

**MAJORITY OF THE HOUSE URGES
ARMS FOR ISRAEL IN LETTER TO
PRESIDENT**

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to enclose the following letter to the President, which as of this date, has been signed by 219 Members of the House of Representatives:

JUNE 10, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is clear to us that the moment has arrived for the United States to take firm action to meet the present danger posed by the involvement of the Soviet Union military forces in the Middle East. In the face of this threat, we believe that it is urgent that our government provide Israel with additional supersonic jet planes to enable her to deter aggression against her.

It is public knowledge that the Soviet-Arab aircraft strength is now four times the strength of that of Israel and that the presence of Soviet fliers and technicians may adversely affect Israel's heretofore qualitative advantage.

The Congress is vitally concerned with the threat of Soviet presence in the Middle East, as evidenced by the number of signatories hereto, and by the letter sent to the Secretary of State which was signed by over seventy Senators, urging the immediate sale of these planes so vital to the preservation of the balance and peace in the Middle East.

Respectfully yours,

Abbitt, Watkins M. (Va.). Addabbo, Joseph P. (N.Y.). Albert, Carl (Okla.). Anderson, Glenn M. (Calif.). Anderson, John B. (Ill.). Anderson, William R. (Tenn.).

Annunzio, Frank (Ill.); Ashley, Thomas L. (Ohio); Baring, Walter S. (Nev.); Barrett, William A. (Pa.); Beall, J. Glenn, Jr. (Md.); Bell, Alphonzo (Calif.); Beville, Tom (Ala.); Biaggi, Mario (N.Y.); Biester, Edward G., Jr. (Pa.); Bingham, Jonathan B. (N.Y.); Blatnik, John A. (Minn.).

Boggs, Hale (La.); Bolling, Richard (Mo.); Brasco, Frank J. (N.Y.); Brinkley, Jack (Ga.); Brock, W. E. (Bill) (Tenn.); Broomfield, William S. (Mich.); Brown, Clarence J. (Ohio); Broyhill, Joel T. (Va.); Buchanan, John (Ala.); Burke, J. Herbert (Fla.); Burton, Phillip (Calif.); Bush, George (Tex.).

Button, Daniel E. (N.Y.); Byrne, James

A. (Pa.); Camp, John N. Happy (Okla.); Carey, Hugh L. (N.Y.); Casey, Bob (Tex.); Celler, Emanuel (N.Y.); Chappell, Bill, Jr. (Fla.); Clark, Frank M. (Pa.); Clausen, Don H. (Calif.); Clawson, Del (Calif.); Cleveland, James C. (N.H.).

Cohelan, Jeffery (Calif.); Conable, Barber B., Jr. (N.Y.); Conte, Silvio O. (Mass.); Conyers, John, Jr. (Mich.); Corbett, Robert J. (Pa.); Corman, James C. (Calif.); Coughlin, R. Lawrence (Pa.); Cramer, William C. (Fla.); Crane, Phillip M. (Ill.); Daddario, Emilio Q. (Conn.); Daniel, W. C. (Dan) (Va.); Daniels, Dominick V. (N.J.).

Davis, John W. (Ga.); Delaney, James J. (N.Y.); Denney, Robert V. (Nebr.); Dent, John H. (Pa.); Derwinski, Edward J. (Ill.); Diggs, Charles C., Jr. (Mich.); Dingell, John D. (Mich.); Donohue, Harold D. (Mass.); Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan (S.C.); Downing, Thomas N. (Va.); Dulski, Thaddeus J. (N.Y.); Duncan, John J. (Tenn.).

Dwyer, Florence P. (N.J.); Eckhardt, Bob (Tex.); Edwards, Don (Calif.); Edwards, Jack (Ala.); Eilberg, Joshua (Pa.); Fallon, George H. (Md.); Farbstain, Leonard (N.Y.); Fascell, Dante B. (Fla.); Feighan, Michael A. (Ohio); Fish, Hamilton, Jr. (N.Y.); Fisher, O. C. (Tex.); Flood, Daniel J. (Pa.); Flowers, Walter (Ala.).

Ford, Gerald R. (Mich.); Fraser, Donald M. (Minn.); Friedel, Samuel N. (Md.); Fulton, James G. (Pa.); Fulton, Richard (Tenn.); Fuqua, Don (Fla.); Gallagher, Cornelius E. (N.J.); Garmatz, Edward A. (Md.); Giaimo, Robert N. (Conn.); Gibbons, Sam (Fla.); Gilbert, Jacob H. (N.Y.).

Goldwater, Barry M., Jr. (Calif.); Green, Edith (Oreg.); Green, William J. (Pa.); Grover, James R., Jr. (N.Y.); Gubser, Charles S. (Calif.); Gude, Gilbert (Md.); Hagan, G. Elliott (Ga.); Haley, James A. (Fla.); Halpern, Seymour (N.Y.); Hanley, James M. (N.Y.); Hansen, Orval (Idaho); Harrington, Michael (Mass.).

Harsha, William H. (Ohio); Hastings, James F. (N.Y.); Hawkins, Augustus F. (Calif.); Hays, Wayne L. (Ohio); Heckler, Margaret M. (Mass.); Helstoski, Henry (N.J.); Henderson, David N. (N.C.); Hicks, Floyd V. (Wash.); Hogan, Lawrence J. (Md.); Holifield, Chet (Calif.); Horton, Frank (N.Y.).

Hosmer, Craig (Calif.); Howard, James J. (N.J.); Hull, W. R., Jr. (Mo.); Karth, Joseph E. (Minn.); Kee, James (W. Va.); Keith, Hastings (Mass.); King, Carleton J. (N.Y.); Koch, Edward I. (N.Y.); Kuykendall, Dan (Tenn.); Kyros, Peter N. (Maine); Latta, Delbert L. (Ohio); Leggett, Robert L. (Calif.).

Lennon, Alton (N.C.); Long, Clarence D. (Md.); Long, Speedy O. (La.); Lowenstein, Allard K. (N.Y.); Lujan, Man-

uel, Jr. (N. Mex.); McCarthy, Richard D. (N.Y.); McClory, Robert (Ill.); McCloskey, Paul N., Jr. (Calif.); McCormack, John W. (Mass.); McCulloch, William M. (Ohio); McFall, John J. (Calif.).

