is following in Southeast Asia.

I commend them for having the courage of their convictions and the willingness to follow their consciences no matter what the personal cost to them.

I think this is in the best tradition of true patriotism and true Americanism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the full text of the statement made by the 250 college student presidents and editors including a letter they sent to President Nixon and the names and colleges of the young men involved. I urge all Senators who have not yet read the statement to read it in full.

I include the names of the young men and three coeds who accompanied them who visited with me in my office yesterday.

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

STUDENTS WHO VISITED OFFICE OF SENATOR
GEORGE MCGOVERN

Roger Black, University of Chicago.
Wayne Hurder, University of North Carolina.
Mark Linder, Macalester College.
Jerry Fleischer, University of Maryland.
David R. Hawk, staff member of the National Student Association.
Clinton E. Deveaux, State University of New York at Buffalo.
Paula Katz.
Jane Lipman.
Ann Rice.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 18, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In December, 1966, 100 of our predecessors as student body presidents and college newspaper editors wrote to President Johnson to raise questions then troubling the student community about the course of United States policy in Vietnam. They attempted to inform the President that "the rising confusion about national purpose (in Southeast Asia could) undermine mutual trust and respect among our people." In 1967, 200 student body presidents and editors again tried to report to the President the seriousness of the pervasive deterioration of youth's trust in our nation's leaders—a mistrust that was hardening into "cynicism about the meaning of pronouncements by high public officials, about American motives in foreign affairs, and even about the national purpose."

These students felt that our government, once made aware of this widespread loss of confidence, would surely make an effort to regain the loyalty of the generation which you described in your Inaugural as "better educated, more committed, more passionately driven by conscience than any other generation in our history." Our predecessors recognized that a candid dialogue or forthright statement of administration objectives alone may not have lessened their fears that United States policy in Vietnam was mistaken. However, it may have averted the discord that resulted from a breakdown in communication and trust.

Many of us were cautiously heartened by the tone established in your Inaugural Address when you restated your confidence and hope in America's youth, and with considerable emphasis asked the nation for a resumption of reasonable and rational discussion.

Mr. President, we urgently write to you now, after several months of your term in office, to advise you that many of the basic questions students and other concerned Americans have raised about our purposes in Vietnam remain unanswered. We can report to you that few students see much reason for continued military action in Vietnam. We are concerned that, unless visible progress toward peace is evident, the war policies you inherited will become identified

with your administration. On the other hand, the formation of new policies dealing with the hard issues of your administration's objectives in Vietnam would go a long way toward reassuring the student community that our government is no longer bound by the tragic policies and mistaken assumptions of the past. The withdrawal of a substantial number of American troops from Vietnam would reassure us that your commitment to peace, enunciated in your Inaugural Address, and again restated in your April 14th message to Congress, is being carried out.

In our predecessors' letter to President Johnson, it was stated that:

"A great many of those faced with the prospect of military duty find it hard to square performance of that duty with concepts of personal integrity and conscience. Even more are torn by reluctance to participate in a war whose toll in property and life keeps escalating, but about whose purposes and value to the United States they remain unclear."

Mr. President, we now must number ourselves among those students who cannot at this time square military duty with integrity and conscience. The urgency of this matter requires that we take our case to you and to the American public. Tuesday we will come to Washington to make public the enclosed statement on the war and the draft which has now been signed by over 250 of our fellow student body presidents and editors.

We share your opinion that the arbitrary and inequitable draft system is not consistent with our whole concept of liberty, justice, and equality under law. We are further convinced that the threat of being conscripted to fight in a war so many Americans do not believe in is one of the primary causes of alienation felt by many of our contemporaries. Since conscription forces men to relate personally to participation in the war, issues of conscience, individual liberty, and constitutional rights, as well as efficient manpower procurement, are bound up with Selective Service matters.

We would welcome the opportunity to share with you more fully our concerns and questions about forthcoming changes in our nation's Vietnam and draft policies—both matters so close to the lives of America's young men. While recognizing the pressures of your office and the demands upon your schedule, we feel that it is now both imperative and appropriate that a reasoned dialogue begin between our country's elected leaders and its young critics. It is our hope that the process of talking and listening to American youth is a high priority in your administration. We would be glad to return with a number of our fellow signers to meet with you in the near future at a time of your convenience.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Glen Brunman, Queens College; Jerry Fleischer, University of Maryland; Roger Black, University of Chicago; Chester Gerlach, St. Norbert College, Wisc.; Charles Hicks, Syracuse University; Wayne Hurder, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Dick Jones, University of Oregon; Mark Linder, Macalester College, Minn.; Malcolm Parker, Muhlenberg College, Pennsylvania.

(NOTE.—The purpose of the attached statement is to demonstrate that this position is widely held by persons in elected offices and positions of responsibility on our campuses. By its nature, the position statement can be signed only in an individual capacity. The signers represent no institution or organization. Affiliation is for identification only. We have asked David Hawk of the staff of the U.S. National Student Association, at 2115 S Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008, to coordinate our efforts. Please direct any response through Mr. Hawk at this address.)

TEXT OF STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS' AND COLLEGE NEWSPAPERS EDITORS' STATEMENT ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND THE DRAFT

Students have, for a long time, made known their desire for a peaceful settlement. The present negotiations, however, are not an end in themselves, but rather, the means to a complete cease-fire and American extrication. And until that ceasefire is reached, or until the Selective Service System is constructively altered, young men who oppose this war will continue to face the momentous decision of how to respond to the draft.

In December of 1966, our predecessors as student body presidents and editors, in a letter to President Johnson, warned that "a great many of those faced with the prospect of military duty find it hard to square performance of the duty with concepts of personal integrity and conscience."

Many of the draft age have raised this issue. In the spring of 1967, over 1000 seminarists wrote to Secretary of Defense McNamara suggesting the recognition of conscientious objection to particular wars as a way of "easing the coming confrontation between the demands of law and those whose conscience will not permit them to fight in Vietnam." In June of 1967, our predecessors submitted, along with a second letter to the President, a petition signed by over 10,000 draft eligible students from nine campuses, calling for alternative service for those who cannot fight in Vietnam. There have been many other similar attempts to influence Congress and the Administration. Nonetheless, despite all our efforts, the Selective Service System has remained impervious to constructive change. Presently, thousands of fellow students face the probability of immediate induction into the armed forces.

Most of us have worked in electoral politics and through other channels to change the course of America's foreign policy and to remove the inequities of the draft system. We will continue to work in these ways, but the possible results of these efforts will come too late for those whose deferments will soon expire. We must make an agonizing choice: to accept induction into the armed forces, which we feel would be irresponsible to ourselves, our country, and our fellow man; or to refuse induction, which is contrary to our respect for law and involves injury to our personal lives and careers.

Left without a third alternative, we will act according to our conscience. Along with thousands of our fellow students, we campus leaders cannot participate in a war which we believe to be immoral and unjust. Although this, for each of us, is an intensely personal decision, we publicly and collectively express our intention to refuse induction and to aid and support those who decide to refuse. We will not serve in the military as long as the war in Vietnam continues.

SIGNATURE LIST

Garry Abrams, Editor, campus newspaper, Berea College (Ky.).
Ira R. Allen, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Maryland.
Robert J. Anderson, Editor, campus newspaper, Hampton Institute (Va.).
Robert H. Audette, Student Body President, Fitchburg State College (Mass.).
Douglas Babb, Editor, campus newspaper, Portland State College (Oreg.).
Gary W. Baker, Editor, campus newspaper, Highland Park College (Mich.).
Russell Bass, Student Body President, San Francisco State College (Calif.).
Wayne Bayer, Student Body President, SUNY at Cortland (N.Y.).
Joseph Bell, Student Body President, University of Nevada.
Arthur J. Belleville, Editor, campus newspaper, Merrimack College (Mass.).

Alfred O. Berg, Student Body President, Tabor College (Kans.).
Konstantin Berlandt, Editor, campus newspaper, University of California at Berkeley.
Paul Bermanzohn, Student Body President, City College of New York.
Joseph Bernick, Editor, campus newspaper, Moorhead State College (Minn.).
Ed Berry, Student Body President, Maryknoll College (Ill.).
Peter Beusan, Student Body President, Augustana College (Ill.).
David Black, Editor, campus newspaper, Oakland University (Mich.).
Roger Black, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Chicago (Ill.).
Wayne Blodgett, Editor, campus newspaper, SUNY at Stony Brook (N.Y.).
Marshall Bloom, Editor, campus newspaper, Amherst College (Mass.).
Tim Boal, Editor, campus newspaper, Olivet College (Mich.).
Noel Bourasaw, Student Body President, Western Washington State College.
Wayne Brass, Editor, campus newspaper, Lakeland College (Wis.).
Michael Bratman, Student Body President, Haverford College (Pa.).
Terence M. Brennan, Student Body President, Sonoma State College (Calif.).
John William Breslin, Editor, campus newspaper, St. Michael's College (Vt.).
George B. Brewster, Editor, campus newspaper, Bard College (N.Y.).
James Broadus, Editor, campus newspaper, Oberlin College (Ohio).
Terrence Brown, Student Body President, Kalamazoo College (Mich.).
Glen Brunman, Student Body President, Queens College (N.Y.).
James Buckley, Student Body President, Cardinal Glennon College (Mo.).
Jan C. Burda, Student Body President, University of Corpus Christi (Texas).
Robert Burton, Editor, campus newspaper, University of New Mexico.
Joseph Bute, Editor, campus newspaper, Lewis College (Ill.).
Edward P. Butler, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Hartford (Conn.).
Franc Caggiano, Student Body President, Staten Island Community College (N.Y.).
B. F. Camber, Editor, campus newspaper, Wofford College (S.C.).
Klmo Campbell, Editor, campus newspaper, College of Marin (Calif.).
Robert Carnevale, Moderator, Greatwood Campus, Goddard College (Vt.).
Kevin Carvell, Editor, campus newspaper, North Dakota State University.
William D. Casey, Editor, campus newspaper, Southwestern at Memphis (Tenn.).
Charles R. Chambels, Student Body President, Hardin-Simmons University (Texas).
David Chambers, Student Body President, Lawrence College (Wisc.).
Michael Chambers, Student Body President, Coppin State College (Md.).
Larry Chilnick, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Oklahoma.
Thomas James Coates, Student Body President, San Luis Rey College (Calif.).
David S. Cohen, Editor, campus newspaper, Parsons College (Iowa).
Steve Cohen, Student Body President, Amherst College (Mass.).
Franc H. Conroy, Editor, campus newspaper, Haverford College (Pa.).
Donald Cornwell, Student Body President, Occidental College (Calif.).
Ken Costa, Editor, campus newspaper, College of San Mateo (Calif.).
Martin J. Costello, Student Body President, College of St. Thomas (Minn.).
Gregory B. Craig, Student Body President, Harvard College (Mass.).
Tito Craig, Student Body President, Amherst College (Mass.).

Edmund T. Crowley, Student Body President, St. Anselm's College (N.Y.).
George Curry, Student Body President, Knoxville College (Tenn.).
Glenn Craig Davis, Student Body President, Reed College (Oregeon).
John Day, Editor, campus newspaper, Portland State College (Oregon).
Nick DeMartino, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Louisville (Kentucky).
Stephen T. DeMott, Editor, campus newspaper, Maryknoll College (Ill.).
Clinton Deaveux, Student Body President, SUNY at Buffalo (N.Y.).
Edward Doolan, Editor, campus newspaper, Fairfield University (Conn.).
Bruce L. Drake, Editor, campus newspaper, Johns Hopkins University (Md.).
Jay Dravich, Student Body President, Long Island University (N.Y.).
Thomas Drysdale, Student Body President, SUNY at Stony Brook (N.Y.).
Charles Dulaney, Editor, campus newspaper, Occidental College (Calif.).
David Durand, Editor, campus newspaper, University of California at Davis.
David Duty, Editor, campus newspaper, American University (Wash., D.C.).
Donald L. Eachus, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Oregon.
L. Rodney Eckberg, Editor, campus newspaper, Northern Montana College.
Bernard Farber, Editor, campus newspaper, Roosevelt University (Ill.).
Michael D. Farenell, Editor, campus newspaper, State University College at Oneonta (N.Y.).
Jay Farness, Editor, campus newspaper, St. Olaf College (Minn.).
Steven Fedder, Student Body President, Community College of Baltimore (Md.).
Martin Ferrell, Student Body President, DePauw University (Ind.).
James Ferrier, Editor, campus newspaper, Trinity College (Ill.).
Norman Fischer, Editor, campus newspaper, Colgate University (N.Y.).
Harvey Fleetwood, III, Moderator of Students, Bard College (N.Y.).
Jerry Fleischer, Student Body President, University of Maryland.
Kevin Foley, Student Body President, Seton Hall University (N.J.).
Frank J. Forest, Student Body President, Western Michigan University.
Matthew H. Fox, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Wisconsin.
John Fraser, Student Body President, Oregon State University.
Ted Frederickson, Jr., Editor, campus newspaper, University of North Dakota.
Richard Freisen, Student Body President, Bethel College (Kansas).
J. M. Fullwood, Student Body President, Mansfield State College (Pa.).
Michael E. Funke, Editor, campus newspaper, Sonoma State College (Calif.).
Jose E. Garriga, Student Body President, Catholic University of Puerto Rico.
Stephen R. George, Editor, campus newspaper, Concordia College (Minn.).
Chester A. Gerlach, Student Body President, St. Norbert College (Wis.).
Michael Gold, Student Body President, University of Maryland.
John William Greene, Jr., Editor, campus newspaper, Livingston University (Ala.).
Bejamin R. Gruberg, Community Moderator, Goddard College (Vt.).
Matthew Gryta, Editor, campus newspaper, Buffalo State University College (N.Y.).
Thomas Gunn, Student Body President, University of Washington.
Kenneth Hallahan, Student Body President, St. Mary's Seminary and University (Md.).
Irvin W. Hanks, Student Body President, Texas Southern University.
Jack Hardy, Student Body President, University of Hartford (Conn.).

- Norm Harpur, Editor, campus newspaper, Oakland University (Mich.).
- Scott Harrison, Editor, campus newspaper, San Francisco State College (Calif.).
- Michael Haupt, Editor, campus newspaper, Concordia Senior College (Ind.).
- Denis Hayes, Student Body President, Stanford University (Calif.).
- Arthur Heltzer, Student Body President, Marquette University (Wis.).
- Peter Helwig, Editor, campus newspaper, Muhlenberg College (Pa.).
- Michael Herthneck, Student Body President, Kalamazoo College (Mich.).
- Richard C. Heymann, IV, Editor, campus newspaper, Washington College (Md.).
- Chuck Hicks, Student Body President, Syracuse University (N.Y.).
- Richard Steven Hill, Student Body President, Centre College (Kentucky).
- Benedict M. Holden, III, Student Body President, University of Hartford (Conn.).
- Michael Holland, Editor, campus newspaper, Oregon College of Education.
- Barry C. Holtzclaw, Editor, campus newspaper, SUNY at Buffalo (N.Y.).
- David Holwerk, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Kentucky.
- Mike Honey, Editor, campus newspaper, Oakland University (Mich.).
- Ronald Hook, Student Body President, Hope College (Mich.).
- Robert Horowitz, Student Body President, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck (N.J.).
- Sean Hughes, Student Body President, University of San Diego (Calif.).
- James Hunt, Editor, campus newspaper, Bates College (Maine).
- Wayne Hurder, Editor, campus newspaper, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- David W. Inglis, Student Body President, Onondaga College (N.Y.).
- Daniel Jackson, Editor, campus newspaper, Iona College (N.Y.).
- Choice T. Jennings, Student Body President, Selma University (Ala.).
- John Jimison, Student Body President, College of Wooster (Ohio).
- Dale Johnson, Editor, campus newspaper, Eastern Montana College.
- Mark C. Johnson, Editor, campus newspaper, College of Wooster (Ohio).
- Rick Johnson, Editor, campus newspaper, Western State College of Colorado.
- Art Johnston, Editor, campus newspaper, Wayne State University (Mich.).
- Harry Stuart Johnston, Student Body President, Menlo College (Calif.).
- Richard Nelson Jones, Student Body President, University of Oregon.
- Peter J. Kaminsky, Student Body President, Princeton University (N.J.).
- David Brian Kane, Editor, campus newspaper, Park College (Mo.).
- Allan Katz, Student Body President, University of Missouri.
- Devereaux Kennedy, Student Body President, Washington University (Mo.).
- Christopher M. Kerns, Student Body President, University of Dayton (Ohio).
- Julius H. Kidd, Student Body President, Bethune-Cookman College (Fla.).
- James W. Kiley, Student Body President, Northern Illinois University.
- Neal F. King, Student Body President, St. Mary's College (Calif.).
- Mike Kirsten, Editor, campus newspaper, University of California at Berkeley.
- Richard Klausner, Editor, campus newspaper, Oberlin College (Ohio).
- Edward Kleinman, Editor, campus newspaper, Jersey City State College (N.J.).
- David Knoke, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Michigan.
- Howard Kohn, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Michigan.
- Robert J. Kovach, Student Body President, West Virginia Tech.
- Joel Kraemer, Editor, campus newspaper, Harvard College (Mass.).
- Michael Krisman, Student Body President, University of California at Irvine.
- Joseph Kroll, Student Body President, University of Minnesota.
- Chuck Larson, Student Body President, Wayne State University (Mich.).
- Garby Leon, Student Body President, Marlboro College (Vt.).
- David Lewin, Editor, campus newspaper, California Institute of Technology.
- Eric Lewis, Student Body President, Manhattan School of Music (N.Y.).
- Anthony K. Lima, Editor, campus newspaper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Mark Linder, Student Body President, Macalester College (Minn.).
- Clay Loges, Student Body President, University of Puget Sound (Wash.).
- Tim Luebke, Editor, campus newspaper, Carleton College (Minn.).
- Peter C. Lutze, Student Body President, Valparaiso University (Ind.).
- Patrick MacDonald, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Washington.
- John P. Mackey, Editor, campus newspaper, SUNY at Cortland (N.Y.).
- William L. Mank, Student Body President, University of Southern California.
- Rick Marcus, Student Body President, Pomona College (Calif.).
- Robert L. Martinez, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Albuquerque (New Mexico).
- Daniel McIntosh, Student Body President, University of California at Berkeley.
- Martin McLaughlin, Student Body President, University of Michigan.
- Edward G. Merzig, Editor, campus newspaper, Houghton College (N.Y.).
- Lann Meyers, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Colorado.
- Theodore C. Miller, Student Body President, Bethune-Cookman College (Fla.).
- Harry Minor, Student Body President, University of Detroit (Mich.).
- John Monson, Editor, campus newspaper, University of California at Irvine.
- Hugh Moore, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Detroit (Mich.).
- Ray Mungo, Editor, campus newspaper, Boston University (Mass.).
- Rosalio U. Munoz, Student Body President, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Bruce A. Murphy, Editor, campus newspaper, Whittier College (Calif.).
- Ted Najam, Student Body President, Indiana University.
- Henry Neuman, Student Body President, Augustana College (Ill.).
- Robert C. Newman, Editor, campus newspaper, Carleton College (Minn.).
- Robert E. Nikkel, Editor, campus newspaper, Fresno Pacific College (Calif.).
- Kevin P. O'Connor, Student Body President, Chaminade College (Hawaii).
- Dan Okrent, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Michigan.
- W. Garnett Palmer, President, Student Faculty Council, St. Paul's College (Va.).
- Malcolm Parker, Editor, campus newspaper, Muhlenberg College (Pa.).
- David B. Perry, Editor, campus newspaper, Wilmington College (Ohio).
- Byron Pfeiffer, Editor, campus newspaper, Concordia Teachers College (Ill.).
- Owen Phelps, Editor, campus newspaper, St. Norbert College (Wisc.).
- Joseph Pilati, Editor, campus newspaper, Boston College (Mass.).
- David E. Pitt, Editor, campus newspaper, Brandeis University (Mass.).
- Joseph Miles Plummer, Editor, campus newspaper, University of California at Riverside.
- Steven Press, Student Body President, Columbia University (N.Y.).
- Dave Radin, Editor, campus newspaper, Cornell University (N.Y.).
- Bruce Randall, Student Body President, Colorado State University.
- John A. Reed, Editor, campus newspaper, Chico State College (California).
- Charles V. Reilly, Student Body President, Brooklyn College (N.Y.).
- Andre Reiman, Editor, campus newspaper, Pomona College (Calif.).
- Darrell Rice, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Kentucky.
- Dan Riley, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Hartford (Conn.).
- Kirk Burns Roose, Student Body President, Swarthmore College (Pa.).
- Oren Root, Editor, campus newspaper, Columbia University (N.Y.).
- Arlin Roy, Moderator, Northwood Campus, Goddard College (Vt.).
- Don Rubin, Student Body President, SUNY at Stony Brook (N.Y.).
- Peter Sagal, Editor, campus newspaper, Long Island University at Brooklyn Center (N.Y.).
- David Samuelson, Editor, campus newspaper, Central YMCA Community College (Ill.).
- Eli Savanick, Editor, campus newspaper, Hesston College (Kansas).
- William C. Schilling, Student Body President, Mount Angel College (Oregon).
- Stephen Craig Schneider, Editor, campus newspaper, Palomar College (Calif.).
- Lawrence Schonbun, President of Student Bar Association, Boston College Law School (Mass.).
- Donald F. Schultz, Student Body President, North Central College (Ill.).
- Richard Paul Schwab, Editor, campus newspaper, SUNY at Buffalo (N.Y.).
- Robert Seaburg, Student Body President, Colgate University (N.Y.).
- Kenneth J. Seltman, Student Body President, Dowling College (N.Y.).
- Brendan John Sexton, Student Body President, New York University.
- Walter Shapiro, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Michigan.
- Michael Shaw, Student Body President, Harpur College (N.Y.).
- Derek Shearer, Student Body President, Yale University (Conn.).
- Mark T. Shutes, Editor, campus newspaper, Youngstown State University (Ohio).
- Edward Siegel, Editor, campus newspaper, Boston University (Mass.).
- Kenneth I. Singer, Editor, campus newspaper, Rider College (N.J.).
- Tomce C. Smith, Student Body President, Columbia University (N.Y.).
- William R. Smoot, II, Editor, campus newspaper, Purdue University (Ind.).
- Ormond Smythe, Community Manager, Antioch College (Ohio).
- Daniel C. Snell, Editor, campus newspaper, Stanford University (Calif.).
- Stephen H. Snow, Editor, campus newspaper, St. Petersburg Junior College (Fla.).
- James D. Soderberg, Editor, campus newspaper, Rocky Mountain College (Mont.).
- James Spaw, Editor, campus newspaper, Kansas City Art Institute (Mo.).
- Felix J. Springer, Student Body President, Amherst College (Mass.).
- Paul Stanger, Editor, campus newspaper, St. Norbert College (Wisc.).
- Michael Starr, Student Body President, Harpur College (N.Y.).
- Carl Stern, Editor, campus newspaper, Reed College (Ore.).
- Strobe Talbott, Editor, campus newspaper, Yale University (Conn.).
- Matthew Tannenbaum, Editor, campus newspaper, American University (Washington, D.C.).
- Eugene Thomas, Student Body President, St. Augustine College (N.C.).
- Thomas J. Thomas, Student Body President, Grinnell College (Iowa).

Michael Tillapaugh, Editor, campus newspaper, State University College at Cortland, (N.Y.).

Bruce E. Tischler, Student Body President, Union Theological Seminary (N.Y.).

Oliver Townes, Editor, campus newspaper, SUNY at Buffalo (N.Y.).

Owen Ullman, Editor, campus newspaper, Rutgers University (N.J.).

Frank Utterington, Editor, campus newspaper, University of Missouri.

Robert Waste, Student Body President, Shasta College (Calif.).

Richard Weatherington, Editor, campus newspaper, Chapman College (Calif.).

Edward Weathers, Student Body President, Wilberforce University (Ohio).

Richard F. Weidman, Student Body President, Colgate University (N.Y.).

Stuart Werbin, Student Body President, Boston University (Mass.).

Louis Wheaton, Student Body President, Columbia School of Social Work (N.Y.).

Daniel Whitehurst, Editor, campus newspaper, St. Mary's College of California.

Barry A. Willner, Editor, campus newspaper, Lafayette College (Pa.).

Barry M. Wohl, Student Body President, Swarthmore College (Pa.).

Tom Wolfe, Editor, campus newspaper, University of California at Berkeley.

Carl Wood, Student Body President, University of California at Riverside.

James Wood, Student Body President, St. Mary's College of California.

David Woods, Student Body President, Phillips University (Oklahoma).

Steven Woodside, Student Body President, University of California at Davis.

Dan C. Woolridge, Editor, campus newspaper, Chapman College (Calif.).

J. Byron Wyndham, Student Body President, Atlantic Christian College (N.C.).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS TO THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

A letter from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the appropriation of \$5,000,000 to finance, during the fiscal year 1970, the management assistance program conducted by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 406 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO LIBERALIZE THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS IS REQUIRED TO EFFECT RECOMPENSEMENT FROM DISABILITY COMPENSATION OTHERWISE PAYABLE TO CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the conditions under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to effect recompensement from disability compensation otherwise payable to certain disabled veterans (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a follow-on report on opportunities for savings through use of spare government-owned communications circuits in Europe, Department of Defense, dated April 29, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a survey of transportation and traffic management activities in the Far East and Southeast Asia, Department of Defense, dated April 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PROGRESS AND RESULTS OBTAINED BY THE UNITED STATES FROM PARTICIPATION IN THE DESALTING AND ELECTRIC POWER GENERATING PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding the progress and results obtained by the United States from participation in the desalting and electric power generating project (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON APPLICATIONS FOR ORDERS AUTHORIZING OR APPROVING THE INTERCEPTION OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on applications for orders authorizing or approving the interception of wire or oral communications, for the period June 20, 1968, to December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-751) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR THE RENEWAL AND EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Office of Federal Cochairman of The Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

WITHDRAWAL OF PROSPECTUSES WHICH AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE OF THE MAIN POST OFFICE BUILDING IN FLINT, MICH., AND THE POST OFFICE GARAGE PROPERTY IN PHILADELPHIA, PA.

A letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, requesting that the approved prospectuses which authorize the purchase of the Main Post Office Building in Flint, Mich., and the post office garage property in Philadelphia, Pa., be withdrawn to enable the Department to proceed with more urgent projects (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON THE COST OF CLEAN WATER AND ITS ECONOMIC IMPACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1969 report to the Congress on "The Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact, U.S. Department of the Interior, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration" (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

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

James E. Allen, Jr., of New York, to be Commissioner of Education.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Phillip N. Whittaker, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

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

Daniel Bartlett, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri;

Richard Van Thomas, of Wyoming, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Wyoming;

Herbert F. Travers, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts;

John W. Stokes, Jr., to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia;

Brian P. Gettings, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia;

Bill Carnes Murray, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia;

Harold M. Grindle, of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Iowa;

F. L. Peter Stone, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware; and

George J. Reed, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

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

John B. Hannum, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

Louis C. Bechtel, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"H. Res. 1047

"A resolution memorializing Congress to reestablish November 11 as Veterans' Day and May 30 as Memorial Day in each year; and directing distribution

"Whereas, the House of Representatives of the First Session of the Thirty-second Oklahoma Legislature by refusing passage of Senate Bill No. 7, has gone on record as opposing changes in the days of the year when holidays referred to in 25 O.S. 1961, §§ 82.1 and 82.2, shall be celebrated; and

"Whereas, the particular calendar days established thereby are dates commemorating historical events significant to man, the world, or to the United States, the purpose of their being recognized as such ought not be lessened by their becoming mere long weekends for our people. This is especially true of Veterans' Day and Memorial Day.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Session of the Thirty-second Oklahoma Legislature:

"Section 1. The Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to rescind its action setting the fourth Monday in October as Veterans' Day and the last Monday in May as Memorial Day and to reestablish November 11 as Veterans' Day and May 30 as Memorial Day.

"Section 2. Duly authenticated copies of this Resolution, after consideration and enrollment, shall be prepared for and transmitted to each House of Congress and to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives the 21st day of April, 1969.

"REX PRIVETT,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives."
A Senate concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which

was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"S. CON. RES. 33

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the congress of the United States to adopt a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the president of the United States to designate the week of August 1 through August 7, 1969, as National Clown Week

"Whereas, The ability to make people laugh in these troubled times and relieve the tension of our modern complex society is a rare and valuable gift; and

"Whereas, Clowns throughout the world have for many years supplied this necessary comic relief; and

"Whereas, The Emmett Kelly Museum in Sedan, Kansas has been established to pay tribute to one of the world's greatest clowns; and

"Whereas House Joint Resolution 236 of the 91st Congress authorizes and requests the president of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of August 1 through August 7 as National Clown Week: Now therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring therein: That the legislature of the state of Kansas respectively urges the congress of the United States to adopt House Joint Resolution 236 and lends its support in requesting the president of the United States to designate the week of August 1 through August 7 as National Clown Week.

"Be it further resolved: That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the secretary of the senate of the United States, the clerk of the house of representatives of the United States and to each member of the congress from this state.

"I hereby certify that the above Concurrent Resolution originated in the Senate, and was adopted by that body April 11, 1969.

"President of the Senate.

"RALPH E. ZARKER,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the House April 15, 1969.

"Speaker of the House.

"L. ORVILLE HAZEN,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution adopted by the Naha City Assembly, Naha, Okinawa, concerning request for reversion of administrative authority of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1647. A bill to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 91-136).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to authorize the President to reappoint as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1969 (Rept. No. 91-162).

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

S. 150. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando Fajardo Vargas (Rept. No. 91-149);

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Blandina Salvador (Rept. No. 91-148);

S. 278. A bill to consent to the New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact (Rept. No. 91-143);

S. 330. A bill for the relief of Dr. Konstantinos Nikolaos Baballaros (Rept. No. 91-147);

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Foo Ying Yee (Rept. No. 91-146);

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaime E. Lazaro (Rept. No. 91-145);

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lydia L. Lazaro (Rept. No. 91-144);

S. 1104. A bill for the relief of Thi Huong Nguyen and her minor child, Minh Nguyen (Rept. No. 91-141);

S. 1438. A bill for the relief of Yau Ming Chinn (Gon Ming Loo) (Rept. No. 91-140);

H.R. 3548. An act for the relief of Dr. Roberto de la la Caridad Miquel (Rept. No. 91-139); and

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Ana Mae Yap-Diango (Rept. No. 91-138).

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

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Hon. Chun Eng. (Rept. No. 91-150); and

S. 738. A bill for the relief of Hector Enrique Gonzales (Rept. No. 91-142).

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

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Christina Bangeawayan (Rept. No. 91-151).

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

S. 882. A bill for the relief of Capt. William O'Hanle (Rept. No. 91-157).

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

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Pine Hall Brick & Pipe Co. (Rept. No. 91-158).

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

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Erman-Howell Division, Luria Steel & Trading Corp. (Rept. No. 91-155).

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning September 1, 1969, and ending September 7, 1969, as "Adult Education Week" (Rept. No. 91-152);

S.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning November 16, 1969, and ending November 22, 1969, as "National Family Health Week"; (Rept. No. 91-153);

S.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning June 8, 1969, and ending June 14, 1969, as "Professional Photography Week in America" (Rept. No. 91-154);

S.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in June of each year as "Helen Keller Memorial Week" (Rept. No. 91-159); and

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution designating the year 1969 as the "Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture" (Rept. No. 91-160).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith (Rept. No. 91-156); and

S.J. Res. 100. Joint resolution to proclaim the week beginning May 1 as "Youth Week" (Rept. No. 91-161).

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

S. 1655. A bill to change the limitation on the number of apprentices authorized to be employed by the Government Printing Office (Rept. No. 91-135).

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert Strange McNamara as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 91-134);

S.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 91-133); and

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 91-132).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2030. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State from imposing a lien on a blind individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2031. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. (See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2032. A bill for the relief of Miss Chin-Hsia Pan; and

S. 2033. A bill for the relief of Mr. Anthony A. Baptiste; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 2034. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide payments pursuant to such Law on account of certain low-rent housing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. MUSKIE):

S. 2035. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize consolidation of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2036. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide educational assistance to veterans attending elementary school; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. PERCY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. RBICOFF, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2037. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to include within the scope of part A thereof comprehensive ambulatory health services, and otherwise to extend and improve the program established by such part A; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 2038. A bill to make the armed robbery of gasoline stations a Federal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional

revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2040. A bill to provide that the temporary judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin created by the Act of March 18, 1966 (80 Stat. 78) shall henceforth be permanent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2041. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 2042. A bill to increase the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by two members who shall be elected town or township officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 2043. A bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2044. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BAYH):

S. 2045. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in order to provide within the Federal Government for the representation of consumers' interests and to undertake studies designed to achieve superior implementation of consumer programs throughout the Federal system; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2046. A bill for the relief of Mario Berardelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 2047. A bill to grant leave time to Federal and District of Columbia employees to engage in public service activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2048. A bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such States under specified conditions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

S. 2031—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CORRECT CERTAIN INEQUITIES IN THE CREDITING OF NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIAN SERVICE IN CONNECTION WITH CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, and send to the desk for appro-

priate reference, a bill to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement.

In the 90th Congress the Senate established a retirement program for the 41,000 National Guard technicians. This action has helped retain these men who are often subject to attractive offers from private industry with superior retirement and fringe benefit plans. However, further improvements in their retirement program are warranted. This is the purpose of the bill I propose which has the support of the association of National Guard civilian technicians at Pease Air Force Base in my own State of New Hampshire and the national association as well.

The men who serve our country as National Guard technicians are vital to the defense of this Nation. They deserve their full share of civil service benefits. I believe the equity of this proposal will result in favorable action by the Senate.

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

The bill (S. 2031) to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2034—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE AN ANNUAL PAYMENT TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an annual payment of \$300 per low-rent public housing unit to local school districts under the impacted school aid program, Public Law 874. This approach has the support of the National School Boards Association which supported a similar proposal I had introduced in the last Congress.

There are more than 1.5 million public schoolchildren living in some 675,000 eligible public housing units, a fourth of which are located in the Nation's 14 largest cities. The continued financial burden of bearing the total local cost of educating the concentrations of public housing children, many of whom require special educational services, is a major factor in the financial crisis which is rapidly developing for the central city school systems.

Although the Federal Government, under the Housing Act, contributes about \$11 for each child in public housing, this amount is only a token payment and short approximately \$375, on the average, of the amount provided by local property taxes for the number of children living in a public housing unit. This amount, as recently pointed out in a House of Representatives report, "is grossly inadequate to offset the revenue lost by exempting public housing from local and State taxation."

Illustrative of this is the situation in New York City where the Federal pay-

ment of \$3.6 million, as estimated in 1967, is only a small proportion of the \$76.1 expended in educating some 63,400 children who live in public housing projects. So the cost of educating these public housing youngsters must be borne by their local property taxpaying neighbors.

There are several reasons for preferring the computation of benefits by public housing unit instead of by individual child. First, this method is more convenient for measuring exact costs and in estimating future obligations. Second, experience in New York City, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and other communities shows that some parents, especially among the poor, are reluctant to complete the necessary forms to qualify the local school district for impacted school aid assistance under Public Law 874 and therefore the schools are deprived of the funds to which they are entitled. This method of computation would obviate this difficulty.

I am hopeful through this bill to bring to a successful conclusion the effort I began in the last Congress. Action should not be further postponed.

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

The bill (S. 2034) to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide payments pursuant to such law on account of certain low-rent housing, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2035—INTRODUCTION OF THE GRANT CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday President Nixon transmitted a message to Congress calling for the enactment of a grant consolidation bill as the first step toward improving and simplifying the administration of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

I am today introducing with the cosponsorship of the senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), and the the junior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Grant Consolidation Act of 1969, which would make the administration of grant programs more manageable and provide the financial assistance for State and local governments in a much more efficient manner.

I am also gratified to receive the cosponsorship of the former Governor of Oklahoma who is now with us as the junior Senator of that great State (Mr. BELLMON).

It moves very definitely down the trail blazed by the President's message of yesterday. I should like to say I am especially pleased at the cosponsorship of the chairman of our Committee on Government Operations (Mr. McCLELLAN), since it is before that committee that the hearings will be held with regard to this bill; and I am equally pleased by the cosponsorship of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), because he did some fine pioneer work in this field in the last Congress, when he introduced S. 698, of which I was privileged to be a cosponsor, and at that time we held some hearings

on the various aspects of this proposal and the problem it is designed to correct.

I think we have evolved out of those hearings, out of last year's discussions, and out of the President's message, a completely bipartisan approach to a very serious problem, which, if properly resolved, can save this country hundreds of millions and perhaps ultimately billions of dollars.

In his statement President Nixon said:

Under our present fragmented system, each one of a group of closely related categorical grants is encumbered with its own individual array of administrative and technical requirements. This unnecessarily complicates the planning process; it discourages comprehensive planning; it requires multiple applications, and multiple bookkeeping both by the Federal agencies and by State and local governments.

Illustrative of the proliferation of Federal financial assistance to State and local governments is the fact that with the enactment of 42 new programs in the 90th Congress, the number of grant categories has reached at least 420. Since 1948, grant programs have increased from \$1.8 billion to an estimated \$20.8 billion for fiscal year 1969 and an expected \$25 billion in the current fiscal year. As a percentage of State and local revenues, grants have become increasingly important, demonstrating the acute need for improving their administration. The percentage of such revenues has grown from over 10 percent 20 years ago to approximately 18 percent in 1968.

President Nixon is seeking authorization from Congress to consolidate grant programs through the technique used so successfully by the President in the past 20 years in reorganizing the executive branch of government. The President would be empowered to offer consolidation plans of Federal assistance programs where, after investigation, he finds that such consolidation is necessary or desirable to accomplish greater efficiency and coordination to promote better execution of these programs and to reduce expenditures.

When a consolidation plan is transmitted, it would become effective at the end of 60 calendar days of continuous session of Congress unless either House passed a resolution disapproving the plan within that period.

Mr. President, I think President Nixon has wisely provided carefully defined limits to the grant consolidation authorization to insure the essential intent of Congress is preserved. In his statement, the President cited examples of these limitations:

Only programs in closely related functional areas could be consolidated.

Terms and conditions could be changed only to the extent necessary to achieve the purposes of the consolidation plan.

In setting new terms and conditions, the President would be limited by the range of those already provided in the programs being consolidated. Thus, if a program providing for a 10% State matching share were being merged with one providing a 20% matching share, he would have to propose a matching share between 10 and 20%.

No consolidation plan could continue any program beyond the period authorized by law for its existence.

No plan could provide assistance to recipients not already eligible under one of the programs being merged.

Responsibility for the consolidated program could not be vested in an agency or office not already responsible for one of those being merged.

Mr. President, the bill we are introducing today covers precisely the points which have been covered in the President's message from the standpoint of its restrictions. As I stated earlier, the Grant Consolidation Act would be only a first step toward improving the administration of grant programs, but, in my view, it is an important first step. I hope that Congress can enact this legislation in the first session of the 91st Congress.

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

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

The bill (S. 2035) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize consolidation of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and others), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2035

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 "Grant Consolidation Act of 1969".

Sec. 2. Title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following immediately after chapter 9 of said title 5:

CHAPTER 10—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION

"Sec.

"1001. Purpose.

"1002. Definitions.

"1003. Federal assistance program consolidation plans.

"1004. Limitations on powers.

"1005. Effective date and publication of consolidation plans.

"1006. Effect on other laws and regulations.

"1007. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on consolidation plans.

"§1001. Purpose.

"(a) The President shall from time to time examine the various Federal assistance programs provided by law and shall determine what consolidations of such programs are necessary or desirable to accomplish the following purposes: (1) any of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of this title, or (2) the purpose of making the programs or aspects thereof more consistent.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes of subsection (a) of this section and that the purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under this chapter, and can be accomplished more rapidly thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"§ 1002. Definitions

"For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) 'agency' means—

"(A) an Executive agency or part thereof; and

"(B) an office or officer in the executive branch;

"(2) 'officer' is not limited by section 2104 of this title;

"(3) 'Federal assistance' or 'Federal assistance program' means any assistance provided by an agency in the form of grants,

loans, loan guarantees, property, shared revenues, payments of taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, repayable advances, contracts, or technical assistance, whether the recipients are a State or local government, their agencies, including school or other special districts created by or pursuant to State law, or public, quasi-public or private institutions, associations, corporations, individuals, or other persons; and

"(4) 'consolidation' means any action described in section 1003(b) of this title.

"§ 1003. Federal assistance program consolidation plans

"(a) When the President, after investigation, finds that a consolidation of Federal assistance programs is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1001(a) of this title, he shall prepare a Federal assistance program consolidation plan (hereafter in this chapter referred to as 'consolidation plan') for the making of the consolidations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit the plan (bearing an identification number) to Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each consolidation included in the consolidation plan, he has found that the consolidation is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1001(a) of this title, and a declaration as to how each program included in the plan is functionally related.

"(b) Each consolidation plan so transmitted—

"(1) may include, with respect to the Federal assistance programs included in the consolidation plan and with respect to the affected agency or agencies, any reorganization or measure incidental thereto as provided for in chapter 9 of this title,

"(2) may alter the terms and conditions provided by law under which the Federal assistance programs included in the consolidation plan shall be administered, including, but not limited to matching, apportionment and other formulas, interest rates, and planning, eligibility, and other requirements: *Provided, however,* That any changes in such terms and conditions shall be limited to those necessary to achieve the purposes of the plan; *Provided, further,* That the President shall, in selecting applicable terms and conditions, be limited by the range of terms and conditions for the provision of Federal assistance already included in the Federal assistance programs included in the plan; and *Provided, further,* That the President shall set forth in his message transmitting the consolidation plan to the Congress his reasons for selecting the said terms and conditions; and

"(3) may abolish any one or more of the terms and conditions of any Federal assistance program.

"(c) The President shall have a consolidation plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session.

"§ 1004. Limitations on powers

"(a) A consolidation plan may not provide for, and may not have the effect of: (1) continuing any Federal assistance program or part thereof beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the consolidation plan did not take effect; (2) consolidating any Federal assistance programs which are not in the same functional area or closely related functional areas; (3) providing any type of Federal assistance included in such a consolidation plan to any recipient who was not eligible for Federal assistance under any of the programs included in the consolidation plan; or (4) vesting responsibility for the administration of the program or programs contained in a consolidation plan in any agency, office, or officer who was not responsible for the administration of one or more such programs

prior to the taking effect of the consolidation plan.

"(b) A provision contained in a consolidation plan may take effect only if the plan is transmitted to Congress before April 1, 1971. Section 905(b) of this title shall not operate to limit any consolidation plan prepared under this chapter.

"§ 1005. Effective date and and publication of consolidation plans

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c), a grant consolidation plan shall become effective at the end of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the plan is transmitted to it unless, between the date of transmittal and the end of the sixty day period, either House passes a resolution stating in substance that the House does not favor the consolidation plan.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a).

"(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and

"(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the sixty day period.

"(c) Under provisions contained in a grant consolidation plan, a provision of the plan may become effective at a time later than the date on which such plan otherwise is effective.

"(d) A consolidation plan which becomes effective shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws and (2) in the Federal Register.

"§ 1006. Effect on other laws and regulations.

"(a) To the extent that any provision of a consolidation plan which becomes effective under this chapter is inconsistent with any provision of any statute enacted prior to the taking effect of the consolidation plan, the provision of the consolidation plan shall control.

"(b) Any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of any matter affected by a consolidation plan which becomes effective under this chapter shall be deemed to be modified to the extent of any inconsistency thereof with the consolidation plan but shall otherwise continue in effect.

"(c) A suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, does not abate by reason of the taking effect of a consolidation plan under this chapter. On motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the consolidation plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of the suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, the court may allow the suit, action, or other proceeding to be maintained by or against the successor of the head or officer under the consolidation plan or, if there is no successor, against such agency or officer as the President designates.

"(d) The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this chapter may not be used for any purpose, but shall revert to the Treasury.

"§ 1007. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on consolidation plans

"(a) This section is enacted by the Congress

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that

House in the case of resolutions described in subsection (b); and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"(b) The provisions of section 910 through 913 of title 5 of the United States Code shall apply with respect to a consolidation plan and, for such purposes.

"(1) all references in such sections to a 'reorganizational plan' shall be treated as referring to a 'Federal assistance program consolidation plan', and

"(2) all references in such sections to 'resolution' shall be treated as referring to a resolution of either House of the Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the ——— does not favor the Federal assistance program consolidation plan numbered ——— transmitted to the Congress by the President on ———, 19—', the first blank therein being filled with the name of the resolving House and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled."