McKneally, Martin B. (N.Y.); Macdonald, Torbert H. (Mass.); MacGregor, Clark (Minn.); Madden, Ray J. (Ind.); Mailhard, William S. (Calif.); May, Catherine (Wash.); Michel, Robert H. (Ill.); Mikva, Abner J. (Ill.); Miller, George P. (Calif.); Minish, Joseph G. (N.J.); Monagan, John S. (Conn.); Moorhead, William S. (Pa.).

Morgan, Thomas E. (Pa.); Morse, F. Bradford (Mass.); Morton, Rogers C. B. (Md.); Moss, John E. (Calif.); Murphy, John M. (N.Y.); Murphy, William T. (Ill.); Nix, Robert N. C. (Pa.); O'Hara, James G. (Mich.); Ottinger, Richard L. (N.Y.); Patten, Edward J. (N.J.); Pelly, Thomas M. (Wash.).

Pepper, Claude (Fla.); Pettis, Jerry L. (Calif.); Philbin, Philip J. (Mass.); Pike, Otis G. (N.Y.); Pirnie, Alexander (N.Y.); Podell, Bertram L. (N.Y.); Preyer, Richardson (N.C.); Price, Melvin (Ill.); Pucinski, Roman C. (Ill.); Rallsback, Tom (Ill.); Randall, William J. (Mo.); Rees, Thomas M. (Calif.).

Reifel, Ben (S. Dak.); Reuss, Henry S. (Wis.); Rhodes, John J. (Ariz.); Riegle, Donald W., Jr. (Mich.); Rodino, Peter W., Jr., (N.J.); Rogers, Byron G. (Colo.); Rogers, Paul G. (Fla.); Rooney, Fred B. (Pa.); Rooney, John J. (N.Y.); Rosenthal, Benjamin S. (N.Y.); Roth, William V. (Del.); Roubidoux, Richard L. (Ind.).

Roybal, Edward R. (Calif.); Ryan, William F. (N.Y.); St Germain, Fernand J. (R.I.); Sandman, Charles W., Jr. (N.J.); Satterfield, David E., III (Va.); Scheuer, James H. (N.Y.); Schneebell, Herman T. (Pa.); Shriver, Garner E. (Kans.); Sikes, Robert L. F. (Fla.); Sisk, B. F. (Calif.); Stanton, J. William (Ohio); Steiger, William A. (Wis.).

Stokes, Louis (Ohio); Stratton, Samuel S. (N.Y.); Stubblefield, Frank A. (Ky.); Symington, James W. (Mo.); Taft, Robert Jr. (Ohio); Thompson, Fletcher (Ga.); Thomson, Vernon W. (Wis.); Tunney, John V. (Calif.); Udall, Morris K. (Ariz.); Van Deerlin, Lionel (Calif.); K. (Ariz.); Van Deerlin, Lionel (Calif.); Vanik, Charles A. (Ohio); Vigorito, Joseph P. (Pa.); Waggoner, Joe D., Jr. (La.).

Waldie, Jerome R. (Calif.); Watkins, G. Robert (Pa.); Whalley, J. Irving (Pa.); Williams, Lawrence G. (Pa.); Wilson, Bob (Calif.); Wilson, Charles H. (Calif.); Winn, Larry, Jr. (Kans.); Wolff, Lester L. (N.Y.); Wright, Jim (Tex.); Wyatt, Wendell (Oreg.); Wydler, John W. (N.Y.); Yates, Sidney R. (Ill.); Zion, Roger H. (Ind.).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 11, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.
Hebrews 11: 10.

O God of grace and goodness, we thank Thee for America with her high mountains, her deep valleys, her broad plains; for her homes, her churches, her schools, her Government; above all, for her people dedicated to faith, to freedom,

and to the fruits of democratic living. We thank Thee for the heritage which is ours—the good gifts of the past—and we pray that we may continue these good works in the present, taking steps which lead to the higher ground of a free and a just society.

Help us and our people to accept our responsibilities as citizens of this Republic we love—to vote intelligently, to pay our taxes readily, to obey the laws of our land fully, to give our influence

to right and good causes heartily, and to live as free men ought to live, going beyond the requirements of justice and mercy.

Thus may we begin to feel a bit at home in Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

**APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF
JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRA-
TION AND NATIONALITY POLICY**

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. MESKILL, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE
ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMA-
TION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, TO SIT
DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY**

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE
ON HIGHWAYS, COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT DURING
GENERAL DEBATE TODAY**

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Highways of the Committee on Public Works may meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock during general debate.

This has been cleared with the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
WILL NOT BE INTIMIDATED**

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the RECORD of June 9, 1970, a statement taking very vigorous exception to objections lodged against S. 30, relating to the control of organized crime in the United States. Certainly anyone is sturdily within his rights so to do this. However—and this is a very strong however—it is not within anyone's rights to lodge an innuendo which assails the character of the opposition to the bill. I quote directly from the statement made, "What I am trying to do here is to show the false character of the argument being used against this legislation, and to note that the influence of organized crime is being brought to bear to prevent the enactment of this law. I hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will see what is really at stake—"

Be it noted that in opposition to many portions of the bill are not only outstanding legal scholars but such eminently respected groups like the Association of the Bar of New York, the National League of Cities, the Judicial Conference of the U.S. Courts, the Criminal

Law Council of the American Bar Association, in addition to the two bodies specifically named in the statement; namely the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives will not be intimidated by innuendoes of this kind. It is presently conducting hearings on this bill and I remind the Members that S. 30 was considered for 1 whole year by the Senate committee before it was referred to its counterpart in the House. This, in itself, bespeaks the intricacy of the proposal and S. 30 requires of this body the most responsible scrutiny. To do less would be an injustice to the challenging nature of the legislation before us.

**WHAT GOES ON IN OUR
COUNTRY?**

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, what goes on in our Government?

Cabinet officials transfer to new offices. Huge new bureaus and managements are interposed between the Cabinet and the President and between the Cabinet and Congress. Confusion is the victor.

The entire bureaucracy trembles. Brave men quit or get fired. Subservience, acquiescence, and mediocrity have become the order of the day.

**WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON
CHILDREN AND YOUTH**

(Mr. BIESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the President has asked Stephen Hess, National Chairman of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, to announce plans for the White House Conference on Youth. Each of us in the House should be aware of this important development evidencing the concern of the White House to listen to the youth of our Nation. While we all realize that no one forum can suffice as a means of communication from young people to the White House, I personally found the plans outlined by Mr. Hess to be genuinely exciting, and I am sure that our young people will see in the Conference an opportunity to help shape the course of events affecting not only themselves but also society as a whole. There has never been a more pressing need for such a Conference. There has never been a deeper need to open channels of communication between youth and the adult community, and between youth and the institutions of Government. The Conference announced by Mr. Hess promises to take a long stride in this direction.

**TRIBUTE TO GEN. ELIZABETH P.
HOISINGTON**

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from Kansas in tribute to Gen. Elizabeth P. Hoisington, Director of the Women's Army Corps of the United States, on the day of her historic promotion to the rank of general.

General Hoisington and Gen. Anna-Mae M. Hays, Director of the Army Nurse Corps, also promoted today, are the first women to become general officers in the history of our country.

Elizabeth Hoisington, born in Newton, Kans., still considers the Sunflower State her home State. She joins a distinguished company of native Kansas women as a true pioneer today, as she is honored by her President and Congress for a career of outstanding public service.

The pioneering spirit of Kansas women did not diminish with the settling of our State. It did not diminish with the culmination of the successful fight for adoption of the 19th amendment, guaranteeing women the right to vote. Amelia Earhart, from my hometown of Atchison, was an internationally known aviatrix and established many world records in the early days of flying.

Now Elizabeth Hoisington joins this select group in national leadership, and I am sure that she will permit all Kansans to share this day with her in a small way.

General Hoisington has been Director of the Women's Army Corps since August 1, 1966. She is the daughter of a West Point officer, and has three brothers who are graduates of the Military Academy as well. Her two sisters are married to Regular Army officers.

A graduate of the College of Notre Dame in Maryland, General Hoisington holds the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star, the Army Commendation Medal, and the French Croix de Guerre.

I join my colleague in congratulating General Hoisington, and also General Hays, on this very special day.

CRITICAL HOUSING SITUATION

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, our housing situation is one of the most difficult and critical problems facing the country today. This is particularly true in Michigan and I am certain it is true in many other areas throughout the Nation.

Although I have no single, quick, or easy solution to the housing crisis, I submit that the problem should not be ignored nor neglected—and that to do so only aggravates a situation that is rapidly deteriorating.

We have legislation pending that offers help—namely, the Emergency Housing Finance Act—which has already passed the other body by a unanimous vote. This bill has been reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency; but as yet, it has not been acted upon by the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, action is needed—the

sooner the better. For this reason, I respectfully urge the majority leadership to make certain that the matter is scheduled promptly in order that this urgently needed housing legislation may be considered by this House.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO FACILITATE DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT RECORDS AND TO ABOLISH JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14300) to amend title 44, United States Code, to facilitate the disposal of Government records without sufficient value to warrant their continued preservation, to abolish the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 16, 17, and 18, and insert:

"(b) Authorizations granted under lists and schedules submitted to the Administrator under section 3303 of this title shall be mandatory, subject to section 2909 of this title. Authorizations granted under schedules promulgated under subsection (d) of this section shall be permissive."

Page 3, after line 6, insert:

"(d) The Administrator may promulgate schedules authorizing the disposal, after the lapse of specified periods of time, of records of a specified form or character common to several or all agencies if such records will not, at the end of the periods specified, have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the United States Government.

Page 3, after line 6, insert:

"(e) The Administrator may approve and effect the disposal of records that are in his legal custody, provided that records that had been in the custody of another existing agency may not be disposed of without the written consent of the head of the agency."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "'(d)'" and insert "'(f)'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PRINTING FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's

desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 580) authorizing certain printing for the Select Committee on Crime, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT COMPILATION ENTITLED "FEDERAL AND STUDENT AID PROGRAMS"

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1175) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Federal and State Student Aid Programs" as a Senate document, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 61

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the compilation entitled "Federal and State Student Aid Programs", prepared by the Library of Congress for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be printed as a Senate document; and that there be printed sixty-two thousand two hundred additional copies of such document, of which forty-three thousand nine hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, four thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and four thousand copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balances shall revert to the respective Senate and House document rooms.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON SPACE PROGRAM BENEFITS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1176) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on space program benefits, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 66

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Aeronautical and Space Science Committee six thousand additional copies of its hearings held during the Ninety-first Congress, second session, on space program benefits.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMPILATION AND PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY OF THE AMERICAN CONGRESS (1774-1970)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1177) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) authorizing the compilation and printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress—1774-1970—and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be compiled and printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, in such style and form as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Ninety-first Congress (1774-1970); and that six thousand four hundred and thirty-five additional copies shall be printed, of which one thousand five hundred and forty-five copies shall be for the use of the Senate, four thousand three hundred and ninety copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and five hundred copies for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 13, insert:

"Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Joint Committee on Printing such sums as may be necessary for the employment of personnel and the payment of expenses to carry out the provisions of this Resolution."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF STATE EDITIONS OF 1970 U.S. CENSUS OF POPULATION

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1178) on the resolution (H. Res. 1041) providing for the printing of additional copies of the State editions of the publication entitled "1970 U.S. Census of Population," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1041

Resolved, That there be printed additional copies of the State editions of the publication entitled "1970 United States Census of Population" so as to furnish twenty-five copies to each Member of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the copies received by each Member shall contain only the population figures of the State from which he is a Representative.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 3, strike out the words "twenty-five" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "twenty-one".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLING OF PUBLIC SPEECHES OF FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1179) on the resolution (H. Res. 1072) authorizing the printing as a House document of a representative sampling of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1072

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document a representative sampling of the speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower selected from the three primary periods of Eisenhower's public life: (1) His service as the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during the war years; (2) his term as Supreme NATO Commander; and (3) his Presidency. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Librarian of Congress and the style and format of printing such document shall be under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. Four thousand three hundred and ninety additional copies shall be printed. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balances shall revert to the House Document Room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17970, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1070 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1070

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 6 of rule XXI to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the

bill (H.R. 17970) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived with respect to any appropriation contained in such bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1070 provides that upon adoption of the resolution it shall be in order to consider H.R. 17970, military construction appropriations, clause 6 of rule XXI—the 3-day rule—to the contrary notwithstanding. The resolution also provides for a waiver of points of order against the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, because the authorization bill has not been signed into law, because it has not been passed by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1070.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee has stated, we did waive the 3-day rule, but I am not certain it is necessary now insofar as probably a third day has expired. The other waiver was simply because the authorization bill is not yet signed into law. It passed the House on May 20.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule so we may proceed with consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). (By unanimous consent, Mrs. GRIFFITHS was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to notify the House that on behalf of myself, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER), the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY), and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), I have this day placed on the Clerk's desk a petition to discharge the House Judiciary Committee from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 264, an amendment to guarantee men and women equal rights under the Constitution of the United States.