GRANT CONSOLIDATION: SUPPORT FROM THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am pleased to sponsor the administration's Grant Consolidation Act introduced today by the senior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) which I feel would be another step along the way in meeting the management crisis which is threatening our Federal grant-in-aid system.

It would provide a necessary adjunct to the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act which was enacted last year by the Congress.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, which I chair, has over the past 4 years made an intensive investigation into the problems faced by State and local officials in their administration of federally assisted programs.

During the 89th Congress, a special subcommittee survey highlighted the fact that State and local administrators were disturbed and confused with the fragmentation of Federal assistance, and the red tape of the Federal bureaucracy which were frustrating comprehensive development, particularly in our urban areas.

Following this survey, the subcommittee launched a series of hearings seeking solutions to the problems of creative federalism. We heard from the Bureau of the Budget, key cabinet officials, governors, mayors, city managers, regional officials, and representatives of public interest groups, who laid out in detail the magnitude of the management crisis, and provided the subcommittee with a wealth of recommendations for immediate congressional action.

We discovered a proliferation of over 500 separate Federal-aid programs administered by over 150 departments, agencies, and bureaus in Washington and over 400 Federal offices in the field. There were project grants and formula grants; incentive grants and multifunctional grants. Some went through the States, others directly to local governments and agencies. Some were conditioned on cost-sharing and planning

requirements; some were not. All combined to provide a barrage of conflicting standards, regulations, and planning requirements which were straining the patience of State and local officials.

We learned that many grants were overlapping in the same general areas. There are 50 different programs to aid general education, 57 programs for vocational and job training; 35 programs for housing; 62 for community facilities and 28 for recreation. Of all the grant programs, those most criticized for duplication and conflict involved grants for water supply, sewers, and sewage treatment facilities, presently being administered by five separate agencies.

This duplication of function at the Federal level leaves State and local governments at a loss to know what assistance is available, in what form, and on what terms, to enable their development projects to go forward. Delays in processing of applications compound the difficulties and uncertainties.

The situation was getting so confused that States and localities were hiring professional "grantmen" to find out what is available and how to cut the red tape. Too many communities unfortunately could not afford this special service and were losing out.

Thus, it became obvious that an overhauling of our Federal grant-in-aid system was long overdue.

One of the major pieces of legislation to grow out of the subcommittee's investigation was the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-577). Among other things, this legislation directed the President to establish regulations for uniform application among Federal agencies for coordination, formulation, and review of Federal programs and projects affecting area and community development consistent with and furthering the objectives of State, regional, and local comprehensive planning. Regulations implementing the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act are expected to be issued in the near future.

However, in developing this legislation, it was obvious that tightening up program management and other administrative procedures in the grant system was not enough. We had to make a concerted effort to reduce the number of grant programs, which we found to be one of the major causes of the confusion. Accordingly, I instructed the subcommittee staff to work with the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to offer proposals to give the President authority, at least to make a start in combining related grant programs with congressional consent. Their recommendations relied on the Executive Reorganization Act approach and were included in S. 698, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, which I introduced on January 26, 1967.

The administration's Grant Consolidation Act is essentially the same approach which was a part of S. 698, and I am very pleased that the President has seen the merit to this approach and has followed the pattern laid out by the subcommittee.

However, it should be noted that hearings on S. 698 did bring opposition from

various quarters to the consolidation feature. It was necessary to drop that item from the bill, while the other features of the legislation were eventually enacted into law.

The administration's measure, unlike S. 698, does contain some limitations of the President's power in sending a consolidation plan to Congress. It provides that programs must be closely related; terms and conditions must be limited to the range already provided; no consolidation plan could extend an authorization, no additional eligibility could be provided; and there are other related sanctions.

It may be that these limitations, and a further refinement of the legislation to meet the specific objections of some Members of the Congress, will strengthen its chances for acceptance.

What pleases me is that President Nixon has recognized this critical area of intergovernmental relations, and has taken steps to develop the tools to cut down the administrative tangle in the grant-in-aid program. He can be assured of my cooperation, and with his acceptance of our proposal, I think we should be able to gain more legislative support for grant consolidation—both by this bill, and the regular process of program legislation.

Mr. President, in the interest of legislative history, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a copy of title VI—Consolidation of Grant-in-Aid Programs, of S. 698, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, as introduced January 26, 1967.

There being no objection, the copy of title VI was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE VI—CONSOLIDATION OF GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 601. (a) The President shall from time to time examine the various programs of grants-in-aid provided by law and shall determine what consolidations are necessary or desirable—

(1) to promote the better execution and efficient management of individual grant programs within the same functional area;

(2) to provide better coordination among individual grant programs within the same functional area; or

(3) to promote more efficient planning and use by the recipients of grants under programs within the same functional area.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes of subsection (a) and that the purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under this title, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

PREPARATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF PLAN

SEC. 602. (a) When the President, after investigation, finds that a consolidation of individual grant-in-aid programs within the same functional area is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 601(a), he shall prepare a grant consolidation plan for the making of such consolidation, and shall transmit such plan (bearing an identification number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that with respect to each individual program consolidated under such plan, he has found that the consolidation is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 601(a).

Each such consolidation plan so transmitted—

(1) shall place responsibility in a single agency for administration of the consolidated program, and

(2) shall specify in detail the formula or formulas for the making of grants under the consolidated program, and shall set forth the differences between such formula or formulas and the formula for making grants under each of the individual programs consolidated under such plan.

(b) Each grant consolidation plan shall provide for only one consolidation of individual grant programs.

(c) The President shall have a grant consolidation plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session.

CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION

SEC. 603. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c), a grant consolidation plan shall become effective at the end of the first period of ninety calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the plan is transmitted to it unless, between the date of transmittal and the end of the ninety-day period, either House passes a resolution stating in substance that the House does not favor the grant consolidation plan.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and

(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the ninety-day period.

(c) Under provisions contained in a grant consolidation plan, a provision of such plan may become effective at a time later than the date on which such plan becomes effective under subsection (a).

(d) A grant consolidation plan which becomes effective shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws and (2) in the Federal Register.

SEC. 604. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described in subsection (b); and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(b) The provisions of sections 910 through 913 of title 5 of the United States Code shall apply with respect to a grant consolidation plan and, for such purposes—

(1) all references in such sections to "re-organization plan" shall be treated as referring to "grant consolidation plan", and

(2) all references in such sections to "resolution" shall be treated as referring to a resolution of either House of the Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the _____ does not favor the grant consolidation plan numbered _____ transmitted to the Congress by the President on _____, 19____, the first blank therein being filled with the name of the resolving House and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled.

EXPIRATION DATE

SEC. 605. The authority of the President under section 602 to transmit grant consolidation plans shall expire three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 2036—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS ATTENDING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, there are 129,000 veterans separated from service during the post-Korean conflict period who have less than an eighth-grade education, and therefore do not qualify for formal education benefits under the present GI bill. From an educational standpoint, each of these men is a forgotten veteran.

Under the present GI bill, a returning serviceman may receive benefits for a variety of educational purposes: Farm cooperative training consisting of enrollment in agricultural employment; apprenticeship or other on-the-job training; flight training if it is generally accepted as necessary to attain a recognized vocational objective in the field of aviation; completion of high school without losing eligibility for college benefits; and part-time, full-time, or a work-study program in college.

However, the unfortunate serviceman who has not yet completed eighth grade—the man with whom we perhaps should be most concerned—is denied benefits to complete his elementary education.

What a hollow ring these programs must have for the forgotten veteran who, desirous of completing a formal education, is told he is not qualified to even enter high school. I want to change that.

This anomaly was brought to my attention by a Colorado constituent. But his is not an isolated case. Of the 129,000 men the Veterans' Administration estimates are in a similar situation, approximately 20,000 have left the military service within the last 3 years.

The World War II GI bill concentrated in the area of on-the-job training with millions of veterans suddenly placed back into civilian life. In the Korean GI bill there was more emphasis on formal education with a more orderly return of veterans into civilian life, a generally higher level of preservice schooling, and increased technical demands in the communities to which they were returning. Yet, with all the movement forward in educational thinking and expansion of educational programs, the serviceman without a bare elementary education was dropped at the wayside under the present GI bill.

What makes this even more puzzling is that the Korean GI bill specifically included elementary education.

The fact that a veteran of the Korean conflict is eligible for elementary school benefits, but Vietnam veterans are not stems from two points: First, the change in the definition of "educational institution" in the present GI bill; and second, the lack of inclusion of elementary education in a 1967 amendment to the present GI bill providing that educationally disadvantaged veterans could complete high school without losing eligibility for college benefits.

The present GI bill was enacted in 1966. The bill which passed the Senate defined "educational institution" with

language identical to that contained in the earlier Korean GI bill including public or private elementary schools. The House bill, however, dropped elementary schools and added language restricting institutions to those furnishing education at the secondary school level or above. The House bill prevailed.

While the serviceman who wanted to use GI benefits to complete an elementary education was blocked, the serviceman seeking to finish high school found himself in only a somewhat better situation. For each month he used benefits for a high school education, he lost a month of eligibility for college benefits under the law. This was corrected by the 1967 amendment entitled "Special Training for the Educationally Disadvantaged."

The irony is that the serviceman who needs to finish eighth grade is, in effect, not considered educationally disadvantaged, but the one who has and needs to finish high school is. It seems to me one encompasses the other.

The bill I introduce today would permit our returning servicemen to attend the same educational institutions as their predecessors from the Korean conflict, and in addition, would permit them to complete their education through eighth grade and high school without losing eligibility for college benefits.

I am advised by the Veterans' Administration that the cost of my bill would be "very slight."

I urge its early consideration by the Senate.

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

The bill (S. 2036) to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, in order to provide educational assistance to veterans attending elementary school, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2037—INTRODUCTION OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTER ACT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOK), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), I am

pleased to introduce today the Neighborhood Health Center Act.

Mr. President, last year I introduced legislation intended to form the basis of a new approach to the delivery of health care for those now unable to afford it. The urgent problems to which that legislation was addressed are still very much with us. Although illness is distributed indiscriminately among our population, proper treatment is still a privilege reserved only for those who can afford it. The United States, acknowledged to be the wealthiest nation in the history of this planet, has not yet committed itself to assuring the availability of health care to all its citizens. Although billions have been spent on medical research, we have not adequately extended the benefits of that research to our own people.

The poor in the United States receive a disproportionately low share of the health services. Federal health programs have tended to provide help to middle-income Americans, while virtually ignoring the health problems of the poor. And the result is that the health of the poor in this country is a national disgrace.

Poor people seek and receive much less medical attention than the affluent, but they need more. And the health gap between the rich and the poor is growing. In 1940, the infant mortality rate for nonwhites was 70 percent higher than for whites. But in 1962, the rate was 90 percent greater. George James, former New York City Commissioner of Health, noted that, if the death rate in a middle-class white neighborhood were projected for New York City as a whole, 12,000 lives a year would be saved. He stated that poverty is the third leading cause of death in New York City.

The changing social and medical order is creating, with increasingly compelling urgency, new challenges in health care. Contemporary patterns of disease and disability call for primary emphasis to be given to health maintenance measures; and the growing complexity of medical resources requires the integrated function of the health team. Effective health maintenance implies, in today's setting, a unified, personalized, and continuous service system.

Present medical care for the poor is fragmented, uncoordinated, and completely unresponsive to the total patient needs. It is hard to believe that, although we spend \$50 billion a year for health care, a recent report of the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower stated flatly:

There is a crisis in American health care.

The report further stated:

Unless we improve the system through which health care is provided, care will continue to become less satisfactory even though there are massive increases in cost and in numbers of health personnel.

The National Advisory Commission on Health Facilities made its report to the President in December of 1968. This report is an excellent one and should be read by all. Its recommendations are summarized in the letter of transmittal when Boisfeuillet Jones, the Chairman, said:

The Commission believes that development of systems for delivery of comprehensive

health care to all our people where they live is a community responsibility. The existing fragmented delivery systems must be made whole through full coordination of resources and services at the local level. Emphasis must be given to the organization of ambulatory care for the individual and his family, with coordinated professional direction through the full spectrum of comprehensive health services.

Health problems are certainly complex. We are faced with a shortage of physicians in the face of an expanding demand. The expansion of medical knowledge in recent years has made it difficult for the solo medical practitioner to provide a complete range of top quality service. This has resulted in increasing specialization and a relative decrease in primary care physicians. Although we are now able to do more for the sick person, it is more difficult for him to gain access to a physician. Nowhere is the problem more acute than in the low-income neighborhoods of our inner cities and rural communities. With the emigration of middle-income population to the suburbs, the physicians and new facilities have followed. Furthermore, with the decline of the municipal tax base, hospitals and clinics in the central city were left to deteriorate, along with schools and housing.

The arrival of large numbers of immigrants from rural areas into our cities has placed an increased load on the charity hospitals. This problem is multiplied by the poor health of low-income populations. For example, the percentage of persons with family incomes under \$2,000 having some chronic illness is triple that of persons with family incomes greater than \$7,000. A recent Harris survey, sponsored by the Blue Cross Association, showed that serious illness has struck one in four poverty level families compared with a national average of 1 in 10. A significantly larger proportion of poor people suffer from eye disease, heart disease, high blood pressure, arthritis, tuberculosis, and mental illness. Especially disturbing is that the infant mortality rate is double and the proportion of mothers dying in childbirth is four times greater among the poor. There is no need to belabor the fact that the poor are the sickest segment in our society; in fact, poverty itself may be thought of as a disease rather than an economic condition.

In the face of these overwhelming health problems a person of limited income has few alternatives in seeking help. Some physicians donate their services but, in general, the poor are referred to the large county or city hospitals. In these institutions large numbers of people are crowded into unpleasant, impersonal, inadequate facilities where they must sit for hours. Before they can see a physician, they are subjected to the indignity of establishing that the degree of their destitution entitles them to free care.

The United States is one of the few modern Western nations with separate medical systems for the poor and the nonpoor. Although the medical profession has been aware of this dual system of health care for many years, only recently has the Congress, with the passage of Medicaid and Medicare, recognized

that the good health of all its citizens is a goal worthy of America.

With the need for services so clearly defined, one may ask what is preventing the poor from receiving adequate medical care. Obviously, inability to pay is important. Unfortunately, Medicaid has not solved this problem. Some States have not implemented it and others have had to cut back due to insufficient funds. However, even had Medicaid not run into financial difficulty it would have been inadequate. There is growing evidence, that Medicare and Medicaid have not succeeded in increasing the availability of health care. A recent study of the effects of these programs by the Tax Foundation concluded:

To date the major demonstrable effect of the 1965 Federal legislation creating Medicare and Medicaid has been a shift in financing medical care from the private to the public sector. Although public spending for medical care increased by nearly three-fifths in the first full year of these two programs, the resulting improvement in per capita medical care for the population at large was only 5%, no greater than had been experienced in some previous years in the 1960's.

One major problem with the present health care system is that it is inaccessible to many low-income families. Figures from Chicago, Cleveland, and Los Angeles show that in spite of the staggering health problems of the poor less than half as many physicians practice in low-income neighborhoods as in the other areas of the cities. Very few of this limited number of ghetto physicians are specialists. It is not surprising that more than 50 percent of inner-city children examined under the Headstart programs had never before been seen by a physician. It was either too expensive or physically difficult for their mothers to get them to a clinic.

In addition to problems of distance and lack of transportation, the operation of tax-supported clinics often seems planned to discourage all but the most diligent. Short daytime-only hours and long waiting periods result in time lost from work, there is no provision for day-care for children whose mothers need care and facilities are decrepit, understaffed, ill-equipped, and generally unpleasant; worst of all is the impersonality of the service. These complaints are not new. They have been voiced repeatedly by community leaders from low-income neighborhoods.

Besides the staffing and facilities problems I have just discussed, there are fundamental organizational barriers which constitute the most serious obstacles to the provision of good health care. These organizational barriers are lack of continuity of services and fragmentation.

Lack of continuity refers to the situation in which no one physician has responsibility for the total care of an individual patient. Thus, a patient may see a different physician each week, and, if hospitalization is required, several more physicians may take charge. With each change irrefragible information is lost and confidence must be rebuilt. The patient has no concept of who his physician is. Although consultation is a neces-

sity, there can be no substitute for a 1-to-1 doctor-patient relationship—for the poor this situation rarely exists and, as a result, the quality of care they receive suffers.

Fragmentation is the division of responsibility for treatment of different diseases among different facilities and personnel. Nowhere is this tendency more evident than in the provision of tax-supported health services. Until recently, Federal and State programs for health care have focused on specific disease categories. Thus, funds may be available for diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis, mental illness, venereal disease, rheumatic fever, cancer screening, and prenatal care, but not for pneumonia, leukemia, or emphysema, or any other disease. In this situation, a person may be refused care not because he is not sick, but because he has the wrong disease.

Specialization within the medical profession has resulted in still further fragmentation of care. One New York inner-city hospital has over 100 different specialty clinics, each one restricted to certain types of illnesses. If a patient comes on the wrong day or at the wrong hour, he must come again some other time. Often the various services are provided in physically separate facilities. This fragmentation is encouraged by the categorical funding of health care through numerous separately administered Federal, State, and local agencies, although it seems obvious that a single primary care physician with responsibility for the health of the patient would be best able to cope with the variety of threats to the health of the patient.

In order to hasten the provision of good health care for all Americans while maintaining a strong orientation toward efficiency and economy, I am today introducing the Neighborhood Health Center Act. It is designed to deal with some of the problems I have just outlined in both rural and urban areas. This bill amends the Hill-Burton Act with the intent of building a system of neighborhood comprehensive ambulatory care centers similar to those established in the experimental OEO program. By bringing multispecialty resources into the areas of low physician accessibility the problems of fragmentation and inaccessibility can be overcome.

After introduction of the Neighborhood Health Center Act last July, I sent copies of it to approximately 400 individuals and organizations interested in the health field. Their response to the bill was helpful and generally favorable. Some sample comments were:

David E. Rogers, M.D., dean of the medical faculty, the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.: "I am pleased to see the thrust toward moving away from categorical programs and increasing our comprehensive services—and also fully agree that broad community planning is necessary so that each hospital does not duplicate expensive equipment which may be present close at hand.

"We will continue to relay our ideas to you—we are much in your debt for projecting this important new legislation."

J. G. Harrar, president, the Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.: "It seems quite clear that there is urgent need for better

ambulatory medical care facilities in the ghettos. It is equally apparent that new techniques are needed for providing service through such centers. Therefore, it would seem an appropriate step on the part of Congress to provide funds for ambulatory health centers."

Jerry Voorhis, secretary, Group Health Association, Washington, D.C.: "The need for more and better health facilities accessible to people so that they can receive care without the necessity of hospitalization or long expensive trips to crowded hospital outpatient department and emergency rooms, is incontestable.

"Your Neighborhood Health Center Act constitutes an imaginative approach. Your lucid analysis of the chaotic medical care situation in the country is an excellent documentation of the need for action."

Lawrence J. Rossi, M.D., medical director of the Hopedale Medical Complex, Hopedale, Ill.: "If implemented, I sincerely believe this legislation would be a large contribution toward the solution of the health care problem of the poor and the rural area and small towns of America."

Pat Schupbach, comoderator, medical center, Y.M.C.A., student board, Chicago, Ill.: "I commend you for introducing and sponsoring legislation to provide funds for the establishment of neighborhood health centers. Throughout my years in the College of Nursing, I have followed the progress of the Mile Square Health Center. The faculty of our college has repeatedly stated that centers such as Mile Square are needed throughout the city and the entire nation."

Marion B. Folsom (Former Secretary of HEW), Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.: "The bill, which would provide funds for construction of health centers, would help to solve one of the problems we have encountered in implementing our program. In the inner city of Rochester, as undoubtedly in the slums of many cities, decent buildings for use as health centers are simply not available, and, as we have found, capital funds to build these centers are hard to come by. Consequently, in our opinion, your bill is very much needed."

Harold Grimm, Buffalo, N.Y.: "With respect to the Neighborhood Health Center Act, I think it would provide federal financial assistance to the states for the benefit of our neediest people. Preventive medicine would certainly contribute to a reduction in the number of hospital admissions and well-staffed clinics by properly qualified medical and paramedical personnel would go a long way toward providing it."

Edward F. Wehlag, Professional Engineer, Whittier, California: "As an Engineer, I have had the opportunity of working with people establishing the Clinic in Watts, as well as the Tufts University project at Mound Bayou, Massachusetts, and other similar applications, including the Kaiser Pediatric Eye Clinic in Bellflower, California. As a citizen, I have come to recognize the great potential of this type of operation, and feel that it is extremely important to the maintenance of the health and welfare of our people in every walk of life."

Joseph Patterson, Ph.D., College of Physical Education, University of Illinois: "I am writing in support of your position urging Congress to pass legislation which will extend the Neighborhood Health Center program. The centers established by the Office of Economic Opportunity have demonstrated their effectiveness in meeting the health needs of the medically indigent.

"Comprehensive health services delivered in this type of organization structure can be best geared to the needs of individual communities. It also provides for better utilization of medical personnel as well as to give the consumer an opportunity to participate in the planning, maintenance and promotion of his own health."

James H. Cavanaugh, Ph.D., Director, Office of Planning and Program Coordination, Department of H.E.W., Washington, D.C.: "As you know, the Department has not yet taken an official position on this proposed legislation but, speaking personally, I concur wholeheartedly with the general objectives of the proposal. Certainly the problem of accessibility to physicians and to care facilities must be major considerations in any meaningful program of planning for health services."

Wilbur Cohen, (Former Secretary of H.E.W.):

"I believe that (we have) definitely proved the value of the neighborhood health center. I believe that instead of the 40 centers (we have) now, we ought to have 400 in the United States within the next couple of years. I believe they are effective because they create a new mechanism for more efficiently utilizing the resources that we have and putting them in a place where people can have access to them."

The main provisions of this bill are as follows:

First. Federal funds are committed to the establishment of outpatient clinics in areas of low physician accessibility. Public Law 88-443, the Hospital and Medical Facilities Act of 1964, is amended to include comprehensive ambulatory care centers among the facilities eligible to be constructed with Federal funds. These centers will be staffed by a group of physicians with different specialty training in order to provide a wide range of services.