This amendment has been in the Judiciary Committee since 1923. Mr. Speaker, two generations and 7 years is long enough for any committee to consider an amendment.

In spite of the fact that there are 245 introducers of this amendment, the committee last held hearings on the amendment in 1948. One generation and 2 years have passed. A new generation has come of age, and another generation passes into middle age. It is well past time that this amendment be considered.

Actually, I have been one of those people who has felt that from many standpoints this amendment is unnecessary. The Constitution properly interpreted should protect women now, but, Mr. Speaker, no matter how well the Su-

preme Court has aided all other minority groups, no matter how many columns have been written on the fact that the Supreme Court has dragged Congress into the 20th century, the truth is that where women are concerned, the Supreme Court still speaks from the thought processes and the institutions of the Middle Ages, Congress and the Executive are light-years ahead of them.

Two days ago the then Secretary of Labor, Mr. Shultz, laid down the best and most comprehensive guidelines in connection with antidiscrimination of women by Federal contractors that have ever been promulgated. I cannot praise him highly enough. It is the single best thing ever done by the executive on behalf of women. I am proud to say that President Johnson issued the Executive order which called forth the guidelines.

In the first such step of its kind, Attorney General Mitchell has entered the case of Phillips against Martin-Marietta on behalf of Mrs. Phillips. I applaud his action also. In 1964 this body passed the Civil Rights Act which included non-discrimination on account of sex. Yet the Supreme Court has delayed decision on any case under this statute and the lower courts have decided in every case against the woman.

As I pointed out, one of the real purposes of passing this amendment is to force the Supreme Court into the modern world.

It is time that the Constitution properly interpreted should have made this amendment unnecessary. It is additionally true that, together with the Executive, we have amended the laws to protect women; but to enforce these laws will cost millions of dollars from individual women and a century of time. In addition, in a climate which moves as Senator SMITH has pointed out toward repression, women would be safer with a constitutional amendment.

Young people of today object that political parties do not carry out their promises.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that the equal rights amendment has been a part of both party platforms since 1944, and of the Republicans since 1940. One generation and 6 years is long enough.

I sat in this body when a discharge petition for a postal pay raise was put on this desk, and Congressmen lined up to sign it. The line should start right here, and this committee should be discharged from further consideration of this amendment this afternoon.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would that request include the rule on the bill H.R. 17070, the alleged postal reform bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. As I understand, it could be included in this request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, have the hearings been completed on that bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. No, the hearings are in progress at this moment, and I believe it is the hope of the committee that we will go into executive session later in the day and vote on the bill.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the gentleman's answer, I would ask him to withhold his request at this time, because if this includes a request for the reporting of a rule to the House on H.R. 17070, I would have to object to it, at least until the content of the rule is made available.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the gentleman's point which is valid, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 165]

Annunzio	Gallagher	Patman
Ashbrook	Gaydos	Pelly
Ashley	Gettys	Philbin
Biaggi	Gibbons	Pike
Blatnik	Gilbert	Pollock
Brademas	Gray	Powell
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	Purcell
Burlison, Mo.	Harvey	Reid, N.Y.
Bush	Hawkins	Reuss
Button	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Clark	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Clay	Keith	Roudebush
Conyers	Kirwan	St Germain
Cowger	Leggett	Satterfield
Culver	Long, La.	Scheuer
Daddario	McCarthy	Schwengel
Dawson	McDade	Stafford
Denney	McMillan	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Martin	Stratton
Edwards, Calif.	May	Stuckey
Edwards, La.	Mayne	Taft
Esch	Moorhead	Teague, Calif.
Frey	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerin
Fulton, Pa.	Ottinger	Weicker
Gallifanakis	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 28, 1970:

H.R. 780. An act to authorize the Secretary

of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

On June 2, 1970:

H.R. 11372. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Washington, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1956 (70 Stat. 290); and

H.R. 12878. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands at the Yavapai-Prescott Community Reservation in Arizona.

On June 5, 1970:

H.R. 3920. An act for the relief of Beverly Medlock and Ruth Lee Medlock;

H.R. 5419. An act to provide relief for Comdr. Edwin J. Sabec, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 6402. An act for the relief of the Sanborn Lumber Co., Inc.;

H.R. 8694. An act for the relief of Capt. John T. Lawlor (retired); and

H.R. 9910. An act for the relief of Hannibal B. Taylor.

CREATING MARINE SANCTUARY AND PROVIDING FOR OIL PUMPING IN SANTA BARBARA AREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-349)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1955 the State of California took steps to protect a particularly beautiful area of its coastline by creating a State Sanctuary extending sixteen miles along the Santa Barbara Channel and closing it to all petroleum exploration. About a decade later, however, the Federal Government issued leases for petroleum exploration immediately seaward from the State Sanctuary. Oil platforms were soon constructed and petroleum drilling began. In January 1969, a blowout in the Channel resulted in widespread oil pollution of the sanctuary.

The twenty Federal leases seaward from the Sanctuary which were granted by the previous Administration should be cancelled. Legislation being submitted today would terminate these leases and create a Marine Sanctuary. Compensation to the lessees would be funded by revenue from oil production at the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve which is also located in California.

To avoid further marine pollution, however, it will be necessary to continue pumping oil from three leases in the area. The oil beneath the Channel where the 1969 blowout occurred is contained in a geological formation which was damaged by oil drilling. If not bled off this high pressure oil would escape through zones of structural weakness causing further pollution. The legislation I am proposing would, therefore, allow production on these three leases under strict management controls.

This proposal for Santa Barbara illustrates our strong commitment to use offshore lands in a balanced and responsible manner. It recognizes the earlier decision made by the people of California

to set aside a part of their coastline as a sanctuary, and it extends the protected area across the Channel to Santa Cruz Island.

This recommendation is based on the belief that immediate economic gains are not the only, or even the major, way of measuring the value of a geographic area. The ability of that area to sustain wildlife and its capacity to delight and inspire those who visit it for recreation can be far more important characteristics. This proposal recognizes that technology alone cannot bring national greatness, and that we must never pursue prosperity in a way that mortgages the nation's posterity.