Second. No additional funds are authorized. However, the present categorical restrictions under Public Law 88-443 are removed, and the type of project to be funded is left to the discretion of the State planning agency. It is felt that each State can best determine its own needs and priorities.

Third. In order to focus Federal expenditures on the health needs of the poor, State allotments will be calculated on the basis of the number of medically indigent families within each State rather than on the basis of the present complicated formula involving average per capita income and population. The industrialized States are discriminated against by the present formula because of their higher per capita income. However, for a 2-year period no State will receive less money under the new formula than it did under the old.

Fourth. To make better use of Federal funds spent for research and planning, the bill provides for the consideration of recommendations of the area-wide planning agencies established under Public Law 89-749.

Fifth. The major goal of the bill is provision of the best possible medical care for all. Therefore, the bill provides for the Surgeon General to give priority to areas with low physician accessibility because these are the areas of greatest need due to the fact that most present legislation ignores these areas.

Sixth. In order to avoid funding inefficient operations, the bill requires priority in granting funds be given to the most efficient and effective facilities. This will, therefore, circumvent the pitfalls of medicare and medicaid which tend to reward the most inefficient operations by reimbursing on a cost basis.

It is anticipated that applicants will

include groups of private physicians, medical schools and their affiliated hospitals, voluntary hospital centers, non-profit organizations, and local medical societies.

The time has arrived when Federal support for health services should be directed away from the categorical approaches of the past and our resources focused on the provision of comprehensive services. Comprehensive implies a one-step entry into an all-inclusive, continuous system. Medically, the term "comprehensive" means a complete approach to the individual no matter what his disease or disability.

Preliminary steps toward a comprehensive approach were taken with the passage of the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966 and the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967. Under sections 314(d) and 314(e) of these laws money is made available for comprehensive health services. Unfortunately, of the more than \$120 million spent, less than \$10 million was actually spent on comprehensive health services. The remainder was consumed by the same old categorical programs previously funded from other sources.

I do not say that the categorical programs are unworthy of support—the prevention and treatment of any disease is a worthy undertaking and should be supported. However, the evidence suggests that this categorical approach to the health problems of the poor has not and cannot succeed. To quote Dr. John DeHoff, director of local health services, Baltimore City Health Department:

The Neighborhood Health Center Act will help hospitals, other medical centers and groups of physicians to move into neighborhoods which have the greatest need, with funding based on needs as measured by indigent and medically indigent populations. Although hospitals give excellent inpatient care for complicated and interesting cases, they cannot easily prevent disease from happening . . . or follow patients closely after they leave a hospital phase of care. Federal Money for construction will help greatly.

Professionals with experience in community medicine realize the futility of the present fragmented and discontinuous approach. Prof. Robert Daniels, of the University of Chicago, Department of Social and Community Medicine, wrote:

The State of Illinois makes a large financial contribution through public aid and welfare programs. However, these are administered in such a way that they respond to episodes of illness rather than providing continuity of health care over periods of time. . . . Many episodes of illness occur in individuals not registered and the medical and hospital community in such situations are uncertain about whether they will be reimbursed by public programs or not.

Comprehensive services must be brought together in easily accessible facilities. It is wrong that in the face of preventable and treatable diseases afflicting large numbers of our citizens most Government programs have ignored the special problems of the poor. The billions spent on medical research have greatly expanded the ability of the modern physician to cure or prevent many previously incurable diseases. Yet in the very shadow of the great medical

centers where hearts are being transplanted and cardiograms are being read by computers thousands of individuals are dying from preventable diseases. No one can deny that the very best medical care in the world is available in American cities but it is obvious that unless one can get to a physician these advances are meaningless. The \$9 billion thus far spent for hospital construction and modernization under Hill-Burton legislation have had far too little impact on improving the health care of the poor. In fact it is the more affluent citizen with his greater demand for and utilization of medical personnel and facilities who has benefited the most from this program.

Comprehensive clinics pay their own way. All evidence indicates that providing comprehensive outpatient care reduces hospital utilization dramatically. In a Massachusetts comprehensive health center a spot check after 2 years of operation indicated that the health level of local residents was raised to the point where the number of hospitalization days had been cut by 80 percent. Not only are many diseases prevented or diagnosed earlier but hospitalization for diagnostic purposes can be avoided by providing such services in the clinic. Most important, the tendency to fragment medical services—fostered by most Federal programs—can be avoided. Perhaps many of the categorical programs will be found unnecessary, which will save more Federal dollars.

For example, diseases such as measles, mumps, diphtheria, polio, and rheumatic fever can be prevented and others, such as tuberculosis, pneumonia, and cervical cancer can be cured if treated early. But immunizations and early diagnosis can only be accomplished only if comprehensive care is available. The orientation of our programs must be shifted from disease to health. The economic loss to the Nation caused by preventable or curable diseases is incalculable. The lack of ambulatory care centers at convenient locations means that large numbers of people wait too long before seeking help and thereby finally require hospital care. This is neither an efficient nor an effective way to provide health services. To quote Mr. Leonard Procita of the Albany Medical College:

We are considering persons here who, because of their marginal income, hesitate too long in obtaining necessary health care. These neglected health problems become more prominent in later years . . . many health problems can be traced to neglect in childhood . . . in this regard a neighborhood health center would be a great step forward in establishing preventive medicine for these people on a sound basis.

The limited program of comprehensive clinics funded under OEO has demonstrated that the neighborhood health center approach is the most effective strategic approach to the delivery of health care in areas of low physician accessibility. It is also the most efficient and probably least costly method of providing top quality services. Comprehensive care implies, though does not necessitate, a multispecialty group practice approach providing a full range of diagnostic services. Where this system has been coupled with prepayment of a

monthly set fee, hospital utilization has been cut in half and overall costs average 25 percent less than for the same range of services provided under the traditional fee-for-service system.

The National Advisory Commission on Health Facilities states:

One approach that has decreased hospital utilization is prepaid practice. A study of Federal employees' health program benefits over a 5-year period shows that employees in prepaid group practice plans had consistently the lowest rates for non-maternity utilization of in-hospital services. In 1965, according to this study, the number of hospital days per 1,000 covered persons in prepaid group practice was approximately half of that for those in the indemnity benefit plan or Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

It has been estimated that the cost of living will rise by 20 percent by 1975, but medical costs are expected to jump 140 percent. As medical-care costs continue to skyrocket, fewer and fewer Americans can afford necessary medical attention. It is my position that we can get more from the health-care dollar. Instead of pouring more dollars into a system, we should come to recognize that only a reorganization of the system itself will produce the level of care of which we are capable.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that if we are to get the most from our health dollar we must take into consideration alternative approaches to funding. Experience with health insurance programs based on the fee-for-service approach has shown that they are usually associated with increased hospital utilization. Many services are not reimbursable unless delivered in the hospital and there is therefore no economic incentive for preventive medicine; again, diseases are being treated, not people. Medicaid and Medicare are basically forms of health insurance and have thus encouraged greater hospital utilization. They have also placed a greater demand on the limited supply of practicing physicians. In fact, I am frequently asked where I expect to find the physicians to staff these clinics.

In answer to this question I can point out that the group-practice approach, with the employment of sufficient paramedical personnel, is itself a partial solution to the physician manpower shortage. In this regard, I received the following letter from Dr. Harold Wise, program director of the OEO Montefiore neighborhood medical care:

The use of paramedical personnel to increase physician productivity has been well documented. We plan to serve a community of 45,000 people. Traditionally, this would require a minimum of 60 physicians. With the more intelligent utilization of nursing and family health worker personnel, we are able to reduce the number of physicians necessary to 25.

Of course, this approach will not, in itself, solve the shortage of physicians. We must push for greater Federal support for the expansion of medical school class size. This can be done by increasing the amount of money authorized for medical student loans and scholarships, for medical school improvement, and for schools for the allied health professions. Direct support of teaching programs

must be instituted instead of funding them through the back door with moneys appropriated for research. We must ask why the United States needs to recruit a large percentage of its practicing physicians from foreign medical schools when qualified college graduates in this country are denied entrance for lack of space. This problem is one of the utmost priority and urgency. However, it must be kept in mind that even if enough medical school places were made available today there would still be a lag of 8 to 10 years before these prospective doctors would enter practice.

The evidence shows that we have the resources to provide comprehensive health care and that vast new expenditures will not be required. What seems to be needed is a focus to bring together the various government and private programs trying to provide health care. At this point the neighborhood health center seems to be the most logical method. Edgar Kaiser wrote to me, saying:

Such facilities can function on a sound operating basis through more effective application of existing public and private funds already available for purchasing health care services.

I am confident that with the proper administration of this proposed legislation we can go a long way toward realizing the goal of top quality health care for all our citizens.

It has been estimated that the cost of living will rise by 20 percent by 1975, but medical costs are expected to jump 140 percent. As medical care costs continue to skyrocket, fewer and fewer Americans can afford necessary medical attention.

It is my position that we can get more from the health-care dollar. Instead of pouring more dollars into a system in order to try to cover up the problems in the system, we should come to recognize that only a reorganization of the system itself will produce the level of care of which we are capable.

The Congress is presently at an important crossroads in the area of health legislation. New health legislation of the past several years has been addressed to important problems and certain demonstration programs have beamed a ray of hope into some hard-core areas of need. However, these can only be looked upon as tentative first steps. And, as in so many other areas, once the path is first tread, we have only begun to realize the truly massive problems of personnel, organization, and financing that must be attended to. The time has now come to correct the inadequacies of the present system. The bill I offer today represents a step in this direction.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section summary be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2037) to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to include within the scope of part A thereof comprehensive ambulatory health services, and otherwise to extend and improve the program established by such part A,

introduced by Mr. PERCY (for himself and others), 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. 2037

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 "Neighborhood Health Center Act of 1969."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 600(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting "including comprehensive ambulatory care centers," immediately after "other medical facilities".

(b) Section 601 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 601. In order to assist the States in carrying out the purposes of section 600, there are authorized to be appropriated, for grants for the construction or modernization of public or other nonprofit hospitals, public health centers, comprehensive ambulatory care centers, facilities for long-term care, diagnostic or treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities, \$295,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

(c) (1) Section 602 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each State shall be entitled for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1970, to an allotment which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated for such year pursuant to section 601 as the number of medically indigent individuals in such State bears to the sum of the medically indigent individuals in all the States. If, in the case of any State, the amount of the allotment as determined under the preceding sentence is less than the amount which would have been allotted to such State if the allotment formula, as in effect under this section for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1969, had remained in effect, then there shall be added (out of the funds appropriated pursuant to the succeeding sentence) to the allotment of such State such amount as may be necessary to cause its allotment to be equal to the amount it would have been allotted under such formula, if such formula had remained in effect. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to make additions to the allotment of States as provided for in the preceding sentence."

(2) Section 602(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The allotment to any State under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which is less than \$175,000 for the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or Guam and \$450,000 for any other State shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotment for such fiscal year to each of the remaining States, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount."

(3) Section 602(c) of such Act is hereby repealed.

(4) Section 602 of such Act is further amended by striking out subsections (e) and (f) thereof and by adding after subsection (d) thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In accordance with regulations, any State may file with the Secretary a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this part be added to the allotment under this part of another State for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of a project, in such other State, which is designed to carry out one or more of the purposes set forth in section 600. Any such request shall contain or be supported by a certification, by the State, that the appropriate areawide health planning agency in such State has been informed of and con-

sulted with respect to such request, and by a statement as to whether any such planning agency approves of such request. If it is found by the Secretary that the completion of the project with respect to which the request is made would meet the needs of the State making the request and that use of the specific portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the corresponding allotment of the other State, to be used for the purpose referred to above."

(d) Section 603(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (3) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) in the case of projects for the construction of comprehensive ambulatory care centers, to facilities located in areas of low physician accessibility, as determined by the Secretary; and".

(e) (1) Section 604(a)(4) of such Act is amended (A) by redesignating subparagraph (E) thereof as subparagraph (F), (B) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (D) thereof, and (C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) the comprehensive ambulatory care centers needed to provide adequate health services for people residing in the State, and a plan for the distribution of such centers throughout the State; and".

(2) Section 604(a)(5) of such Act is amended by inserting "comprehensive ambulatory health centers" immediately after "diagnostic or treatment centers".

(3) Section 604(a) of such Act is further amended (A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (11) thereof, (B) by redesignating paragraph (12) thereof as paragraph (13), and (C) by adding after paragraph (11) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(12) provide that the State agency shall furnish to the Secretary with respect to each application for a project, detailed information regarding the costs of services to be provided by the proposed health facility; and".

(f) (1) The first sentence of section 605(b) of such Act is amended (A) by striking out "and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)", and (B) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (5) that such project is in furtherance of or consistent with any comprehensive health plan carried out by the State agency, referred to in section 314(a) (2)(A) of the State in which such project is to be located".

(2) Section 605 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) An application for a project shall be approved under this section only if—

"(1) the applicant supplies the Secretary with such data as may be necessary in order for him to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of operation of any other health facilities operated by such applicant;

"(2) the Secretary determines that such other health facilities operated by the applicant are being operated efficiently and effectively; and

"(3) the Secretary determines that it is, or has the potential to be, the most efficient and effective project operated in the area. In determining, for purposes of this subsection, the efficiency of any health facility which is an accredited teaching institution, there shall be deducted from the total costs of such facility all costs attributable to the training of medical personnel."

(g) Section 607(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "any one or more subparagraphs or paragraphs of".

(h) (1) Section 625(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'Federal share' with respect to any project means the proportion of the

cost of construction of such project to be paid by the Federal Government, and shall be whichever of the following the State elects—

"(1) the share determined by the State agency in accordance with standards included in the State plan, which provide equitably for variations between projects on the basis of objective criteria related to the economic status of areas and, if the State so elects, such other factor or factors as may be appropriate and be permitted by regulations, except that such standards may not be provided for a Federal share of more than 66⅔ per centum, or less than 33⅓ per centum;

"(2) the amount (not less than 33⅓ per centum and not more than 66⅔ per centum) established by the State for all projects in the State; or

"(3) 50 per centum of the cost of construction of the project.

The State agency shall, prior to the approval by it, under the State plan approved under part A, of the first project in the State during any fiscal year, give written notification to the Secretary of the Federal share which it has elected pursuant to the preceding sentence of this subsection for projects in such State to be approved by the Secretary during such fiscal year, and such Federal share or shares for projects in such State approved by the Secretary during such fiscal year shall not be changed after approval of such first project by the State."

(2) Section 625 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) The term 'comprehensive ambulatory care center' means a clinic which (i) is associated with an accredited hospital center, (ii) is staffed by a formal or informal group of licensed medical doctors of various specialties, some of whom have admitting privileges in such hospital, and (iii) provides a wide range of diagnostic and treatment services for patients who are primarily ambulatory, and (iv) provides personal preventative services including health education.

"(n) The term 'medically indigent' means, in the case of any State which has a State plan for medical assistance which has been approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act, an individual eligible for medical assistance under such State plan; and, in the case of any other State, an individual determined to be medically indigent in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect July 1, 1969.

The material, presented by Mr. PERCY, follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTER ACT

(a) Amends the purpose section of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to include comprehensive ambulatory care centers among the categories of facilities to be assisted.

(b) Eliminates the earmarking of funds for specific categories of projects. The type of projects to be funded in each state is left to the discretion of the State planning agency.

Changes the present state allotment formula which is based upon average per capita income and population to one based upon the number of medically indigent in each state.

(c) Requires the approval of the appropriate areawide health planning agency for a state to share its allotment with another state.

(d) Requires that the Secretary, in prescribing regulations under the comprehensive ambulatory care center program, give priority to areas of low physician accessibility.

(e) Requires that the state plan include information on the number of comprehensive ambulatory care centers needed to provide adequate health services for the state.

Requires that information be submitted with each application detailing the cost of health services to be provided by the proposed facility.

(f) Requires projects to be consistent with comprehensive health plans provided for under the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966. Applications must provide data concerning efficiency of operation of health facilities presently operated by the applicant and requires the Secretary to give priority to the most efficient project applicants.

(g) Technical amendment.

(h) Technical amendment.

Defines "Comprehensive Ambulatory Care Center" and "medically indigent."

S. 2039—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO RAISE NEEDED ADDITIONAL REVENUES BY TAX REFORM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Tax Reform Act of 1969. This bill was authored by Congressman HENRY REUSS, a well-known and distinguished economist and member of the Joint Economic Committee. Congressman REUSS introduced this bill (H.R. 5250) in the House on January 29 where it has been cosponsored by approximately 50 Congressmen.

The bill is designed—by closing 13 of the most flagrant loopholes in the tax system—to help restore to that system the equity which is intended in the original law. It would also make possible the elimination of the 10-percent surtax by raising \$9 billion in revenues—the exact price-tag of the surtax.

Last January, outgoing Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr spoke prophetically of a potential "taxpayers revolt" if tax reform did not come soon. Since then, even Mr. Barr has expressed surprise at how accurately this phrase described the national mood.

In mid-April, for example, the Gallup poll showed almost 70 percent of the taxpaying public seriously complaining about the size of their tax bill. Although taxes will never be popular, this figure shows a dramatic increase of 17 points over the Gallup test in 1966.

Another gage of public opinion is the almost unprecedented number of letters of complaint which have poured into the offices of Members of Congress and the Treasury Department.

What accounts for this sudden nationwide feeling of discontent?

The majority of taxpaying Americans, especially the 35 million in the \$7,000- to \$20,000-income group, are being taxed more than ever before. Added to increased Federal income and excise taxes are rising local and State levies. On top of this burden comes the 10 percent surcharge.

In contrast, most Americans see less meaningful return for these increased taxes than ever before.

The war in Vietnam is unpopular. The crisis in our cities is frightening. Pictures of hungry children and stories of closing Job Corps camps are sad and bewildering.

The low- and middle-income groups—who bear the greatest tax responsibility

in the Nation—are beginning to understand that in this difficult time when we are struggling to survive as a decent and humane Nation, they are carrying more than their fair share of this effort.

They are becoming aware of the enormous gap between what the tax system pretends to be—a system based essentially on ability to pay—and what it actually is. People are learning some "truths" about how the tax system really works, and they are understandable angry.

For example:

If you are very rich, you pay a smaller, not greater percentage of your income to the Federal Treasury.

If you are at the very top of the economic structure, it is possible to avoid paying any taxes at all. In 1967, 381 such people found themselves in this enviable situation. And the number of people in this bracket is rising sharply.

If you earn your money on the stock market, instead of at a paying job, your tax bill will probably be cut in half. The capital gains loophole puts a ceiling of 25-percent tax on your long-term capital gains income if you are in the 50-percent bracket.

In total, approximately \$35 billion is lost to the Treasury annually through these and some 20 other tax loopholes.

But wealthy individuals and big corporations are not breaking any law. They are simply taking advantage of special tax breaks passed by the Congress at special times in history to aid special interest groups. If such preferential treatment was once justified for reasons of social development or national defense, it has long since outlived its rationale and the laws should be repealed.

Today these special benefits are putting an unfair and sometimes intolerable burden on those least able to pay—the lower- and middle-income Americans—while exempting those most able to pay. They cause a very considerable loss of badly needed revenue to the Treasury. Some of them are contributing substantially to the present inflationary boom. Others are indirectly responsible for the current policy of tight money and high interest rates which are so rough on the homebuilding industry, on State and local government, and on small business. And finally, there is evidence that some of these loopholes, by providing unnecessary incentives for capital investment overseas, are contributing to our balance-of-payments problem.

For all these reasons, substantial tax reform legislation should be passed.

There are a number of proposals dealing with loopholes pending before the congressional committees. President Nixon's proposals include some very meaningful steps toward plugging loopholes. There is also a great deal of merit in various proposals to set a minimum tax on high-income groups, to eliminate taxes on the poor, and to raise the standard deduction—improvements with important benefits for the middle- and lower-income taxpayer.

Congressman REUSS' bill seems to be the most thoughtful and comprehensive of all the proposals dealing with loopholes. It will receive close study by the appropriate congressional committees.

There are obvious loopholes which can be closed today; others need to be broadened or refined.

But the bill offers a creative starting point.

The public has made clear its feelings on the need for tax reform. The President has echoed this sentiment by sending to Congress a broad tax reform package. Now it is up to the Congress to take positive and direct action. This subject has too long been the target of endless congressional studies and hearings.

We are at a crucial time in our history when the credibility of our most basic Government and private institutions is in serious trouble.

For the first time in its existence, the enormous Defense Establishment is coming under close public scrutiny—and the result is a widespread lack of public confidence in what the Department has been doing with its multi-billion dollar budgets. The relevance and credibility of our best educational institutions are being questioned daily. The major corporations are under serious attack for their lack of social consciousness in helping to solve the serious domestic problems such as air and water pollution.

The tax system is now suffering from this same credibility gap. It is high time we righted the regressive and discriminatory features of our tax structure and restored to it the equity which the public quite rightfully expects. We seem to forget that taxes are levied with the consent of the people, and that consent is given in the firm belief that the right to tax will be carried out in the best tradition of justice and fair play.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, along with an excellent section-by-section analysis prepared by Congressman REUSS be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2039) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2039

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

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Short title, etc.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Tax Reform Act of 1969".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Sec. 102. Technical and conforming changes.

The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall, as soon as practicable but in any event not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a draft of the technical and conforming changes in the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954 which are necessary to reflect throughout such Code the changes in the substantive provisions of law made by this Act.

TITLE II—CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH

Sec. 201. Carryover of basis at death.

(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1014.—Section 1014 (relating to basis of property acquired from a decedent) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) DECEDENTS DYING AFTER JUNE 30, 1969.—In the case of a decedent dying after June 30, 1969, this section shall not apply to any property for which an adjusted carryover basis is provided by section 1023."

(b) ADJUSTED CARRYOVER BASIS.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by redesignating section 1023 as section 1024 and by inserting after section 1022 the following new section:

"Sec. 1023. Adjusted carryover basis for certain property acquired from a decedent dying after June 30, 1969.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, if—

"(1) carryover basis property is acquired from a decedent dying after June 30, 1969, and

"(2) the gross estate at death of the decedent exceeds \$60,000,

then the basis of such property in the hands of the person so acquiring it shall be the adjusted basis of the property immediately before the death of the decedent, further adjusted as provided in this section.

"(b) CARRYOVER BASIS PROPERTY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'carryover basis property' means any property acquired from a decedent dying after June 30, 1969, which is property described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), or (9) of section 1014(b), other than—

"(1) property acquired by the decedent before January 1, 1951.