I urge the Congress to give this legislation early and careful consideration. It represents another way in which the Federal Government can clearly demonstrate its commitment to the quality of life in America.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 11, 1970.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17970) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17970), with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I must take a moment of your time to express my appreciation to the members of the subcommittee and to the staff for their effective and meaningful cooperation and a job well done. The members of the subcommittee, Mr. McFALL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. LONG, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. TALCOTT have given unstintingly of their time during long and careful hear-

ings. They have helped to produce a bill which I think is a good bill. We have developed in our subcommittee one of the strongest and most effective teams in the Congress. I am equally pleased with the work of the staff. We are fortunate in having young staff members with dedication, who are growing in knowledge and capability and who have done an extraordinarily good job for the committee and for the Congress.

The bill now before the Congress recommends an expenditure of \$1,997,037,000 for military construction for the various programs of the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1971. This compares with \$2,134,800,000 which was recommended by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The Committee recommendation represents a reduction of \$137,763,000 below the budget. Of this amount, \$39,071,000 was eliminated in the authorization process in the House.

It must be noted that authorizing legislation has not been completed. The House has passed a bill but the Senate has not acted. Consequently, we have accepted the House-passed bill as a guideline. Undoubtedly, there will be a requirement for revisions in the estimate now before you when Senate and Conference action has been completed on the authorization.

As in previous years, let me urge that you study the report which accompanies this bill. It tells you briefly, but in reasonable detail, the principal problems confronting the military construction program and the efforts which are being made to cope with those problems.

Consider, if you will, the small size of the program now before you. This has been the case for years. The budget request for fiscal year 1971 provides for increases only in certain special categories of construction. Excluding these special high-priority categories of facilities, and taking into account the effects of inflation on construction costs, the fiscal year 1971 budget does not represent an increase above last year's military construction level.

It is essential to note that military construction, during the period of the Southeast Asia conflict has been held to absolutely minimum levels. The \$2.9 billion which has been provided since 1965 for construction in support of the Southeast Asia conflict largely has been at the expense of the replacement and modernization of facilities at permanent installations in the United States. Witnesses have been unanimous with regard to the adverse effect of World War II barracks and bachelor officer quarters and inadequate family housing upon the retention of military personnel. If we hope to achieve an all-volunteer force, adequate facilities for military personnel will have to be provided. Without a substantial improvement, it will be extremely difficult to retain people in the military service, much less attract them to the service.

At almost any base you visit you will find the services are required to make do with many inadequate facilities or with facilities which were not designed for present-day purposes. Some of these are temporary World War II structures

which have long outlived their usefulness. Maintenance is far behind desired levels; as a matter of fact, deferred maintenance is increasing year by year. That means we are failing to keep pace with the inroads of obsolescence and decay. This shortens the life of structures which otherwise could be useful for much longer periods. One of the greatest problem areas is that of housing and under the term "housing" I include family housing, bachelor enlisted quarters and bachelor officers' quarters. Housing should be comfortable, adequate, and pleasing, but sometimes it is disgraceful.

The simple fact is that the rate of construction provided in the budget request will not allow the military services and Defense agencies to provide for new missions, keep up with depreciation of their existing plants, and catch up on their outstanding facilities deficits. These deficits total approximately \$19,100,000,000 for the Active Forces, \$1,200,000,000 for the Reserve Forces, and \$2,800,000,000 for family housing. Thus the level of requested appropriations is considerably less than the amount needed for replacement and modernization. The effect of the failure to provide more adequate facilities has been, and will continue to be, low retention of military personnel, high real property maintenance costs, and high operating costs because of inefficient plant layout.

The committee has tried to place greatest emphasis on the timely construction of certain types of facilities, such as housing, personnel support facilities, and pollution abatement items. It has deferred items of other types which it feels are less urgent.

Please note also that this program is directed toward the needs of a permanent peacetime military force. It takes into account projected reductions in the size of the military establishments and programs for postwar peacetime force of approximately 2,600,000 persons. This compares with 3,127,000 at the end of April 1970.

The bill takes into account all base closures and realignments which have been announced. Only minor adjustments were required to accomplish this. There probably will be other base closures in the future, maybe after election, but there is no way to identify them now and to reflect them in this bill.

Fluctuations in the implementation of the military construction programs have in recent years contributed imbalances almost as bad as the low level of recommended programs. It will be recalled that last November the administration froze construction contracting except for family housing, pollution abatement, and a few urgently needed projects. It is anticipated that the freeze will be lifted before the end of the current month. This means we will have almost a 2-year construction program in operation and this will produce a measure of complication. The Services understand the problem and they have assured us that they plan to phase in the two programs in an orderly way. The committee has provided guidelines to assist in this matter.

There also is the serious problem of inflation. This has produced a cost esca-

lation which is inescapable and, when added to the problems of deferral, has increased the problems of the services in their efforts for orderly contracting. Regrettably, deferrals aggravated by inflation have necessitated cutbacks in the level of construction and in the quality and quantity of scheduled projects. For a number of years, costs went up by 2 or 3 percent per year. Now they are jumping at the rate of 8 percent per year, and the future looks even more bleak.

In this bill Safeguard is the most costly item and in fact it accounts for most of the increase in the military construction program over last year. The amount provided herein is \$357 million. Last year the appropriation was \$14,100,000. However, due to a change in the program, there was carryover of \$83 million which was available last year. Details of the program are shown on page 6 of your report. I discussed the Safeguard program quite thoroughly in yesterday's RECORD in light of criticism which had been expressed in separate views in the committee report. I trust that you have had an opportunity to study my comments but for your information, they appear on page 19245 in yesterday's RECORD.

The committee has approved new obligatory authority for military construction for the Safeguard program in the amount of \$357 million and \$8,800,000 for family housing to support Safeguard. This will provide: \$322,000,000 for construction, site preparation, renovation, and land acquisition; \$27,400,000 for planning and design; \$4,400,000 for access roads; and \$3,200,000 for research and development facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range. The amounts made available for fiscal year 1971 are in addition to \$335,200,000 of new obligatory authority made available in fiscal years 1968 through 1970.

The objectives of the deployment of the Safeguard as set out by the President on March 14, 1969, are:

First, protection of our land-based retaliatory forces against a direct attack by the Soviet Union;

Second, defense of the American people against the kind of nuclear attack which Communist China is likely to be able to mount within the decade; and

Third, protection against the possibility of accidental attacks from any source.