"(2) property (not including property of extraordinary value) which is a personal or household effect,

"(3) property acquired by any person from the decedent before his death which was disposed of by such person before the decedent's death,

"(4) property described in section 2042 (relating to proceeds of life insurance), and

"(5) property which constitutes a right to receive an item of income in respect of a decedent under section 691.

"(c) INCREASE IN BASIS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The basis of carryover basis property in the hands of the person acquiring it from the decedent shall be increased by its proportionate share of the Federal and State estate taxes attributable to the net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties.

"(2) MINIMUM INCREASE.—In the case of any decedent, the aggregate increase under paragraph (1) shall not be less than whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

"(A) the amount (if any) by which \$60,000 exceeds the aggregate bases of all property included in the gross estate (such bases to be determined after the application of section 1014 but before any adjustment under this section), or

"(B) the amount (if any) by which \$15,000 exceeds the amount by which the aggregate bases of all property to which section 1014 applies (such bases to be determined after the application of section 1014) is greater than the aggregate adjusted bases of such property immediately before the death of the decedent.

"(3) MANNER OF ALLOCATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the increase under this subsection in the basis of each carryover basis

property shall be that amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate increase determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) as the appreciation in value of such property bears to the aggregate appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties having appreciation in value.

"(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR SECTION 303 REDEMPTIONS.—To the extent the decedent provides by will, the increase in basis under this subsection shall be allocated first to stock which is carryover basis property and which after his death is redeemed under section 303 (relating to distributions in redemption of stock to pay death taxes). Any remaining increase in basis under this subsection shall be allocated among the other carryover basis property in accordance with subparagraph (A).

"(4) FAIR MARKET VALUE LIMITATION.—The increase under this subsection in the basis of any property shall not exceed the increase necessary to produce a basis equal to the fair market value of such property.

"(d) FURTHER INCREASE IN BASIS FOR CERTAIN STATE SUCCESSION TAX PAID BY TRANSFEREE OF PROPERTY.—If—

"(1) any person acquires carryover basis property from a decedent, and

"(2) such person actually pays an amount of estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes with respect to such property to any State or possession of the United States or to the District of Columbia for which the estate is not liable,

then the basis of such property (after any adjustment under subsection (c)) shall be increased (but not above its fair market value) by the portion of such amount which is attributable to the appreciation in value of such property.

"(e) TREATMENT OF COMMUNITY PROPERTY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The surviving spouse's interest in all community property—

"(A) for purposes of subsections (a) (2) and (c) (2), shall be treated as included in the gross estate of the decedent.

"(B) for purposes of this section (other than subsection (d)), shall be treated as property acquired from the decedent, and

"(C) for purposes of subsections (b) (1) and (e), shall be treated as property held by the decedent.

"(2) COMMUNITY PROPERTY DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'community property' means property—

"(A) held by the decedent and the surviving spouse as community property under the laws of any State or possession of the United States, or any foreign country, and

"(B) at least one-half of the whole community property interest in which was includible in determining the value of the decedent's gross estate under chapter 11.

"(f) SPECIAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS FOR APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION (c).—For purposes of subsection (c)—

"(1) FEDERAL AND STATE ESTATE TAXES.—The term 'Federal and State estate taxes' means only—

"(A) the tax imposed by section 2001 or 2101, reduced by (i) any credit allowable with respect to a tax on prior transfers by section 2013 or 2102, and (ii) any credit allowable with respect to State death taxes under section 2011 or 2102, and

"(B) any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes, for which the estate is liable, actually paid by the estate to any State or possession of the United States, or to the District of Columbia.

"(2) FEDERAL AND STATE ESTATE TAXES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NET APPRECIATION IN VALUE.—The term 'Federal and State estate taxes attributable to the net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties' means that amount which bears the same ratio to the Federal and State estate taxes as the net appreciation in value of the carryover basis

properties bears to the value of the gross estate (as defined in section 2031 or section 2103).

"(3) NET APPRECIATION.—The net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties is the amount by which the fair market value of all such property exceeds the adjusted basis of such property immediately before the death of the decedent.

"(4) GIFTS.—In the case of carryover basis property acquired from the decedent by gift, the increase in basis under subsection (c) shall not exceed the amount by which the increase under such subsection is greater than the increase allowable under section 1015(d).

"(5) CHARITABLE GIFT.—If—

"(A) a deduction is allowable under section 2055 or 2106(a) (2) with respect to any property, and

"(B) such property is specifically identifiable as passing from the decedent to a use specified in such section,

then, to the extent of such deduction, such property shall be treated as property which is not carryover basis property.

"(g) OTHER SPECIAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—For purposes of this section, when not otherwise distinctly expressed, the term 'fair market value' means fair market value determined under chapter 11 (including section 2032, relating to alternate valuation).

"(2) PROPERTY PASSING FROM THE DECEDENT.—For purposes of this section, property passing from the decedent shall be treated as property acquired from the decedent.

"(3) DECEDENT'S BASIS UNKNOWN.—If the facts necessary to determine the basis (unadjusted) of carryover basis property immediately before the death of the decedent are unknown to the person acquiring such property from the decedent, such basis shall be treated as being the fair market value of such property as of the date (or approximate date) at which such property was acquired by the decedent or by the last preceding owner in whose hands it did not have a basis determined in whole or in part by reference to its basis in the hands of a prior holder.

"(4) CERTAIN MORTGAGES.—For purposes of subsections (c) and (d), if—

"(A) there is an unpaid mortgage on, or indebtedness in respect of, property,

"(B) such mortgage or indebtedness does not constitute a liability of the estate, and

"(C) such property is included in the gross estate undiminished by such mortgage or indebtedness, then the value of such property to be treated as included in the gross estate shall be the value of such property, diminished by such mortgage or indebtedness.

"(5) DECEDENTS NONRESIDENT AND NOT CITIZENS.—In the case of a decedent nonresident not a citizen of the United States—

"(A) this section shall be applied by substituting for the figure '\$60,000' wherever it appears the amount of the exemption determined under section 2106(a) (3), and

"(B) subsection (c) (2) (B) shall be applied by substituting for the figure '\$15,000' the amount which is equal to ¼ of the amount of the exemption determined under section 2106(a) (3).

"(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

(c) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1016(a).—Section 1016(a) (relating to adjustments to basis) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(22) to the extent provided in section 1023, relating to adjusted carryover basis for

certain property acquired from a decedent dying after June 30, 1969."

(d) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 691(c).—

(1) Section 691(c) (2) (A) (relating to deduction for estate tax in case of income in respect of decedents) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) The term 'estate tax' means Federal and State estate taxes (within the meaning of section 1023(f) (1))."

(2) Section 691(c) (2) (C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) The estate tax attributable to such net value shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the estate tax as such net value bears to the value of the gross estate."

(e) INFORMATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 (relating to information concerning persons subject to special provisions) is amended by inserting after section 6039 the following new section:

"Sec. 6039A. Information regarding basis of property acquired from a decedent.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Every executor (as defined in section 2203) shall furnish with respect to the property of the decedent such information as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations relating to—

"(1) the name and last address of the decedent;

"(2) the name and address of each person acquiring property from the decedent or to whom the property passed from the decedent, and a description of each item of such property;

"(3) the adjusted basis (within the meaning of section 1011) of each such item in the hands of the decedent immediately before his death; and

"(4) any other information similar or related in nature to that specified in this paragraph.

If an executor is unable to furnish all of the information required under this subsection with respect to an item of property, he shall include in his return as much of such information as he is able to, including a description of such item and the name of every person holding a legal or beneficial interest therein, and, upon notice from the Secretary or his delegate, such person shall be treated with respect to such item as if he were an executor for purposes of this section.

"(b) STATEMENTS TO BE FURNISHED TO PERSONS WHO ACQUIRE PROPERTY FROM A DECEDENT.—Every executor who is required to furnish information under subsection (a) shall furnish in writing to each person described in subsection (a) (2) such information with respect to each item of property acquired from the decedent or passing from the decedent to such person as is required under subsection (a) and which the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations."

(2) PENALTIES.—Subchapter B of chapter 68 (relating to assessable penalties) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6684. Failure to file information with respect to basis of property acquired from a decedent.

"(a) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FURNISHED TO THE SECRETARY.—Any executor who fails to furnish information required under section 6039A (a) on the date prescribed therefor (determined with regard to any extension of time for filing) shall pay a penalty of 1 percent of the fair market value of the property described in section 6039A (a) (2), or \$5,000, whichever is less, for such failure, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect.

"(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FURNISHED TO BENEFICIARIES.—Any executor who

falls to furnish in writing to each person described in section 6039A(a)(2) the information required under section 6039A(b), unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, shall pay (upon notice and demand by the Secretary or his delegate and in the same manner as tax) \$50 for each such failure, but the total amount imposed for all such failures shall not exceed \$1,000."

(f) **DISCHARGE OF EXECUTOR FROM PERSONAL LIABILITY.**—Section 2204 (relating to discharge of executor from personal liability) is amended by striking out "notified," where it appears in the second sentence of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "notified or on furnishing of a bond pursuant to section 6165 in circumstances in which the Secretary or his delegate is satisfied that such payment will be made,".

Sec. 202. Effective date.

The amendments made by section 201 shall apply only with respect to decedents dying after June 30, 1969.

TITLE III—REPEAL OF UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION

Sec. 301. Repeal of deduction.

Sections 170(b)(1)(C) (relating to unlimited deduction for certain individuals) and 170(g) (relating to application of unlimited deduction) are repealed.

Sec. 302. Effective date.

Section 301 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1969.

TITLE IV—REPEAL OF STOCK OPTION PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Repeal of provisions.

(a) **QUALIFIED STOCK OPTIONS.**—Section 422 (relating to qualified stock options) is repealed.

(b) **RESTRICTED STOCK OPTIONS.**—Section 424 (relating to restricted stock options) is repealed.

Sec. 402. Effective date.

Section 401 shall apply with respect to options granted after June 30, 1969.

TITLE V—REPEAL OF DIVIDEND EXCLUSION

Sec. 501. Repeal.

Section 116 (relating to partial exclusion from gross income of dividends received by individuals) is repealed.

Sec. 502. Effective date.

Section 501 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1969.

TITLE VI—MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTION

Sec. 601. Repeal of privilege of groups to elect exemption.

Section 1562 (relating to privilege of groups to elect multiple surtax exemptions) is repealed.

Sec. 602. Effective date.

Section 601 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1969.

TITLE VII—MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

Sec. 701. Elimination of exemption.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 103(c) (relating to industrial development bonds) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) **INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS.**—

"(1) **SUBSECTION (a)(1) NOT TO APPLY.**—Any industrial development bond (as defined in paragraph (2)) issued after June 30, 1969, shall not be considered an obligation described in subsection (a)(1).

"(2) **INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOND DEFINED.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'industrial development bond' means an obligation the payment of the principal of interest on which is—

"(i) secured in whole or in part by a lien, mortgage, pledge, or other security interest

in property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation, or

"(ii) secured in whole or in part by an interest in (or to be derived primarily from) payments to be made in respect of money or property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation

which is or will be used, under a lease, sale, or loan arrangement, for industrial or commercial purposes.

"(B) **EXCEPTIONS.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), property shall not be treated as used for industrial or commercial purposes if it is used—

"(i) to provide entertainment (including sporting events) or recreational facilities for the general public;

"(ii) to provide facilities for the holding of a convention, trade show, or similar event;

"(iii) as an airport, dock, wharf, or similar transportation facility;

"(iv) in the furnishing or sale of electric energy, gas, water, or sewage disposal services; or

"(v) in an active trade or business owned and operated by an organization described in subsection (a)(1).

"(3) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any obligation issued before January 1, 1969, for a project assisted by the United States under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1450 and following, relating to slum clearance and urban renewal) or under title I or title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131 and following)."

(b) **CERTAIN URBAN RENEWAL BONDS.**—Section 102(g) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1152(g)), is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Obligations, including interest thereon, other than industrial development bonds (within the meaning of section 103(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), issued by local public agencies for projects assisted pursuant to this title, and income derived by such agencies from such projects, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States."

Sec. 702. Effective date.

The amendments made by section 701 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1969, but only with respect to obligations issued after such date.

TITLE VIII—MUNICIPAL BOND GUARANTEE CORPORATION

Sec. 801. Establishment of a government corporation to assist in the expansion of the capital market for municipal securities while decreasing the cost of such capital to municipalities.

Sec. 802. Findings and declaration of purpose.

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that the municipal security market, as now constituted, is forcing the Nation's municipalities and States to pay such a high rate of interest on their securities that they cannot afford to finance many needed public facilities. This high rate of interest is directly attributable to (1) the limited supply of private capital available in the present municipal securities market, (2) the institutional rigidities within such markets, and (3) the fallings of the existent municipal securities rating system which discriminates against most of the Nation's smaller communities and many of the larger cities and which fails to reflect the infinitesimally low rate of actual security defaults since World War II.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to expand the municipal capital market and thereby enable State and local public bodies to borrow private capital funds at net interest costs lower than are now obtainable through the issuance of securities and to

provide Federal assistance to achieve such lower net interest costs at a net gain to the United States Treasury.

Sec. 803. Definitions.

As used in this title—

(1) The term "Corporation" means the "Municipal Bond Guarantee Corporation".

(2) The term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

(3) The term "State or local public body" means any public corporate body or political subdivision; any public agency or instrumentality of one or more States, municipalities, or political subdivisions of one or more States (including any public agency or instrumentality of one or more municipalities or other political subdivisions of one or more States); any Indian tribe; and any board or commission established under the laws of any State to finance specific capital improvement projects.

(4) The term "needed public facilities" means any public work, public facility, or equipment relating thereto deemed necessary by a State or local public body; but does not include any industrial or commercial facility for private use, by lease, conditional or installment sales contract, or other means of transfer, where such facility is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities.

PART I—MUNICIPAL BOND GUARANTEE CORPORATION

Sec. 811. Establishment of corporation.

There is hereby established a body corporate to be known as the "Municipal Bond Guarantee Corporation". The Corporation shall have its principal offices in the District of Columbia and shall be deemed, for purposes of venue in civil actions, to be a resident of the District of Columbia. The Corporation may establish offices in such other places as it deems necessary or appropriate in conduct of its business.

Sec. 812. Board of directors.

(a) (1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") consisting of nine members to be appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be regular full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government. The Board shall be responsible for overall policymaking and general supervision of the Corporation.

(2) The President shall designate a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Board.

(3) Each member of the Board shall serve for a term of four years or until his successor has been appointed; except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(4) The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairman which shall be not less often than four times a year.

(b) Members of the Board, other than members who are regular full-time officers or employees of the Government, shall receive for their services, as members, the per diem equivalent to the rate for GS-18 when engaged in the performance of their duties, and each member of the Board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Sec. 813. Executive director.

(a) Subject to the general supervision and overall policymaking of the Board, the management of the Corporation shall be vested in an Executive Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(90) Executive Director, Municipal Bond Guarantee Corporation."

Sec. 814. General powers of corporation.

(a) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this title, the Corporation shall have power—

(1) to have a corporate seal which may be altered at pleasure and to use the same by causing it, or a facsimile thereof, to be impressed or affixed or in any other manner reproduced;

(2) to sue and be sued;

(3) to enter into and perform contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, on such terms as the Corporation may deem appropriate, and consent to modification thereof, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529 and 41 U.S.C. 5), and section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a);

(4) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary for the conduct of its business in accordance with the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment in the competitive service, and chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent for GS-18;

(5) except as may be otherwise provided in this part, in the Government Corporation Control Act, or in any other laws specifically applicable to Government corporations, to determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for;

(6) to issue such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title; and

(7) to exercise all powers specifically granted by the provisions of this title and such incidental powers as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) All suits of a civil nature at common law or in equity to which the Corporation shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, except that no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property.

Sec. 815. Services and facilities of other agencies—utilization of personnel, services, facilities, and information.

The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize on a reimbursable basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, except that any such agency having custody of any data relating to any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Corporation shall, to the extent permitted by law, upon request of the Corporation, make such data available to the Corporation without reimbursement.

Sec. 816. Finality of certain financial transactions.

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any financial transaction authorized under this Act shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the United States.

Sec. 817. Taxation.

The Corporation, including its reserves, surplus, and income, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or by any State, or any subdivision thereof, except any real property acquired by the Corporation shall be subject to taxation by any State or political

subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value as other real property is taxed.

Sec. 818. Government Corporation Control Act.

Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting after "Federal Housing Administration," the following: "Municipal Bond Guarantee Corporation."

Sec. 819. Annual Report.

The Corporation shall submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, a comprehensive annual report of its activities under this title.

Sec. 820. Appropriations.

Except as otherwise specifically provided for in this title, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions under this title.

PART II—FUNCTIONS OF THE CORPORATION

Sec. 821. Comprehensive economic and fiscal Reports.

(a) Upon the request of any State or local public body which intends to issue bonds or other securities to finance needed public facilities, or by any bond underwriting firm or bank planning to submit a bid for such bonds or other securities, or by any Federal agency that has received an application from a State or local public body for assistance in financing a public facility under a Government direct loan or loan guaranty program, the Corporation is authorized to provide a comprehensive report detailing the public body's economic and fiscal resources. Such report shall include, but not be limited to—

(1) a review of the economic circumstances of the area served by such body, such as demographic factors, business activity, construction patterns, income, employment, and public facilities infrastructure;

(2) an examination of such body's fiscal position including trends of revenues, expenditures, tax levies and collections, property valuations, Federal and State aids, direct and overlapping indebtedness;

(3) if revenue-producing facilities are involved, an analysis of the relevant financial statements, rate schedules and users, and other financial developments; and

(4) appropriate economic, fiscal, and financial ratios, averages, and indices and comparisons of such measures with national and regional averages.

Such report shall exclude qualitative judgments or comparable comments that in any way involve an evaluation of the investment merits of a prospective bond issue or reflect a credit evaluation of the State or local public body concerned

(b) The Corporation is authorized to charge and collect a fee for reports provided under this section to cover administrative and other necessary expenses. Such fee shall not exceed, in the case of any such report, one-tenth of 1 per centum of the amount of the bonds or other securities to be issued or loans to be made, but in no event shall the fee for any such report be less than \$100 or more than \$5,000.

(c) All fees received in connection with reports provided under this section, all funds in the form of gifts, bequests, or demonstration grants received from private foundations or associations, Federal agencies, or other public bodies seeking to improve the quality and availability of information relating to the economic and fiscal circumstances of State and local public bodies, and all other receipts of the Corporation in connection with the performance of its functions under this section, shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be established by the Corporation which shall be known as the "Municipal Economic and Fiscal Reports Fund". All administrative and other expenses

incurred by the Corporation in connection with the performance of its functions under this section shall be paid from such fund.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no application by a State or local public body for a loan under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, section 306 of the Consolidated Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1961, or the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 shall be approved unless there has been received by the administering Federal agency a comprehensive economic and fiscal report prepared under this section. Any fee paid in connection with any such report, as prescribed in subsection (b), may be included in the amount covered by the Federal loan or loan guarantee.

Sec. 822. Debt service guarantee contracts.

(a) Upon the application of any State or local public body, the Corporation is authorized to enter into a debt service guarantee contract to guarantee the payment of principal and interest on bonds or other securities to be issued by such body to finance one or more needed public facilities. Any such contract shall obligate the Corporation, during any period in which the bonds or other securities are outstanding, to pay to a trustee under an indenture security such bonds or other securities (or to a paying agent where no trustee is provided for), such amounts as may be needed, when added to the moneys available from the taxes, revenues, or other funds pledged by such body as security for such bonds or other securities (including all reserve funds therefor), to make payment of principal and interest when due.

(b) No guarantee contract shall be entered into under this section unless—

(1) a comprehensive economic and fiscal report has been prepared by the Corporation, pursuant to section 821, with respect to the State or local public body applying for the guarantee;

(2) the interest income from the bonds or other securities with respect to which the guarantee is entered into is subject to Federal taxation, and such bonds or other securities are to be issued and sold to persons or entities other than the United States or any agency thereof; and

(3) the Corporation determines that (A) such bonds or other securities contain satisfactory amortization provisions not in excess of the debt paying capacity of the borrower, and (B) the public facility project to be financed is economically sound.

In making the determinations under clause (3), the Corporation shall rely, to the fullest extent possible, upon the data contained in the comprehensive economic and fiscal report referred to in clause (1), and upon the borrower's debt repayment record during the twenty-five-year period preceding the date of application for a guarantee under this section.

(c) The Corporation is authorized to charge and collect an annual fee, as consideration for a guarantee of bonds or other securities under this section, to cover necessary administrative expenses and to provide a reserve for losses. Such fee shall not exceed two-tenths of 1 per centum per annum of the aggregate amount of bonds or other securities covered by the guarantee contract which are outstanding at the beginning of each year.

Sec. 823. Municipal debt service guarantee fund.

(a) There is hereby established in the Treasury a revolving fund to be known as the "Municipal Debt Service Guarantee Fund" (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") which shall be used by the Corporation in carrying out section 822. Initial capital for the fund shall be obtained through the issu-

ance by the Corporation of debenture notes, and notes so issued shall be subscribed to as follows:

(1) The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall subscribe to such notes in a principal amount of \$1,000,000.

(2) The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation shall subscribe to such notes in a principal amount of \$100,000.

(3) Each Federal Reserve bank shall subscribe to such notes in a principal amount equal to two-tenths of 1 per centum of the surplus of such bank on January 1, 1968.

Subscriptions shall be accompanied by a certified check payable to the fund in an amount equal to one-half of the subscription. The remainder of such subscription shall be subject to call from time to time by the Corporation upon ninety days' notice. Notes so issued shall bear interest at a rate to be determined in accordance with subsection (c), and shall be repayable in annual installments, commencing not earlier than ten years from the date of receipt of the subscription price.

(b) All fees received in connection with guarantees issued under section 822, all receipts from the issuance of debenture notes, all funds borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to subsection (c), all earnings on the assets of the fund, and all other receipts of the Corporation in connection with the performance of its functions under section 822 shall be deposited in the fund. All payments to trustees (or paying agents) under section 822(a), repayments of debenture notes issued pursuant to subsection (a), repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury of sums borrowed pursuant to subsection (c), and all administrative expenses and other expenses of the Corporation in connection with the performance of its functions under section 822 shall be paid from the fund.

(c) (1) The Corporation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary in amounts sufficient, together with moneys in the fund, to make payments of principal and interest on all bonds or other securities guaranteed under section 822 in accordance with a debt service guarantee contract. Such obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Corporation reflecting the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Secretary and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations of the Corporation issued under this subsection, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act; and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include the purchase of any such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

Sec. 824. Interest reduction grants.

(a) In order to achieve a decrease in the interest costs burdens arising in the financing of needed public facilities, the Corpora-

tion is authorized to enter into contracts to make interest reduction grants to any State or local public body in connection with bonds or other securities issued by such body to finance needed public facilities; except that no grant shall be made hereunder in the case of any bonds or other securities the interest income from which is exempt in whole or in part from Federal taxation.

(b) The amount of any grant made under this section shall not exceed the sum of (1) the guaranty fee prescribed in section 822 (c), and (2) 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of the annual interest charge payable each year by the State or local public body on the bonds or other securities with respect to which such grant is made. Any such grant shall be payable for each of the years in which any of the bonds or other securities covered by the contract are outstanding.

(c) No grant shall be made under this section unless (1) the State or local public body has entered into a debt service guaranty contract pursuant to section 822, and (2) the Corporation finds that the interest charges on the bonds or other securities are reasonable, after taking into account the taxable status of the bonds or other securities, the availability of a Government guarantee, and the general level of interest rates then prevailing.

(d) The Corporation may make advance or progress payments on account of any contract entered into pursuant to this section, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

Sec. 825. Investment of funds

Moneys in the Municipal Economic and Fiscal Reports Fund and in the Municipal Debt Service Guarantee Fund may be invested in obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, or in obligations eligible for investment of public funds. Such obligations may be sold and the proceeds derived therefrom may be reinvested in other obligations of the type herein prescribed. Income from such investment or reinvestment shall be deposited in the respective funds.

Sec. 826. Conforming amendments

(a) Section 202(b)(1) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking the comma after "reasonable terms" and inserting in lieu thereof "with due allowance for the debt service guarantees authorized by title VIII of the Tax Reform Act of 1969."

(b) Section 201(a)(2) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after "on terms" the following: ", with due allowance for the debt service guarantees authorized by title VIII of the Tax Reform Act of 1969."

TITLE IX—PERCENTAGE DEPLETION RATES FOR OIL, GAS, AND CERTAIN OTHER MINERALS

Sec. 901. Reduction in rates.

Section 613(b) (relating to percentage depletion rates) is amended—

(1) by striking out "27 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent"; and

(2) by striking out "23 percent" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent".

Sec. 902. Effective date.

Section 901 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1969.

TITLE X—INCREASE IN GIFT TAX RATES TO ESTATE TAX LEVEL

Sec. 1001. Increase in rates.

The table in section 2502(a) (relating to

computation of tax) is amended to read as follows:

"RATE SCHEDULE

"If the taxable gifts are:	The tax shall be:
Not over \$5,000----	3% of the taxable gifts.
Over \$5,000 but not over \$10,000.	\$150, plus 7% of excess over \$5,000.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$20,000.	\$500, plus 11% of excess over \$10,000.
Over \$20,000 but not over \$30,000.	\$1,600, plus 14% of excess over \$20,000.
Over \$30,000 but not over \$40,000.	\$3,000, plus 18% of excess over \$30,000.
Over \$40,000 but not over \$50,000.	\$4,800, plus 22% of excess over \$40,000.
Over \$50,000 but not over \$60,000.	\$7,000, plus 25% of excess over \$50,000.
Over \$60,000 but not over \$100,000.	\$9,500, plus 28% of excess over \$60,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$250,000.	\$20,700, plus 30% of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$250,000 but not over \$500,000.	\$65,700, plus 32% of excess over \$250,000.
Over \$500,000 but not over \$750,000.	\$145,700, plus 35% of excess over \$500,000.
Over \$750,000 but not over \$1,000,000.	\$233,200, plus 37% of excess over \$750,000.
Over \$1,000,000 but not over \$1,250,000.	\$325,000, plus 39% of excess over \$1,000,000.
Over \$1,250,000 but not over \$1,500,000.	\$423,200, plus 42% of excess over \$1,250,000.
Over \$1,500,000 but not over \$2,000,000.	\$528,200, plus 45% of excess over \$1,500,000.
Over \$2,000,000 but not over \$2,500,000.	\$753,200, plus 49% of excess over \$2,000,000.
Over \$2,500,000 but not over \$3,000,000.	\$998,200, plus 53% of excess over \$2,500,000.
Over \$3,000,000 but not over \$3,500,000.	\$1,263,000, plus 56% of excess over \$3,000,000.
Over \$3,500,000 but not over \$4,000,000.	\$1,543,200, plus 59% of excess over \$3,500,000.
Over \$4,000,000 but not over \$5,000,000.	\$1,838,200, plus 63% of excess over \$4,000,000.
Over \$5,000,000 but not over \$6,000,000.	\$2,468,200, plus 67% of excess over \$5,000,000.
Over \$6,000,000 but not over \$7,000,000.	\$3,138,200, plus 70% of excess over \$6,000,000.
Over \$7,000,000 but not over \$8,000,000.	\$3,838,200, plus 73% of excess over \$7,000,000.
Over \$8,000,000 but not over \$10,000,000.	\$4,568,200, plus 76% of excess over \$8,000,000.
Over \$10,000,000----	\$6,088,200, plus 77% of excess over \$10,000,000."

Sec. 1002. Effective date.

Section 1001 shall apply with respect to calendar years after 1969.

TITLE XI—USE OF UNITED STATES BONDS TO PAY ESTATE TAX

Sec. 1101. Repeal of authority to use bonds for tax payments.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 14 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 765) is repealed.

(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF BONDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law,

no bond or other obligation of the United States may be accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury in satisfaction of any amount of Federal estate tax liability greater than their fair market value of such obligation at the time it is presented as payment of such liability.

Sec. 1102. Effective date.

Section 1101 shall apply with respect to obligations acquired after June 30, 1969.

TITLE XII—USE OF FARMING DEDUCTIONS TO OFFSET NONFARM INCOME

Sec. 1201. Limitation on deductions.

Part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 277. Limitation on deductions attributable to farming.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming, the deductions attributable to such business which, but for this section, would be allowable under this chapter for the taxable year shall not exceed the sum of—

"(1) the adjusted farm gross income for the taxable year, and

"(2) the higher of—

"(A) the amount of the special deductions (as defined in subsection (d) (3) allowable for the taxable year, or

"(B) \$15,000 (\$7,500 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return), reduced by the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income (taxable income in the case of a corporation) for the taxable year attributable to all sources other than the business of farming (determined before the application of this section) exceeds \$15,000 (\$7,500 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

"(b) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS USING CERTAIN RULES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a taxpayer who has filed a statement, which is effective for the taxable year, that—

"(A) he is using, and will use, a method of accounting in computing taxable income from the business of farming which uses inventories in determining income and deductions for the taxable year and

"(B) he is charging, and will charge, to capital account all expenditures paid or incurred in the business of farming which are properly chargeable to capital account (including such expenditures which the taxpayer may, under this chapter or regulations prescribe thereunder, otherwise treat or elect to treat as expenditures which are not chargeable to capital account).

"(2) TIME, MANNER, AND EFFECT OF STATEMENT.—A statement under paragraph (1) for any taxable year shall be filed within the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for such taxable year, and shall be made and filed in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations. Such statement shall be binding on the taxpayer, and be effective, for such taxable year and for all subsequent taxable years and may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) CHANGE OF METHOD OF ACCOUNTING, ETC.—If, in connection with a statement under paragraph (1), a taxpayer changes his method of accounting in computing taxable income or changes a method of treating expenditures chargeable to capital account, such change shall be treated as having been made with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate and, in the case of a change in method of accounting, shall be treated as a change not initiated by the taxpayer.

"(c) CARRYBACK AND CARRYOVER OF DISALLOWED FARM OPERATING LOSSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The disallowed farm operating loss for any taxable year (herein-

after referred to as the "loss year") shall be—

"(A) a disallowed farm operating loss carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the loss year, and

"(B) a disallowed farm operating loss carryover to each of the 5 taxable years following the loss year,

and (subject to the limitations contained in paragraph (2)) shall be allowed as a deduction for such years, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, in a manner consistent with the allowance of the net operating loss deduction under section 172.

"(2) LIMITATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The deduction under paragraph (1) for any taxable year for disallowed farm operating loss carrybacks and carryovers to such taxable year shall not exceed the taxpayers' net farm income for such taxable year.

"(B) CARRYBACKS.—The deduction under paragraph (1) for any taxable year for disallowed farm operating loss carrybacks to such taxable year shall not be allowable to the extent it would increase or produce a net operating loss (as defined in section 172(c)) for such taxable year.

"(3) TREATMENT AS NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYBACK.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a disallowed farm operating loss carryback shall, for purposes of this title, be treated in the same manner as a net operating loss carryback.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ADJUSTED FARM GROSS INCOME.—The term 'adjusted farm gross income' means, with respect to any taxable year, the gross income derived from the business of farming for such taxable year (including recognized gains derived from sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property), reduced, in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, by an amount equal to 50 percent of the lower of—

"(A) the amount (if any) by which the recognized gains on sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property which under section 1231(a) are treated as gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets held for more than 6 months exceed the recognized losses on sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property which under section 1231(a) are treated as losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets held for more than 6 months, or

"(B) the amount (if any) by which the recognized gains described in section 1231(a) exceed the recognized losses described in such section.

"(2) NET FARM INCOME.—The term 'net farm income' means, with respect to any taxable year, the gross income derived from the business of farming for such taxable year (including recognized gains derived from sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property), reduced by the sum of—

"(A) the deductions allowable under this chapter (other than by subsection (c) of this section) for such taxable year which are attributable to such business, and

"(B) in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), whichever is lower.

"(3) SPECIAL DEDUCTIONS.—The term 'special deductions' means the deductions allowable under this chapter which are paid or incurred in the business of farming and which are attributable to—

"(A) taxes,

"(B) interest,

"(C) the abandonment or theft of farm property, or losses of farm property arising from fire, storm, or other casualty,

"(D) losses and expenses directly attributable to drought, and

"(E) recognized losses from sales, exchanges, and involuntary conversions of farm property.

"(4) FARM PROPERTY.—The term 'farm property' means property which is used in the business of farming and which is property used in the trade or business within the meaning of paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of section 1231(b) (determined without regard to the period for which held).

"(5) DISALLOWED FARM OPERATING LOSS.—The term 'disallowed farm operating loss' means, with respect to any taxable year, the amount disallowed as deductions under subsection (a) for such taxable year, reduced, in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, by an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), whichever is lower.

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) BUSINESS OF FARMING.—A taxpayer shall be treated as engaged in the business of farming for any taxable year if—

"(A) any deduction is allowable under section 162 or 167 for any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer with respect to farming, or with respect to any farm property held by the taxpayer, or

"(B) any deduction would (but for this paragraph) otherwise be allowable to the taxpayer under section 212 or 167 for any expense paid or incurred with respect to farming, or with respect to property held for the production of income which is used in farming.

For purposes of this paragraph, farming does not include the raising of timber. In the case of a taxpayer who is engaged in the business of farming for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (B), property held for the production of income which is used in farming shall, for purposes of this chapter, be treated as property used in such business.

"(2) INCOME AND DEDUCTIONS.—The determination of whether any item of income is derived from the business of farming and whether any deduction is attributable to the business of farming shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, but no deduction allowable under section 1202 (relating to deduction for capital gains) shall be attributable to such business.

"(3) CONTROLLED GROUP OF CORPORATIONS.—If two or more corporations which—

"(A) are component members of a controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563) on a December 31, and

"(B) have not filed a statement under subsection (b) which is effective for the taxable year which includes such December 31,

each have deductions attributable to the business of farming (before the application of subsection (a)) in excess of its gross income derived from such business for its taxable year which includes such December 31, then, in applying subsection (a) for such taxable year, the \$15,000 amount specified in paragraph (2)(B) of such subsection shall be reduced for each such corporation to an amount which bears the same ratio to \$15,000 as the excess of such deductions over such gross income of such corporation bears to the aggregate excess of such deductions over such gross income of all such corporations.

"(4) PARTNERSHIPS.—A business of farming carried on by a partnership shall be treated as carried on by the members of such partnership in proportion to their interest in such partnership. To the extent that income and deductions attributable to a business of farming are treated under the preceding sentence as income and deductions of members of a partnership, such income and deduction

shall, for purposes of this chapter, not be taken into account by the partnership.

"(5) **TWO OR MORE BUSINESSES.**—If a taxpayer is engaged in two or more businesses of farming, such businesses shall be treated as a single business.

"(6) **RELATED INTEGRATED BUSINESSES.**—If a taxpayer is engaged in the business of farming and is also engaged in one or more businesses which are directly related to his business of farming and are conducted on an integrated basis with his business of farming, the taxpayer may elect to treat all such businesses as a single business engaged in the business of farming. An election under this paragraph shall be made in such manner at such time, and subject to such conditions as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations.

"(7) **SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS AND THEIR SHAREHOLDERS.**—

"For special treatment of electing small business corporations which do not file statements under subsection (b) and of the shareholders of such corporations, see section 1379.

"(f) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

Sec. 1202. Technical amendments.

(a) The table of sections for part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 277. Limitation on deductions attributable to farming."

(b) Section 172(1) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For limitations on deductions attributable to farming and special treatment of disallowed farm operating losses, see section 277."

(c) Section 381(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(24) **FARM OPERATING LOSS CARRYOVER.**—The acquiring corporation shall take into account, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the disallowed farm operating loss carryovers under section 277 of the distributor or transferor corporation."

(d) Subchapter S of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 1379. Electing small business corporations engaged in business of farming.

"(a) **SEPARATE APPLICATION TO FARMING INCOME AND DEDUCTIONS.**—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, an electing small business corporation which is engaged in the business of farming during its taxable year (other than a corporation which has filed a statement under section 277(b) which is effective for such taxable year), and the shareholders of such corporation, shall apply the provisions of sections 1373 through 1378, separately with respect to—

"(1) income derived from the business of farming by such corporation and deductions attributable to such business, and

"(2) all other income and deductions of such corporation.

In computing the taxable income and undistributed taxable income, or net operating loss, of such corporation with respect to the business of farming, no deduction otherwise allowable under this chapter shall be disallowed to such corporation under section 277.

"(b) **SHAREHOLDERS TREATED AS ENGAGED IN BUSINESS OF FARMING, ETC.**—For purposes of section 277—

"(1) each shareholder of an electing small business corporation to which subsection (a) applies shall be treated as engaged in the business of farming,

"(2) the undistributed taxable income of such corporation which is included in the gross income of such shareholder under section 1373 and is attributable to income and deductions referred to in subsection (a) (1), and dividends received which are attributable to such income and deductions and are distributed out of earnings and profits of the taxable year as specified in section 316(a) (2), shall be treated as income derived from the business of farming by such shareholder, and

"(3) the deduction allowable (before the application of section 277) to such shareholder under section 1374 as his portion of such corporation's net operating loss attributable to income and deductions referred to in subsection (a) (1) shall be treated as a deduction attributable to the business of farming.

"(c) **SPECIAL RULES OF SECTION 277(e) APPLICABLE.**—For purposes of this section, the special rules set forth in section 277(e) shall apply."

(2) The table of sections for subchapter S of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 1379. Electing small business corporations engaged in business of farming."

Sec. 1203. Effective date.

The amendments made by this title shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, except that for purposes of applying section 277(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by section 1201 of this title) with respect to disallowed farm operating losses of any taxpayer for taxable years beginning after such date—

(1) such amendments shall also apply to the 3 taxable years of such taxpayer preceding the first taxable year beginning after such date, and

(2) in the case of a taxpayer to whom section 1379(b) of such Code (as added by section 1202(d) of this title) applies for any of his first 3 taxable years beginning after such date, section 1379 of such Code shall apply with respect to the electing small business corporation of which such taxpayer is a shareholder for the 3 taxable years preceding each such taxable year of such taxpayer, but only with respect to any such preceding taxable year for which the corporation was an electing small business corporation.

TITLE XIII—GAINS FROM THE DISPOSITION OF DEPRECIABLE REALTY

Sec. 1301. Inclusion of realty as section 1245 property.

(a) **AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1245.**—Section 1245(a) (3) (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable property) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and by inserting immediately after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) any real property which is or has been property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167, or"

(b) **REPEAL OF SECTION 1250.**—Section 1250 (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable realty) is repealed.

Sec. 1302. Effective date.

This title shall apply to dispositions occurring after June 30, 1969.

TITLE XIV—REPEAL OF 7 PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Sec. 1401. Repeal of credit.

Section 38 (relating to credit for investment in certain depreciable property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) **TERMINATION OF CREDIT.**—The credit provided by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to property placed in service by

the taxpayer on or before the date of the enactment of this subsection and with respect to property placed in service after such date—

"(1) to the extent such property is attributable to construction, reconstruction, or erection by the taxpayer (A) on or before such date, or (B) after such date pursuant to the terms of a binding written contract as in effect on such date, or

"(2) such property was acquired by the taxpayer (A) on or before such date, or (B) after such date pursuant to the terms of a binding written contract as in effect on such date.

Notwithstanding section 46(b) (relating to carryback and carryover of unused credits), no amount shall be added pursuant to such section to the amount allowable as a credit by this section for any taxable year ending after the date of the enactment of this subsection."

Sec. 1402. The amendment made by section 1401 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The material, presented by Mr. NELSON, follows:

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

(Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat-Wis.)

TITLE I: SHORT TITLE AND PROVISION FOR PERFECTING AMENDMENTS

TITLE II: TAXING CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH—SAVINGS \$2.5 BILLION

When shares of stock and other forms of property increase in value, the increase is subject to tax as a capital gain. However, the capital gains tax rate on property held for more than 6 months is only half of that for ordinary income, and it never goes higher than 25 percent. In addition, the tax is not assessed until the property is sold and the increase in value is realized.

But some capital gains are never taxed at all. Here is how it works. Suppose a taxpayer bought some stock in a small electronics company for \$5000 back in 1958. The company has flourished and the stock is now worth \$15,000. If he sells it now he will have to pay a capital gains tax on the \$10,000 increase in value. For the high bracket taxpayer who pays the maximum 25 percent capital gains rate, this means a tax of \$2500. But if he never sells the stock and it passes on to his heirs, neither he nor his heirs will ever have to pay income tax on the increase in value. The heirs' only responsibility for taxes is on any future profit they receive.

This loophole greatly favors those who have large amounts of accumulated wealth to pass on to the next generation.

Moreover, many older investors who would rather see their money go to their heirs than to the Internal Revenue Service tend to hold on to investments they would normally sell. As a result, capital which would otherwise be set free to flow into sound and productive investments is locked in, distorting investment decision-making.

Closing this loophole by simply taxing these capital gains at death would increase Federal revenues by \$2.5 billion a year.

TITLE III: ELIMINATING THE UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION—SAVINGS \$60 MILLION

The unlimited charitable deduction is a little-known device that costs the Treasury some \$60 million a year in lost revenues.

The ordinary taxpayer may not deduct more than 30 percent of his income for his contributions to charity, no matter how much he gives. Not so for some millionaires, however. They are allowed to deduct gifts to charity without limit if—in that year and eight of ten preceding years—their charitable contributions plus Federal income taxes paid exceeded 90 percent of taxable income.

This may sound like a hard way to escape taxation, but it really is not if you are a millionaire and a careful investor. Notice that it is only 90 percent of taxable income that must be given away or paid in taxes—the millionaire who receives most of his income from capital gains, tax-free state and local bonds, and oil property will have relatively little taxable income. Thus the 90 percent requirement need not be a serious obstacle—a modest annual gift to a favorite charity, which might be a foundation set up by the wealthy taxpayer himself—and the full benefit of an unlimited charitable deduction is his to reap.

TITLE IV: ELIMINATING SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR STOCK OPTIONS—SAVINGS \$150 MILLION

The stock option loopholes enables top executives of large corporations to pay taxes on part of their incomes at low capital gains rates.

It works this way. If the executive is rewarded by his corporation with a bonus or a raise, he pays taxes on it just like everyone else. If he is a top-level executive, however, the corporation is more likely to give him an option to purchase its stock instead. The option is simply a right to purchase the company's stock at any time the executive wants to within, say, the next ten years, at the price the stock is selling for at the time the option is granted. Thus an executive granted an option in 1960 when the company's stock is selling for \$50 a share can exercise it in 1968 by buying the stock at that price, even though the stock may have risen in value to \$300 a share during those eight years. Exercising the option therefore gives him a capital gain of \$250 a share, taxable at the low capital gains rates. By contrast, the man who received the same amount of income in the form of salary or a bonus would pay an income tax at least double that of the option-favored executive.

If perchance the stock should decline in value the executive is no worse off. He has no obligation to buy the preferred stock, so he simply does not exercise his option.

As a result of President Kennedy's 1962 request that the stock option loophole be closed, the Revenue Act of 1964 tightened up the terms qualifying business executives for this privileged treatment. The privilege still remains, however. It is time to ring down the curtain on it.

By so doing, the saving to the Treasury could well be \$150 million.

TITLE V: ELIMINATING THE \$100 DIVIDEND EXCLUSION—SAVINGS \$225 MILLION

Corporation stockholders are specially favored by the \$100 dividend exclusion loophole. These generally high-bracket taxpayers get their first \$100 of dividends each year tax-free. By contrast, their neighbors who put their money in savings accounts or in government bonds pay income tax on all the interest they receive.

The dividend exclusion was first written into the tax law in 1954. The ostensible reason was to compensate for the "double taxation" of dividends which are taxed first to the corporation as corporate income and then again as a dividend when distributed to the taxpayer.

The logic of this double taxation argument would lead to the conclusion that all dividends should escape tax, but even the strongest proponents of the 1954 dividend exclusion did not have the temerity to push for this.

Corporations and their stockholders are separate entities—legally and in fact. The very purpose of incorporation is to limit the owner's liability by separating his income and assets from those of the corporation. Since the stockholders benefit substantially by this legal separation from the corporation, it is no injustice for the law to continue to view the stockholder and the corporation as separate entities at tax time.

Double taxation, moreover, is all around us. Excise taxes, sales taxes, and use taxes are often pyramided on top of each other. There is a sales tax on automobiles, for example, yet many of the parts in the car were already taxed at least once before when they were sold to the car manufacturer.