The Safeguard military construction program which is being funded this year will provide construction, including remote launch sites, at Phase 1 sites which are Grand Forks and Malmstrom and where contracts already have been let; construction and access roads at Whiteman Missile Site Radar, Mo.; advance preparation at five phase II sites. These are to be in Northeastern United States, the Washington area, the Upper Northwest, the Michigan-Ohio area, and Warren Air Force Base. The program will also provide additional research and development facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range; and 400 units of family housing. Fiscal year 1971 funds will also provide for mission depot facilities and area offices, and for additional planning and design.

According to testimony received by the committee, the denial of funding for construction at Whiteman Missile Site Radar or the denial of funds for advance site preparation at the five other phase II sites would delay the possible operational readiness dates for these sites by a year. Similarly, the funding of remote launch sites at each of the two phase I sites is necessary in order to provide this increase in missile defense capability in accordance with the schedules for the initial operating date of these sites.

You will, of course, want to know the total investment cost of the system we are now discussing. The currently estimated investment cost for the program which is set forth in this bill is \$5.9 billion. We have obligated or spent about \$2 billion. If the program should be completed, we will need about \$4 billion more. Please bear in mind that I am not talking about construction alone. I am talking about the entire cost of the system. To complete the eight-site Safeguard system would require a total expenditure of as much as \$9 billion. A full 12-site system has been projected by the Department of Defense and if it should be authorized and funded by the Congress, the total cost on that system would be \$10.7 billion.

Now let us turn to the Vietnamese program. It is small, the budget request was for \$40 million, and under the House-passed authorization bill this amount was reduced to \$25 million. The committee recommends this amount. It is almost altogether for the support of the Vietnamization program. This is treated in detail in your report on page 7.

We have also approved a contingency fund of \$35 million as requested by the Office of the Secretary of Defense for unexpected and emergency operations. We feel this is a necessary item because of the unpredictable nature of happenings in that part of the world.

There is an item which I want to call to your attention. It is the family housing program which is being provided in limited numbers for the families of Vietnamese servicemen. It is extremely difficult for people in the United States to understand the plight of the serviceman in Vietnam. His salary is low and his benefits are few. Until recently, there has been no housing program for his dependents. Consequently, it has been difficult for his family to survive even under austere circumstances. An experimental project was initiated to provide very simple, very cheap housing. The cost in most instances varies from \$400 to \$600, and in a few cases to \$900. The materials largely are provided by the United States and the work is done by the Vietnamese. The result is an extremely small and austere house, but at least it is a home. The results of making some of these available has given a tremendous boost to morale among the Vietnamese. We think it is one of the best investments we have made in the program of Vietnamization. It is helping to cut the desertion rate which is aggravated by the fact that the Vietnamese soldier is very concerned about his family. It is

still a small program and it should be expanded.

For our own servicemen and their families, in this year's bill we provide for 8,000 units of on-base family housing. The number for this compares with 4,800 units for fiscal 1970. The Pentagon estimates that 12,500 units per year is a minimum requirement for a satisfactory housing level for those eligible for quarters. It is obvious that we are far short of that goal. As a matter of fact, we have never been close to that number. In other words, the housing situation is not one which, on most bases, can be said to improve morale and encourage retention. Since retention is now an increasingly difficult problem and since a lack of proper housing is one of the items which always figures prominently in retention problems, it would be well to give more thought to providing additional adequate housing wherever it is needed.

Family housing is denied almost entirely to those in the lower enlisted grades. It is authorized only for those above E4 and for some career E4's. This arbitrary limitation increases the hardship of young people who, regardless of their station in life, are going to fall in love, get married, and have babies. Their plight is serious and in some instances desperate. Even when the wife also is working, they are very often forced to live under extremely bad conditions. The services say they can't even provide housing for those who are eligible. Consequently, they will not undertake a broader responsibility. It is a very disheartening situation and one day I hope the Congress and the Department of Defense will stop ignoring it and do something about it.

Despite this generally unhappy situation, the committee has found it difficult to arouse the Services to a determined effort to correct the housing shortage. The level of construction which is programmed drops well below the minimum which the Services state they must have. We on the committee have repeatedly urged that imagination and engineering skills be pressed into service to provide more housing units for the money that is available through new concepts or changes in program definitions. While there has been some response and some improvement, it does not measure up to the level which we think the Services are capable of providing. Again in this year's report, we urge that a more vigorous effort be made to develop new housing programs which can relieve the problem with minimum expenditures.

The committee is pleased by the progress which is being made in pollution control programs by the military services. The program before you this year in this area totals \$75,400,000 for 105 line items. It is by far the largest amount ever appropriated for this purpose and it attacks air, water, and industrial pollution. There is still much to be done before pollution control at military bases reaches a fully satisfactory level. It is estimated that the total requirement to bring military bases into full compliance with Federal and State regulations, including this year's appropriations, is ap-

proximately \$235 million. Nevertheless, I can state that I now believe the program on which we are embarking will place the military services ahead of their counterparts in the civilian economy in this very important field. Consequently, I commend the military services for the progress which they are making and urge that it be continued.

Last year we explored more fully than ever before the administration of non-appropriated funds. I think the results have been a better managed program and more accountability. Nonappropriated funds are generated by profits from messes, PX's, and so forth. They are used for the construction of service clubs, swimming pools, and other items of this nature when it is not possible to get a direct appropriation from the Congress for them. We find that total projected expenditures for fiscal 1970 in this category are estimated to be \$56.3 million and that \$151.4 million has been spent for construction with nonappropriated funds in the previous 5 fiscal years. I think the services themselves were more than a little surprised at the scope of the program, and I am confident that a better program will result from the inquiries of this committee.

One of the heaviest cuts in this bill has been taken in NATO infrastructure, not that the program is not needed. It is needed. We must have facilities if NATO is to function effectively. The burden has been increased heavily by the defection of France from the NATO countries. A cut in the NATO program is inflicted primarily to try to force our own people to negotiate more effectively for the repayment of a proper share of the costs by our allies. As in most negotiations involving Uncle Sam, the people on the other side of the table are better at waiting out a situation or they play a better poker hand than our representatives. We think our spokesmen too frequently yield, and we seek to strengthen their resolve. The budget request is for \$50 million. We provide \$33,500,000.

We are seeking to provide adequate living, training, working, and storage facilities. Consequently, we have not made meat-axe cuts in the bill before you. There would be no justification for such a course of action. The bill was heavily pruned by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. It was again reduced by the authorizing committee. It has been cut about as much as it can stand.

I have attempted to state that there is a vital need for a more adequate military construction program, which is based around sound planning and supported by proper maintenance. It is equally important that long-range planning for military contingencies take into account the lessons learned in warfare of the present and that projected for the future. In all of this Congress and the Department of Defense share a joint responsibility. The primary burden is on the Department of Defense, but Congress should give full support where support is justified. There is need for constant and sympathetic cooperation and both should accept their responsibility not to stint where Amer-

ica's safety or the well-being of uniformed personnel are concerned.

Finally, let me comment on the now prevalent furor over military expenditures and emphasize the obvious fact that we have never spent too much on military construction. Those who are genuinely interested in the well-being of American families should not overlook the fact that the needs of many of the families of those in the uniformed services are being neglected to an extent as great as any in civilian life.

To those who wish to direct efforts for reductions in expenditures primarily toward the military let me point to the fact that, taking into consideration the Vietnamese war and the higher costs of defense due to wages and inflation, we actually have the smallest level of defense spending we have had in years. Defense spending without these added factors is less than it was in the early 1960's, in times of comparative peace. As a result of this situation, badly needed modernization of equipment has been delayed and construction of on-base facilities has had to take more than its share of the reduction. Those are dangerous delays which are becoming more aggravated with each passing day.

The Russians have not made a corresponding reduction in their level of defense spending. They spend approximately twice as great a percentage of their gross national product on defense as we do. They are spending about as much in dollar value as we spend, and Russia, by virtue of lower wages and better control of inflation, gets more for a defense dollar than we do.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that as a percentage of our national income, defense spending has gone down since World War II while as a percentage of national income our spending for social and welfare programs has gone up?

Mr. SIKES. Yes; it has been going down very steadily.

Mr. JONAS. While spending for social and welfare programs has been going up?

Mr. SIKES. That is very definitely true and that is reflected in the budget before us. Right now we are spending proportionately less money for the defense needs of our country than at any time, I think, since just before the Korean war.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, assure the committee now sitting that the funds in this bill for advance site preparation, for the five phase II sites, do not amount to a commitment to deploy Safeguard ABM's at those sites?

Mr. SIKES. None whatever. This is advance planning. It involves a minimum amount of money and does not commit us to deployment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has given his usual detailed explanation of this military construction appropriation bill. I will not go over the same issues, but will instead confine my remarks to a few general statements which express my concern regarding the military construction program.

It is my contention that the program we are appropriating for today is the minimum program required to carry on the adequate construction that is needed for our military services throughout the world.

We have all been hearing a great deal about the future possibility of having a volunteer army. I think we have to recognize that if this comes about, and I am not opposed to it in spite of the problems that are inherent in accomplishing it, a volunteer force will require substantial additional expenditures in the military construction program—not less.

If we are to expect our young men to make the military a career, then we will have to provide more adequate and proper family housing than we have at the present time. We will also have to provide better facilities for our men to work in while they are in the service.

I would like to call your attention to page 3 of the report which refers to the fact that military construction programs are substantially underfunded. Our facility construction deficit totals approximately \$19,100,000,000 for the Active Forces, \$1,200,000,000 for the Reserve Forces and \$2,800,000,000 for family housing.

This is based on a force of approximately 2.6 million men, which is what we expect to have after the Vietnamese situation is concluded. So I believe the discussions we hear these days about the great savings that are expected in the Department of Defense after Vietnam are misleading. These savings will be far less than anticipated if we are going to modernize our military, make it attractive for our men to serve, and continue a force capable of carrying out its mission in defense of our country.

As the gentleman from Florida has stated, there are funds in the budget for pollution abatement. We certainly want to do everything possible to be sure that our military installations comply with all local and Federal regulations concerning pollution control.

Funds for family housing are also included and I agree with the chairman as to how much more is really needed. But we all recognize the current fiscal situation and 8,000 additional units is all that we are going to be able to fund this year.

Insofar as the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile program is concerned, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will present an amendment to delete all ABM funds except those for research and development at Kwajalein.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I propose to offer an

amendment which will delete funds for deployment of the Safeguard ABM system.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to say that I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Illinois. He has been stalwart in his opposition to this program but we have been up and down this hill more times than I can recall. As I have said, I respect his judgment, and even more his persistency. But we have already debated and voted on this issue in the authorization bills for military construction and military procurement this year. The debate on the military procurement authorization bill included a teller vote on an amendment to delete all procurement funds. The amendment was defeated 131 to 85. This was immediately followed by another vote on an amendment to strike phase II procurement funds. This second amendment was defeated 128 to 86. We also voted on a similar amendment on the military construction authorization bill. This was defeated on a teller vote of 146 to 76. These votes took place in the past few weeks.

I am sure the gentleman from Illinois will present his case and do so effectively, but I hope that the House will not spend too much time this afternoon on the ABM issue. As I have said, we have been down this road too many times and I do not think we should travel it again.

I would also encourage those of you who have military installations in your districts to read the report. It includes information concerning what military construction is planned for each district and State.

There really is nothing in this bill that is new or unusual. It is the same kind of bill we have presented year after year in order to provide adequate facilities for the defense of our country and the men who serve in it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his courtesy and his generosity in giving me this time. The subject of my amendment, the Safeguard ABM, is one of the most important that faces this Congress. It has been considered before and will be presented again because it is so controversial.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee if he would assist me in regard to the material in the report on page 7. This is in regard to providing, as the report states:

Minimum essential support of U.S. forces whose presence in Southeast Asia is necessary during the various phases of Vietnamization.

I understand this to be part of the Vietnamization program. The question I direct to the gentleman is this: I assume that with the reduction of our troop

strength in Vietnam as programed by President Nixon, there would appear to be available for troop housing the billets that have been used by our troops. And yet I see there would be a pipeline, as the report puts it, for urgent needs of an estimated \$246 million. There was a funding of \$25 million for additional housing and a backlog of funded construction in Vietnam of \$275 million. In other words, sizable sums seem to be available for the housing essential for the Vietnamese troops, for the Republic of Vietnam. The question I ask is whether or not we can use existing housing that our troops have been using to house the Vietnamese troops as they take over?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I assure you that all of the existing United States and South Vietnamese facilities have been taken into consideration in planning the request for the items that are now before us. The South Vietnamese use any of our facilities that are available as soon as they become available, if they are suitable for the Vietnamization program.