Closing the dividend exclusion loophole would increase Treasury revenues by \$225 million.

TITLE VI: ELIMINATING THE BENEFITS DERIVED FROM MULTIPLE CORPORATIONS—SAVINGS, \$200 MILLION

Dividing a business enterprise into a number of separate parts for tax purposes has long been a disorder of the corporate world. The advantages of multiple incorporation result from the way the corporation tax is set up: the first \$25,000 of a corporation's earnings are taxed at 22 percent, while everything above that is taxed at 48 percent. Therefore, dividing the enterprise up into a number of separate corporations, each reporting earnings of \$25,000 or less, avoids the extra 26 percent tax entirely. Since each \$25,000 in earnings beyond the first \$25,000 would otherwise be taxed at the full 48 percent rate, there is a tax savings of 26 percent of \$25,000 (or \$6,500) for each separate corporation.

Take, for example, a corporation with earnings of \$100,000 a year—splitting it up into four \$25,000 corporations can save \$19,500 a year in taxes. There is one case on record of a corporation that divided itself into 734 separate corporations, for a tax saving that approached \$5,000,000 a year.

Although Congress put some limits on the multiple corporation dodge in 1964, this loophole still costs the Treasury \$200 million a year.

TITLE VII: REMOVING THE TAX EXEMPTION ON MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS—SAVINGS \$50 MILLION

Communities throughout the country are today issuing municipal bonds bearing tax-free interest to finance industrial plants and commercial facilities for private, profit-making corporations.

The usual technique is for the municipality to construct a plant in accordance with the corporation's specifications and then to lease the plant to the corporation, using the rental payments to retire the bond.

Although the interest on state and local bonds has long been tax-free, this privilege was not extended to industrial development bonds until 1954, and then not by law but by a Treasury ruling.

There is no justification whatever for extending the tax-exempt privilege to these bond issues. They serve no public purpose, but merely subsidize plant construction for large corporations that are fully capable of financing these plants themselves. They flood the tax-exempt bond market and drive up interest rates on all tax-exempt bonds. And they have been a prime weapon in the arsenal of rural, largely Southern, areas seeking to lure run-a-way plants from other parts of the country.

This plant piracy has forced a number of industrial states to allow their local governments to issue these bonds, with the result that some 44 states now authorize them. With virtually all states issuing these bonds, this kind of financing no longer gives one state an advantage over another. The states end up caught in a beggar-thy-neighbor rat-race which benefits no one but the subsidized corporations.

Early in 1968 the Treasury Department attempted to reverse its 1954 ruling by revoking the industrial development bond tax exemption. However, Congress thwarted this attempt by passing legislation that permitted the exemption to continue for most issues. The tax exemption was first limited to issues of under \$1 million, except that larger issues

for arguably public purposes (like sports arenas, airports, pollution abatement facilities, and industrial parks) would remain tax exempt. Congress then raised the upper limit on bond issues to \$5 million if the issuing community was willing to work within certain restrictions. The upshot of all this is that some 87 percent of industrial development bond issues will continue to be tax exempt.

Closing this loophole for good would save the Treasury at least \$50 million a year.

TITLE VIII: A MUNICIPAL BOND GUARANTEE CORPORATION AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO TAX EXEMPT BONDS—SAVINGS \$900 MILLION

The interest on state and local bonds has been tax-free ever since the original income tax law of 1913. As a matter of fact, taxpayers need not even report this income on their tax returns.

As a consequence, state and local bonds have long been a favorite investment for the very rich. Although the average taxpayer perceives no great advantage in buying municipal bonds at 4 percent when he can get corporate bonds that will pay him 7 percent, the tax free bonds look very good indeed to taxpayers in the 50-percent-and-up brackets.

Not surprisingly, then, over 80 percent of tax-free bonds held by individuals are in the hands of the wealthiest 1 percent of the population.

This tax exemption does, however, have one important redeeming feature—it enables hard-pressed states and cities to raise money for schools, roads, water purification plants, hospitals, and other essential public facilities at relatively low interest rates. Simply taxing the interest on municipal bonds, therefore, would force municipalities either to pay higher interest rates (which few of them could afford) or to forego badly-needed public improvements.

Fortunately there is a solution at hand that does not involve giving tax-free income to millionaire investors. The idea is this: tax the income from these bonds, but have the federal government pay a direct subsidy to states and cities to compensate them for their higher borrowing costs. The Treasury would come out comfortably ahead on the deal, since it now loses far more revenue (\$1.8 billion in 1968) than the states and localities save in lower borrowing costs (about \$9 billion).

This Title therefore sets up a Municipal Bond Guarantee Corporation to guarantee State and local bond issues against default, and to pay to states and localities an interest subsidy sufficient to reduce their interest payments by one-third. The funds for the subsidy would come from general Federal revenues. In return for the guarantee and subsidy, states and localities would be required to waive the tax exempt status of the bond issues involved, thus allowing the Federal government to tax the interest.

Although municipalities could continue to issue tax exempt bonds, the Guarantee Corporation route would be more attractive in most cases. Treasury Department experts estimate that municipal borrowing costs are only reduced 25 percent because of the tax-exempt feature, while the Federal interest subsidy would reduce their borrowing costs by 33 percent. The Treasury would also come out ahead, since they would get an estimated 42 cents in extra tax revenue for every 33 cents that had to be turned over to municipalities as an interest subsidy.

TITLE IX: REDUCING THE MINERAL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FROM 27½ PERCENT TO 15 PERCENT ON OIL AND FROM 23 PERCENT TO 15 PERCENT ON 41 OTHER MINERALS—SAVINGS \$900 MILLION

The most notorious tax loophole of all is the oil depletion allowance. It allows oil producers to receive 27½ percent of the gross income from their oil wells tax-free—so long

as it does not exceed 50 percent of net income. In theory, this is to compensate the oil man for the fact that the oil in his well is being used up, or depleted, by the drilling, much as other businessmen are allowed to take deductions for the depreciation of their plant and machinery. Unlike other industries, however, the oil depletion allowance continues year after year as long as the well keeps producing—it does not stop when the cost of the well is recovered. Normal cost depreciation, by way of contrast, permits capital assets to be depreciated over their useful life, but total deductions cannot exceed the total cost of the asset.

As a result of this provision, the Treasury estimates, the cost of the average oil well is recovered 19 times over. The effect of this on oil company tax bills is striking: in 1966 the 20 top oil companies in America cleared a total profit of more than \$4¼ billion—yet they paid Federal income taxes at the rate of only 8½ percent. That is about the same rate a man and wife earning \$3,000 a year must pay.

Ideally, percentage depletion should be replaced with cost depletion. But since we are not living in an ideal world, this Title provided only that the oil depletion allowance be reduced by less than one-half, from 27½ to 15 percent, the percentage now applicable to over 40 other minerals. In addition, this Title would reduce to 15 percent the mineral depletion allowance on 41 minerals now enjoying a 23 percent depletion rate. Thus these two reforms would put a 15 percent ceiling on all percentage depletion.

The revenue gain from this modest proposal would be at least \$900 million a year.

TITLE X: ESTABLISHING THE SAME RATE FOR GIFT AND ESTATE TAXES—SAVINGS \$150 MILLION

Present tax law places a premium on a person giving away his property during his lifetime. Property given away during a donor's lifetime is taxed at the gift tax rate, which is only three-fourths as high as the estate tax rate that applies to property transferred at death. In addition, \$3000 can be given away each year to any number of individuals without paying any gift tax. Finally, over and above these yearly \$3000 gifts, \$30,000 can be given away by a person during his lifetime without paying a gift tax.

This Title simply raised the gift tax rates by 25 percent to bring them in line with the estate tax rates. Property given away would then be taxed at the same rate without regard to whether it is given during the donor's lifetime or at his death.

This reform would bring in \$150 million in extra revenues annually.

TITLE XI: ELIMINATING PAYMENT OF ESTATE TAXES BY THE REDEMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BONDS AT PAR—SAVINGS \$50 MILLION

If upon death a person faces a probable \$100,000 estate tax bill and has a smart lawyer, the lawyer will advise his client to buy \$100,000 worth of long-term U.S. Government bonds. Why? Because the U.S. Treasury will redeem its bonds at par (face) value in payment of estate taxes, no matter what his client paid for them. If his client, for example, buys Government bonds for \$80,000 and his estate turns them in at \$100,000 a few weeks later, the decedent reduces his estate tax bill by 20 percent.

The Treasury loses \$50 million a year as a result of this little known generosity.

TITLE XII: LIMITING HOBBY FARMERS' USE OF FARM LOSSES TO OFFSET OTHER INCOME—SAVINGS \$400 MILLION

The "hobby farm" loophole allows wealthy individuals with a yen for the bucolic to escape both city life and a large amount of taxes by becoming gentleman farmers. These part-time rustics get most of their income from sources other than farming, but by maintaining a farm they can take advantage

of special farm accounting rules—which were developed to ease bookkeeping chores for ordinary, full-time farmers—and show "tax losses" which are not true economic losses. These tax losses are then used to offset non-farm income, generally resulting in a large tax savings overall.

Not only is this loophole a large drain on the Treasury—around \$400 million a year—it also gives the hobby farmer an unfair competitive advantage over the genuine farmer. The ordinary farmer must compete in the market place with these wealthy hobby farmers, to whom a profit in the ordinary sense is not necessary. In addition, the Treasury has said, the attractive farm tax benefits available to the wealthy have caused them to bid up the price of farm land beyond that which would prevail in a normal farm economy.

This Title deals with the hobby farm problem by limiting the amount of non-farm income that can be offset by farm losses in any one year. For those with non-farm income up to \$15,000, farm losses can offset this non-farm income in full. However, for each dollar of non-farm income in excess of \$15,000, the amount of non-farm income that can be offset is reduced by a dollar. Thus, someone with a non-farm income of \$20,000 could only offset \$10,000 of it with farm losses, while someone with non-farm income of \$30,000 or more could offset none of it with farm losses.

In addition, there are carryover and carry-back provisions that allow farm losses to be offset against farm income—but no other income—for the prior 3 years and the subsequent 5 years.

TITLE XIII: ELIMINATING ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON SPECULATIVE REAL ESTATE—SAVINGS \$150 MILLION

This Title would repeal section 1250 of the Internal Revenue Code, which permits accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate investments.

By taking advantage of this accelerated depreciation provision, a real estate speculator can deduct more than the normal amount of depreciation in the early years of a building's life in return for lower-than-normal deductions in the later years. However, if he sells the building at the proper time he can avoid those lower deductions in the later years. The new purchaser can in turn begin again with higher-than-average deductions, skimming the cream of accelerated depreciation before he too sells the property. The advantage of this for the speculator is that these higher-than-normal deductions can be used to offset ordinary income, reducing his tax bill.

But this is not the only tax advantage that flows from accelerated depreciation. If the speculator sells the property at a profit, his entire profit is taxed at the low capital gains rate—including the "book profit" resulting from accelerated depreciation. This extra book profit comes about because accelerated depreciation has reduced the nominal value of the property below what it would be if normal straight-line depreciation had been used. In most non-real estate transactions this extra book profit—the difference between book value and real value—is taxed as ordinary income. Not so for real estate (except in certain limited circumstances). There this fictional gain is taxed at the reduced capital gains rates.

Repealing the accelerated depreciation provision would save the Treasury \$150 million annually.

TITLE XIV: REPEALING THE 7 PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT—SAVINGS \$3 BILLION

The 7 percent investment tax credit, enacted in 1962, permits business firms to subtract from their tax bills 7 percent of the value of eligible new equipment installed during the year. It was intended to stimulate

the economy by providing a subsidy to private investment.

However, our economy has been overstimulated and we are now in a period of serious inflation, fed in part by the investment tax credit. The credit concentrates inflationary spending power on precisely that portion of the economy that is already most overheated—the capital goods sector. And, having stimulated inflation in the capital goods sector in the first place, it creates a second round of inflation by causing business to hasten to invest before inflation drives up capital goods prices even further. Nor is this all. In order to damp down the inflation caused in considerable part by the investment tax credit, the country's monetary authorities are currently engaged in a policy of restricting money and credit and raising interest rates.

The purpose of the tight money policy is to slow inflation, mainly in the capital goods sector. Unfortunately, tight money and high interest rates fall upon the just and unjust alike. The business firm that overinvests in capital equipment may have to pay high interest rates, but it is bountifully subsidized by the government through the investment tax credit, and is thus largely insulated from the effects of interest rate increases. Meanwhile, the three segments of the economy that suffer most from tight money and high interest—the housing industry, state and local government, and small business have no investment tax credit to rescue them from the effects of tight money and high interest rates.

This Title would repeal the investment tax credit for all property installed after its enactment, except that property which was ordered under binding contract before enactment would continue to qualify. Doing this would bring in an extra \$3 billion in revenues annually.

S. 2040—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE THAT THE TEMPORARY JUDGESHIP FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN SHALL HENCEFORTH BE PERMANENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Mr. NELSON, a bill to convert the temporary judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin to a permanent judgeship.

At present, the number of permanent judgeships allotted to the eastern district of Wisconsin is two. In 1966, the Congress recognized that the caseload for this district had become too heavy to be handled by only two judges. Accordingly, by the act of March 18, 1966, Congress authorized the creation of a third judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin on a temporary basis. The act provided that the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge would not be filled.

Mr. President, the need for additional judicial help that existed in 1966 in the eastern district has not abated. If anything, the caseload is greater than ever. If the cases coming before the district court are to continue to receive the attention they deserve, and if the court is to conduct its business efficiently and expeditiously, it is essential that when the first vacancy occurs in the office of district judge it be filled as promptly as possible.

Mr. President, in recent years, the issue of law and order has become a matter of acute national concern. It

was probably the most hotly debated issue in last year's election campaign. Unquestionably, there are many, many different viewpoints on this problem—some approach it from a social perspective, others from a political perspective, and still others from a legal point of view. But virtually everyone who has ever spoken out on this critical issue is agreed on one thing: the need for a judicial process that is swift and sure.

This goal, Mr. President, can be achieved only if we have a sufficient number of judges to handle the caseload. Accordingly, Senator NELSON and I introduce a bill to provide that the temporary judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin shall henceforth be permanent.

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

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

The bill (S. 2040), to provide that the temporary judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin created by the act of March 18, 1966 (80 Stat. 78), shall henceforth be permanent, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. NELSON), 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. 2040

A bill to provide that the temporary judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin created by the Act of March 18, 1966 (80 Stat. 78), shall henceforth be permanent

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the existing district judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin created by subsection (c) of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes," approved March 18, 1966 (80 Stat. 78), shall be a permanent judgeship and the present incumbent of such judgeship shall henceforth hold his office under section 133 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act. Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Act of March 18, 1966 (80 Stat. 78), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28, United States Code, will reflect the change made by the first section of this Act in the number of permanent judgeships for the eastern district of Wisconsin, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
•	•
•	•
•	•
•	•
"Wisconsin	
"Eastern	3
•	•
•	•
•	•

S. 2041—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND FURTHER THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

The proposed bill has been requested by the acting director of the Peace Corps and I introduce it in order that there

may be a specific bill to which members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letters from the Peace Corps dated January 17 and April 21, 1969, and the section-by-section analysis of the proposed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, section-by-section analysis, and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2041) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2041

A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1969" and "\$112,800,000" and substituting "1970" and "\$101,100,000", respectively.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (h), immediately after "(31 U.S.C. 492a)", add "the Act of October 21, 1968 (5 U.S.C. 5584) for purposes of erroneous payments of allowances provided under the Peace Corps Act."

The material, furnished by Mr. FULBRIGHT, follows:

PEACE CORPS,

Washington, Jan. 17, 1969.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is draft legislation which will enable the Peace Corps to continue its work on behalf of world peace and understanding.

This legislation will authorize the appropriation of \$109.8 million for the Peace Corps in Fiscal 1970. It also would amend the Peace Corps Act to provide that Peace Corps Volunteers be deemed Government employees for purposes of the Act of October 21, 1968, which authorizes the waiver of claims arising from erroneous payments to Government employees.

The authorization will enable the Peace Corps to train an estimated 8,500 Volunteer applicants in the coming year, the same number trained this year. The estimated total number of Volunteers and trainees serving at the end of the Peace Corps Program Year, August 31, 1970, will therefore be about 13,800, approximately 100 more than the estimated number on August 31, 1969.

During the past year, the Peace Corps has increased the number of countries and areas in which it has programs from 57 to 59, and requests for Volunteers have been received from several additional countries.

The Peace Corps will continue in 1970 to seek more effective and more economical ways to recruit, select, train, program and support our Volunteers.

The Bureau of the Budget advised on January 13, 1969, that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JACK VAUGHN.

A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1969" and "\$112,800,000" and substituting "1970" and "\$109,800,000", respectively.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (h), immediately after "(31 U.S.C. 492a)", add "the Act of October 21, 1968, (5 U.S.C. 5584) for purposes of erroneous payments of allowances provided under the Peace Corps Act."

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED ACT TO AMEND FURTHER THE PEACE CORPS ACT

The proposed act ("the bill") to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended ("the act"), has two purposes. First, it authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 1970 under the general authority in the act for appropriations to carry out programs in furtherance of the purposes of the act. The bill would accomplish this by striking out the amount and the reference to the fiscal year in that general authorization and substituting the new amount and the new fiscal year. Deletion of the amount and year in the general authorization has, of course, no effect on prior appropriations thereunder to carry out the provisions of the act. Second, the bill would effect one other amendment to the act, which is of a substantive nature designed to promote more effective and efficient operation of the Peace Corps.

Section 1.—Amends section 3(b) of the act, which relates to authorizations, to authorize the appropriation of \$109,800,000 for fiscal year 1970.

Section 2.—Amends section 5(h) of the act, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, to deem volunteers employees of the United States Government for the purposes of the Act of October 21, 1968, (P.L. 90-616, 82 Stat. 1212, 5 U.S.C. § 5584). This would authorize the Comptroller General and the Peace Corps, in accordance with standards prescribed by the Comptroller General and as to claims aggregating not more than \$500, to apply the provisions of that Act to waive claims arising out of erroneous payments to volunteers or volunteer leaders of the allowances provided under the Peace Corps Act (mainly readjustment and subsistence allowances under sections 5(b) and (c) and 6(1) and (2)).

PEACE CORPS,

Washington, April 21, 1969.

The Honorable SPIRO T. AGNEW, President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Under cover of letter dated January 17, 1969, Mr. Vaughn submitted for your consideration draft legislation which would enable the Peace Corps to continue its work on behalf of world peace and understanding. As a result of a further budget review undertaken at the President's direction, it has been determined that a reduction in the appropriation which that legislation would have authorized is feasible. For your convenience the draft legislation is resubmitted in full with the appropriate reduction in the authorization sought.

This legislation will authorize the appropriation of \$101.1 million for the Peace Corps

in Fiscal 1970. It also would amend the Peace Corps Act to provide that Peace Corps Volunteers be deemed Government employees for purposes of the Act of October 21, 1968, which authorizes the waiver of claims arising from erroneous payments to Government employees.

The authorization will enable the Peace Corps to train an estimated 7,500 Volunteer applicants in the coming year. This is approximately 1,000 less than the figure of 8,500 proposed in Mr. Vaughn's letter to you of January 17. This reduction is the single most important factor in permitting the reduction of \$8,700,000 from the authorization requested in the draft legislation previously submitted. The estimated total number of Volunteers and trainees serving at the end of the Peace Corps Program Year, August 31, 1970, will therefore be about 12,000, approximately 400 less than the estimated number of August 31, 1969.

During the past year, the Peace Corps has increased the number of countries and areas in which it has programs from 57 to 59, and requests for Volunteers have been received from several additional countries.

The Peace Corps will continue in 1970 to seek more effective and more economical ways to recruit, select, train, program, and support our Volunteers.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

BRENT ASHBRANNER,
Acting Director.

Enclosure: As stated—

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED ACT TO AMEND FURTHER THE PEACE CORPS ACT

The proposed act ("the bill") to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended ("the act"), has two purposes. First, it authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 1970 under the general authority in the act for appropriations to carry out programs in furtherance of the purposes of the act. The bill would accomplish this by striking out the amount and the reference to the fiscal year in that general authorization and substituting the new amount and the new fiscal year. Deletion of the amount and year in the general authorization has, of course, no effect on prior appropriations thereunder to carry out the provisions of the act. Second, the bill would effect one other amendment to the act, which is of a substantive nature designed to promote more effective and efficient operation of the Peace Corps.

Section 1.—Amends section 3(b) of the act, which relates to authorizations, to authorize the appropriation of \$101,100,000 for fiscal year 1970.

Section 2.—Amends section 5(h) of the act, which relates to Peace Corps Volunteers, to deem volunteers employees of the United States Government for the purposes of the Act of October 21, 1968 (P.L. 90-616, 82 Stat. 1212, 5 U.S.C. § 5584). This would authorize the Comptroller General and the Peace Corps, in accordance with standards prescribed by the Comptroller General and as to claims aggregating not more than \$500, to apply the provisions of that Act to waive claims arising out of erroneous payments to volunteers or volunteer leaders of the allowances provided under the Peace Corps Act (mainly readjustment and subsistence allowances under sections 5 (b) and (c) and 6 (1) and (2)).

S. 2044—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT AND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to ex-

empt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence. This measure is similar to others concerning the subject of interstate employee's income tax withholding by States which the Commerce Committee has approved in years past. It is apparent that some employees whose work requires their presence in more than one State may be suffering from a double taxation burden. I think the Congress should give very serious consideration to this legislation at an early date. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 2044), to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) (for himself and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2044

A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part I of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by redesignating section 26 as section 27 and by inserting before such section a new section as follows:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"SEC. 26. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any railroad, express company, or sleeping car company, subject to the provisions of this part, to an employee who performs his regularly assigned duties as such an employee on a locomotive, car, or other track-borne vehicle in more than one State, shall be withheld for tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of any such carrier; nor shall any such carrier file any information return or other report for tax purposes with respect to such wages or salary with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2 (a) Section 202(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after "Nothing in this part" a comma and the following: "except as provided in section 226A."

(b) Part II of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after section 226 a new section as follows:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENT STATE

"SEC. 226A. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any motor carrier subject to

the provisions of this part to any employee who performs his regularly assigned duties as such an employee on a motor vehicle in more than one State, shall be withheld for tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of such carrier; nor shall such carrier file any information return or other report for tax purposes with respect to such wages or salary with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means any possession of the United States or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 3. (a) Part III of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by redesignating section 323 as section 324 and by inserting before such section a new section as follows:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"Sec. 323. No part of the wages or salary paid by any water carrier subject to the provisions of this part to an employee who performs his regularly assigned duties as such an employee on a vessel in more than one State, shall be withheld for tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of such carrier; nor shall such carrier file any information return or other report for tax purposes with respect to such wages or salary with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence."

(b) The table of contents contained in section 301 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by striking out

"Sec. 323. Separability of provisions."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 323. Exemption of certain wages and salary of employees from withholding by other than residence State.

"Sec. 324. Separability of provisions."

SEC. 4. (a) Title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after section 1111 the following new section:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"SEC. 1112. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any air carrier to an employee who performs his regularly assigned duties as such an employee on an aircraft in more than one State shall be withheld for tax purpose pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of such carrier; nor shall such carrier file any information return or other report for tax purposes with respect to such wages or salary with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means the District of Columbia and any of the possessions of the United States."

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1112. Exemption of certain wages and salary of employees from withholding by other than residence State."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the

first calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

S. 2045—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH AN OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of Senator BAYH and myself to introduce a bill to permanently establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President.

As you know, Mr. President, I have long advocated dealing forcefully with mercantile abuses which, I believe, go far toward undermining the entire character of our free enterprise system, a system that is far and away the most successful economic system ever devised by man and which has provided more people with more of the physical comforts of life than has ever been believed possible. Today it easily outdistances any of its competitors. Institutions, however, do not survive by themselves, but require adjustment to new roadblocks which arise in an ever-changing human environment.

My purpose today is not to review the outstanding achievements—and there are many—we have made under our free enterprise system, but to focus on a weakness in the system which, if allowed to grow unchecked, may eventually have to be dealt with more drastically.

That weakness lies in the failure of many of our institutions—both public and private—to meet the needs and problems of all of us who spend increasing amounts of money each year in the marketplace, too often with unsatisfactory results and little opportunity for substantial redress.

The buyer-seller relationship has drastically changed. It was not long ago a buyer of a piece of an inferior product could take it back to the seller—a neighborhood entrepreneur who, dependent on his reputation in the neighborhood, could be trusted to rectify the situation and to assure against its repetition.

Today the buyer-seller relationship is on another footing entirely. The buyer no longer has access to the one with ultimate responsibility. The ultimate responsibility has gone from the individual entrepreneur to the impersonal corporate structure. In addition, each consumer's grievance is no longer the immediate concern of the seller—what the seller is concerned about is usually a multimillion-dollar picture in which the individual grievant is a fly speck problem. Even a number of grievants may not really merit any great attention or consideration from a corporate structure dedicated first to maximizing the return on its investment.

The inability of consumers—and what affects adversely the middle-class consumer has a tenfold impact upon the poor or marginal consumer—to deal with giant institutions in a growing, complex world of commerce should not raise eyebrows. Nor is it surprising to me that public institutions confronted with the lobbying activities of highly resourceful, well-organized interests do not always respond in ways most favorable to consumer interests. It is clear,

however, that there is a need for the consumer to be forcefully represented in the highest councils of government.

Last week, the President appointed Virginia Knauer to serve as his special assistant for consumer affairs, a position created by Executive order. The appointment bodes well for consumers because of Mrs. Knauer's fine service as director of Pennsylvania's consumer affairs agency. But events leading to Mrs. Knauer's somewhat tardy appointment demonstrate graphically that the position of the consumers' spokesman in government cannot be left to happenstance. The consumer's right to his representative, to one devoted to his interest, should be made statutory and should be made permanent.

There is now being considered by the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations a bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs. This proposal originated with Senator Kefauver and has been advocated consistently in recent years by Congressman ROSENTHAL. Because of my belief that the interests of consumers should have the highest priority, I have supported that proposal. The Department concept, however, does present problems which were eloquently highlighted by Ralph Nader in his testimony before the Ribicoff subcommittee:

There is much in this bill with which I agree. There is a definite need for a distinct arm of the Federal Government to promote and represent the consumer interest by performing the following functions—*investigation, research and testing, information dissemination, handling complaints and advocacy before agencies and courts* and presentations before Congress. I do not find persuasive, however, the depositing of various regulatory functions including the transfer of several consumer laws from other departments and agencies to the proposed Department. Giving the Department of Consumer Affairs such a regulatory role would (a) simply refocus the entire lobbying environment on the Department; (b) weaken the Department's strong advocate role because it would have to referee between competing interests in its administrative hearings and rule-making roles; (c) further lighten any public interest burdens from other Departments and regulatory agencies and (d) generate *needless* opposition to any Department by established agencies apprehensive of losing their programs. To be effective, a consumer agency must not have anything to give to industry or commerce, as it most assuredly would if it had a regulatory role. Having something to give would attract the same forces that undermined or controlled other agencies. The thrust of a consumer agency, in my judgment, is to assist in the reform of other agencies to perform in the public interest, not to progressively relieve them of that horizon in their deliberations.

Betty Furness, in her testimony before the subcommittee stated:

I don't think we yet know exactly what such a Department (of Consumer Affairs) should contain or exactly what commissions and agencies and offices should be moved into that Department.

We don't know exactly what statutory powers that Department would need to carry out such a broad mission, and I think it would be a great misfortune if we handicapped a department in its very first days with inadequate authority or the wrong authority.

The Consumer Affairs Act of 1969 is designed to provide a meaningful alternative to the department concept. Without juggling the present alignment of agencies, it would perform a coordinating function which hopefully might bring some order to the diverse handling of consumer affairs by too numerous agencies. Not only should it coordinate, but its mission will be simultaneously to aid in eliminating "overlap, conflict or any other problems tending to interfere with" the Government's consumer programs. In addition, the bill would—

Authorize the establishment of consumer complaint centers and aid in the resolution of such grievances;

Collect and disseminate pertinent consumer information;

Encourage and support research; Develop consumer education programs;

Assist State and local governments to establish consumer programs; and

Work with business representatives to provide higher quality products and better service.

This bill would also provide for a consumer counsel who could participate in all types of regulatory proceedings affecting the consumer and act for the Director of the Office in court matters affecting consumers.

The bill further provides broad investigative authority through which the Office might accomplish its mission on behalf of consumers.

Basically, the bill is designated not to create another agency to add to the existing agencies, but to cut across existing agency lines to insure proper protection for consumers. It is designed to insure that in every regulatory proceeding affecting consumers, an individual with responsibilities only to the consumer will participate. It is designed to insure that information and data, paid for by the consumer's taxes, is communicated to him in a way that will make the problems of the marketplace easier for him to handle.

Finally the bill is designed to provide a moderate response to a most pressing problem. It should be the goal of the office created by this bill to simplify, not complicate, the administration of the many programs designed to benefit America's 200 million consumers. Its aim should be to streamline the process, and not to provide another story to the bureaucratic structure. Its future lies in the development, modification, or elimination, whatever the case may be, of programs to meet the ever-changing needs of consumers.

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

The bill (S. 2045), to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in order to provide within the Federal Government for the representation of consumers' interests and to undertake studies designed to achieve superior implementation of consumer programs throughout the Federal system, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BAYH), was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2047—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO GRANT LEAVE TIME TO FEDERAL AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES TO ENGAGE IN PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to provide 5 days public service leave time for public employees who engage in nonpartisan civic activities and, in so doing, are required under present regulations to utilize their annual leave or to take leave without pay.

Because of the restrictions of the Hatch Act, thousands of talented and dedicated Federal employees are denied the opportunity of exercising the full responsibilities and privileges of U.S. citizenship. With official encouragement, however, many employees are able and do participate in civic activities of a nonpartisan nature and are able to make important contributions. This is particularly true on local levels where critical administrative problems relating to such nonpolitical matters as schools, parks, trash collection, local roads, and other matters of community concern go begging for solutions because the skills needed to solve these problems are simply not available.

The Federal Government contains a wealth of professional administrative and executive talent in a variety of areas that could be engaged in efforts to solve difficult local problems.

Many Federal employees do participate in such activities and, indeed, do so without seeking rewards for their efforts. They should not be penalized for such service by being required to use annual leave time which is needed for a myriad of other personal uses including, but by no means limited to, vacations.

The private sector is well ahead of the Government in permitting employees to participate in civic activities without regard to distinctions between working and nonworking time. This is not uniformly true, of course, but many businesses and professions encourage a certain amount of community service on the assumption that both the firm and its employees have a stake in community affairs. This bill should provide the stimulus for participation by employees of the Federal Government as well.

I would like to make it clear that this measure is not designed either to add significantly to the cost of government or simply to give Federal employees extra days off. The bill provides advance approval by one's agency before leave can be taken. The Civil Service Commission is directed to draw regulations to prevent abuse. To be effective, this measure will require intelligent management on the part of both the Commission and individual supervisors. These caveats, however, do not in any way detract from my conviction that the dividends to be derived from the activity this measure will encourage are not measurable in dollars.

There is another benefit to be gained by encouraging Federal employees to engage in civic activities. Individuals who may not regularly face stimulating challenges to their professional creativity at

work will have a choice to confront problems requiring new approaches and solutions. The stimulus of such activity could well result in more effective work on the job.

Mr. President, I hope the Congress will carefully consider this measure. With the too numerous problems our society faces, we simply cannot afford not to encourage capable citizens to contribute their time and ability to the search for solutions. I submit this measure will supply a strong incentive to such public-spirited efforts.

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

The bill (S. 2047) to grant leave time to Federal and District of Columbia employees to engage in public service activities, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2048—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PERMIT STATES OR OTHER DULY CONSTITUTED TAXING AUTHORITIES TO SUBJECT PERSONS TO LIABILITY FOR PAYMENT OF PROPERTY TAXES ON PROPERTY LOCATED IN FEDERAL AREAS WITHIN SUCH STATES UNDER SPECIFIED CONDITIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such States under specified conditions.

Privately owned property in Federal enclaves is beyond the taxing authority of State and local governments. Residents of these areas usually cannot vote, run for public office, or serve on juries. In many enclaves they may not claim the right of access to State and local schools and other public institutions, facilities, and services. Finally, they cannot enjoy the full benefit of State laws or judicial processes relative to adoption, the probate of wills, the descent and distribution of property, marriage and divorce, and other civil matters.

Residents of such areas are, however, subject to nearly all other State and local taxes, including those on sales, use, gross receipts, gasoline and motor vehicle fuels, and gross and net income. The only remaining tax immunity enjoyed by residents of Federal enclaves is that on private property. This legislation would remove that final immunity under the stipulation that States provide the concomitant public services, privileges, and rights of State citizens to the residents of such Federal areas. These benefits must be provided to all citizens in order to assure equal justice under law.

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

The bill (S. 2048), to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property

located in Federal areas within such States under specified conditions, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1858), to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. RANDOLPH, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 82), authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week."

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

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1872), to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950).

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) 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. 1781), to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1896), to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. BURDICK, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 773) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to exempt certain private aircraft entering or departing from the United States and Canada at night or on Sunday or a holiday from

provisions requiring payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 1994), to authorize the use of facilities at the U.S. Public Health Service Owyhee Indian Hospital to provide certain medical care to non-Indians.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. HART, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) be added as cosponsors of S. 2029, the Omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1969.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 191—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION FOR THE CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE OF MARGARET AND ALAN MCSURELY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91-137)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit, for the consideration of the Senate, a resolution and a copy of the report to accompany the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the report be printed, and that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the resolution and report call upon the Senate to refer the matter to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, so that he may proceed against Margaret and Alan McSurely for contempt of the Senate.

Margaret and Alan McSurely, in their appearance as witnesses before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations on March 4, 1969, first, refused to produce books and records lawfully subpoenaed before the subcommittee; and, second, failed to appear or to produce the said books and records pursuant to the order and direction of the chairman, with the approval of the subcommittee, before noon on March 7, 1969.

The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, pursuant to its lawful authority, has been making an investigation of the substantial number of riots and civil disorders that have plagued our cities. The authority to study and investigate riots is contained in Senate Resolution 216 dated March 15, 1968, 90th Congress, second session, and in Senate Resolution 26 dated February 17, 1969, for the 91st Congress, first session.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that in this investigation, the subcommittee was attempting to pursue its duties under the Senate rules and under

the Senate resolution to first, determine the economy and efficiency of the operation of Federal agencies; second, investigate organized crime; and, third, investigate riots and causes of riots and how they might be prevented and, pursuant to the resolutions, "shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1970, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations."

In substance, Mr. President, this subcommittee was performing its legislative oversight duties as assigned and directed to it by the Senate.

The Supreme Court has upheld the right of Congress to designate areas of investigation by congressional committees. In the case of *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, at page 215, the Court stated:

We are mindful of the complexities of modern government and the ample scope that must be left to the Congress as the sole constitutional depository of legislative power. Equally mindful are we of the indispensable function, in the exercise of that power, of congressional investigations. The conclusions we have reached in this case will not prevent the Congress, through its committees, from obtaining any information it needs for the proper fulfillment of its role in our scheme of Government. The legislature is free to determine the kinds of data that should be collected * * *.

Pursuant to its authority, the subcommittee duly authorized and issued a subpoena for the appearance of Margaret and Alan McSurely. Pursuant to the aforementioned subpoena, Margaret and Alan McSurely were called upon and did appear to testify on March 4, 1969, before the subcommittee in Washington, D.C.

Accordingly, Margaret and Alan McSurely were sworn as witnesses. Thereafter, they refused to produce books and records lawfully subpoenaed before the subcommittee. The chairman asked the witness if he brought the records in response to the subpoena. The following colloquy occurred between the chairman and the witness:

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you a question, and your answer is not responsive to it. Did you bring the records with you? Do you have them here? Are you prepared to present them in an open hearing now?

Mr. MCSURELY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Pursuant to the rules of the subcommittee, the chairman then ruled, and his ruling was sustained by the members of the subcommittee present, that Margaret and Alan McSurely were to appear and produce the said books and records on or before noon, March 7, 1969. They did not appear nor were the records made available to the subcommittee.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court has upheld the right of congressional committees to direct witnesses to produce records in response to a subpoena. In *United States v. Bryan*, 339 U.S. 323, the respondent was convicted for failure to produce records for a congressional committee. Her conviction was reversed by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The Supreme Court reversed

the court of appeals. At page 329, the Court stated:

If it is shown that such committee is, in fact, obstructed by the intentional withholding of documents, it is unimportant whether the subpoenaed person proclaims his refusal to respond before the full committee, sends a telegram to the chairman, or simply stays away from that hearing on the return day. His statements or actions are merely evidence from which a jury might infer an intent to default * * *.

Again, on page 331, the Supreme Court stated:

Persons summoned as witnesses by competent authority have certain minimum duties and obligations which are necessary concessions to the public interest in the orderly operation of legislative and judicial machinery. A subpoena has never been treated as an invitation to a game of hare and hounds, in which the witness must testify only if cornered at the end of the chase. If that were the case, then, indeed, the great power of testimonial compulsion, so necessary to the effective functioning of courts and legislatures, would be a nullity. We have often iterated the importance of this public duty, which every person within the jurisdiction of the Government is bound to perform when properly summoned * * *. (Italics added)

The refusal of the McSurleys to produce the lawfully subpoenaed books and records prevented the subcommittee from obtaining testimony pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry by the subcommittee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and the Committee on Government Operations have reviewed the resolution and report and referred the matter to the Senate for action. I urgently ask you to uphold the authority and dignity of the Senate by resolving to present this matter to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia so that he may proceed against Margaret and Alan McSurely for contempt of the Senate, under title II, section 192, and others, of the United States Code, as well as any other appropriate provision of the law.

Mr. President, this committee, or any other committee of Congress with the responsibility for legislative oversight or investigations, will be useless hereafter to the U.S. Senate if this challenge to its authority and its jurisdiction is sustained.

It is not a challenge merely to the committee; it is a challenge to the U.S. Senate. It is a defiance of the authority of the U.S. Senate to investigate and determine the facts, through this committee, which has the overall duty and responsibility of overseeing the expenditures of monies by Government agencies, and of investigating riots, crime, and organized criminal activities.

Mr. President, there is also involved a challenge to the authority of the subcommittee to inquire into the expenditures of money by agencies of the Federal Government, and the causes of riots, crime, and organized criminal activities. When Congress votes expenditure of taxpayers' dollars, it has a right and a need to be informed whether they are spent in accordance with the legislative intent—to determine what safeguards or legislation are necessary to guard the proper

expenditures of funds and to prevent waste.

The issue is: Can Congress inquire into the substantial number of riots and civil disorders that have plagued our cities during recent years? If we cannot do this, then we are powerless to safeguard and protect the citizens of this Nation.

This is the issue, Mr. President, and I trust the Senate will uphold its committee and its subcommittee in the action they have taken. I may say that not only did the subcommittee members, present and voting, unanimously recommend this action, but it has been unanimously approved by the members of the parent Committee on Government Operations, present and voting.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will be governed in accordance with the recommendations of these committees.

SENATE RESOLUTION 192—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF CAMPUS DISORDERS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 192) to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the impairment of the internal security of the United States arising from disorders at educational institutions.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN.)

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION TO REFER S. 1418 TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 193); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 193

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1418) entitled "A bill for the relief of Carleton R. McQuown", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 21

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, one thousand additional copies of Part 1, and seven hundred additional copies of Part 2, Thermal Pollution—1968 hearings,

held during the second session of the 90th Congress.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CAPITOL REEF NATIONAL PARK IN THE STATE OF UTAH—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 17

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 531) to establish the Capitol Reef National Park in the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. MOSS, which appear under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ARCHES NATIONAL PARK IN THE STATE OF UTAH—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 18

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 532) to establish the Arches National Park in the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. MOSS, which appear under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CAPITOL REEF AND ARCHES NATIONAL PARKS IN THE STATE OF UTAH—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 17 AND 18

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the last days of the administration of President Johnson, he, by Executive proclamation, expanded the boundaries of two national monuments in my State of Utah, and at the same time recommended that these areas be made into national parks. The two national monuments, in their expanded size, are Arches National Monument and Capitol Reef National Monument.

Since that time, I have made a rather extensive review of the boundaries of the extended monuments, and today I propose to introduce amendments that will change those boundaries somewhat.

By way of explanation, upon the recommendation of the President, I introduced bills to change the monuments to national parks, and that is the status of the matter now. Hearings on these national park bills have been set by the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. But in the interim, with the assistance of many local people, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, geologists from the University of Utah, and others, I have made a visual survey of the boundaries and have spent a good deal of time studying contour maps to determine what areas should be included and what might reasonably be excluded because of their unsuitability for national park status and the need to use them for other multiple-use purposes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit amendments to S. 532 and S. 531, and ask that they be printed and made avail-

able to the committee at once, prior to the hearings which have been set.

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

The amendments (No. 17 and 18) were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on April 1, I introduced S. 1749, a bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes. This bill was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Since the bill seeks to amend title 5 of the United States Code and relates only to Federal employees, almost all of whom are under the civil service, including all postal employees, I believe that the bill should be considered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which has jurisdiction over Federal civil service, including postal matters generally. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from consideration of S. 1749 and that such bill be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of S. 846, to provide compensation to certain silver-dealer claimants by authorizing the sale of silver bullion, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

This bill is a companion to a resolution which I introduced on the recommendation of the Joint Commission on the Coinage, providing that the Court of Claims makes a determination of the legal and equitable merits of the claims made by certain silver dealers listed in this bill. The court would also be charged with the responsibility of determining the amount, if any, which may be legally or equitably due to each claimant.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Both of these measures deal with the same problem and must be considered together. I have discussed the matter with Senator SPARKMAN, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and he agrees that the committee should be discharged and that the bill should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and has authorized me to make this request.

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

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred

to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Victor Cardosi, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire, for the term of 4 years, vice Paul G. April, resigning.

William L. Martin, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Robert O. Doyle.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 8, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce the scheduling of a hearing on Tuesday, May 13, in room 4232, at 10 a.m., on the nominations of Mr. DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, to be Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Mr. John B. Martin, Jr., of Michigan, to be Commissioner on Aging.

REVISED HEARING NOTICE

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 29, as appears on page 10625 of the RECORD, I announced that hearings would be held on May 1 and May 14, before the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Committee on Public Works at 10 a.m. in room 4200, on S. 1072 and S. 1090, on proposed legislation extending for 2 years the authority of the Appalachian Regional Commission and of the five regional commissions established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

In the text of the hearing notice, however, the date of the testimony of Hon. Robert A. Podesta, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and the several regional co-chairmen erroneously reads May 7. This should be changed to read May 14.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 5, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, May 5, 1969.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (under authority of the order of the Senate of April 29, 1969), 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Oliver L. Troxel, Jr., of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zambia.

John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Matthew J. Loram, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey.

Francis E. Meloy, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Spencer M. King, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guyana.

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Daniel Z. Henkin, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Phil G. Goulding, resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Richard K. Burke, of Arizona, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Arizona for the term of 4 years vice Edward E. Davis, resigning.

U.S. MARSHAL

Isaac George Hylton, of Virginia, to be U.S. Marshal for the eastern district of Vir-

ginia for the term of 4 years vice Forest F. Walker, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Arthur Fletcher, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Laurence H. Silberman, of Hawaii, to be solicitor for the Department of Labor.

Robert D. Moran, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Edward E. Johnston, of Hawaii, to be High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

PEACE CORPS

Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Spain.

Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

William Leonhart, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Val Peterson, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Alfred Puhan, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

Phillip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 1, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Russel H. Dilday, Jr., Tallowood Baptist Church, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Fear thou not; for I am with thee; be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness.—Isaiah 41: 10.

Dear Father, knowing the immense and complex responsibilities these Representatives face, we are quick to acknowledge that so often the best we have is not enough. And taking courage from Thy clear and unmistakable promise which we have just read, we unashamedly be-

gin these proceedings with prayer for Thy help.

Sustain and strengthen our President, we pray, under the heavy demands of his office.

Sustain and strengthen the Speaker and each Member of this body. Sensitize their minds to that wisdom which comes only from Thee. Reinforce their native abilities with Thine own unlimited power and transplant within them a courageous enthusiasm to obey Thy will to the end that in all things Thy perfect plan for this Nation may be accomplished.

For it is in the name of Thy Son Jesus, who ever liveth to make intercession for us, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

APRIL 25, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of