But I must point out to the gentleman that their requirements are considerably different from ours. Our bases were built on a large and a more elaborate scale. Our bases are not always located where the Vietnamese troops will be required to be located. All this has been taken into account. Also a great deal of recoupment has already been accomplished. I do not feel that there is any money available for recoupment that has not already been taken into consideration.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The only point I would make is that Vietnamization is going to be a considerably more expensive program than some of us had envisioned. I understand the reason for this is that we provide housing not only for the Vietnamese troops, but also for the families of the Vietnamese troops.

Mr. SIKES. I am glad the gentleman touched on the matter of the Vietnamese family housing. This is something the members of this subcommittee have explored very carefully. The requirements for the troops themselves are on a very minimal basis. They are substandard if compared with the facilities we build for our own forces. But there has been in addition a small program of housing which has been developed for the families of the Vietnamese troops.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the best things we have done over there. We are talking about an extremely austere little one-room house, a house that may cost \$400 to \$600. Generally we provide the material and the Vietnamese provide the labor. In some cases we build the whole house.

The reason this housing is important is because the Vietnamese forces have to live under very difficult circumstances. Their pay is low and inflation takes a terrific toll. Their families have suffered in comparison, to other families in Vietnam, and that has caused a high desertion rate. The Vietnamese are highly attached to their families. They leave and go home to see how their families are doing. They do not really feel they are

deserting. They go to see how their families are doing.

If we have provided a very small low-cost house for their families, we have given them a morale boost. This is one of the best and low-cost things we have done.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not oppose low-cost housing for the Vietnamese. The difficulty we have is that many of the troops from my own area and from other major cities, while they are serving in Vietnam, actually have families who do not have adequate housing at home, where they have originated. I wish we could do something for those families as well.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there is no higher priority for this Nation today than assuring our national security in a world torn by explosive forces. While it is well we should seek to find a basis for stopping the arms race which continues unabated between the Soviet Union and ourselves, until an acceptable understanding is reached, we have no alternative except to maintain our national strength and power. Having accepted this principle, however, that does not mean this Nation is required to buy every new strategic weapon that is proposed and to buy it in greater quantity than the Soviet Union.

It does not mean we must waste our resources in purchasing expensive and unnecessary weapons systems merely because they have the recommendation of military experts. Some Members may have seen the television documentary a few nights ago that showed the results of three Air Force programs for the construction of certain supersonic bombers such as the B-58, several hundred of which are now resting in an Air Force scrapyard in Arizona, the B-70, the lone survivor of which is in an Air Force museum, and the FB-111, a bomber of inadequate range and payload. All three programs were built at a cost of \$6.5 billion, that we can never recover, \$6.5 billion that has gone down the drain, buying aircraft which contributed absolutely nothing to our defense.

I predict, Mr. Chairman, the ABM, the Safeguard ABM, will undoubtedly join that unfortunate array of weaponry that looked so pretty, so expensive, and turned out to be so ineffective.

Congress does have a function to perform in reviewing our military posture. It is a most important function. It is our responsibility to insist that to the greatest extent possible this \$70 to \$80 billion a year that is spent on defense must not be wasted in ill-conceived, unproven and rashly hurried weapons systems.

That is why today I will offer an amendment to strike the funds for the deployment of the Safeguard ABM. I say to the House that the Safeguard ABM is ill-conceived, it is unproven, it is being rashly hurried into deployment, nationwide deployment, without having completed its research cycles.

It is a current example of Maginot line thinking.

Do Members remember the storm which swept across the country late in 1968 and early last year over the deployment of the Sentinel ABM system? President Nixon called a halt to that system.

He announced he was discarding it for the Safeguard system. But the Sentinel system has not been discarded. The only thing that has been discarded is its name.

I ask the Members to look at these two charts. One of them shows the deployment of the so-called discarded Sentinel ABM system. The other shows the deployment of the current Safeguard system.

Members will note that the Sentinel system has 15 footprints. The Safeguard system has 12 footprints. However, the thrust is the same. The only thing that has happened is that the centers of the footprints have been moved from the perimeters of the cities, a few miles away. This was done in order to quell the storm of criticism that swelled when people were told that they were going to be living with nuclear tipped Sentinel missiles.

For all intents and purposes the two systems are still the same. The Safeguard is the Sentinel, except that there is a different name and fewer footprints.

Mr. Chairman, the impression was given by the President last year that this was to be a new concept and a new system, but all one has to do is to look at the two charts to see that, in both, the areas to be protected are the same.

Let me point out the missile bases. Here we have Grand Forks and Malmstrom, in the center of two footprints, and in the Sentinel system we have Grand Forks and Malmstrom in the center of two footprints.

In the phase 2 we are going to be asked to put a Safeguard site at the Warren Air Force Base in Missouri. Under the Sentinel system there is an installation at the Warren Air Force Base in Missouri.

What is the difference? They are identical. The two systems are virtually identical. The areas to be protected are the same.

So let there be no doubt as to what has happened. Neither Sentinel nor Safeguard has any substantial difference, one from the other. Admittedly, they offer no protection, either of them, against the Russian missile threat, and that appears in the RECORD.

Many of the Members of the House believe that the Safeguard and the Sentinel before it, the antiballistic missile system, would cover the skies over the United States with a protective umbrella like a protective shield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Nothing is further from the truth. One need only to look at the testimony before this subcommittee, before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, to see the admissions by the highest officials of the Department of Defense that a saturation attack by the Soviet Union would overwhelm any anti-ballistic-missile system that we could possibly deploy.

But they still make the same kind of a representation to this country that this system will protect the country. Nothing is further from the truth.

These are systems that will not protect the missile bases they are supposed to protect. They will not protect against the so-called Chinese threat as the Department of Defense represents. The Safeguard will not protect our Air Force bomber bases as is claimed, too. They will not protect against an accidental missile launch.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. My recollection is that when the President reexamined the question of the ABM and said that the Sentinel deployment was proceeding under a mistaken concept; namely, that of city defense—

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. FRASER. He also said that one of the reasons why that was a mistaken concept was that this might lead the Soviet Union to believe we were trying to acquire a first strike capability.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. FRASER. On this ground he recommended Safeguard, which he told us would be primarily aimed at defending Minuteman fields.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. FRASER. Do I correctly understand that what the gentleman is telling us now is that despite what the President has said, in the Safeguard II deployment they are moving back toward city defense, that defense the President said he was abandoning?

Mr. YATES. I will tell the gentleman that they never moved away from it. The only thing they moved were some sites on the perimeters of the cities.

But, as far as the footprints themselves and the areas to be covered by the sites, they are almost identical—they are almost exactly the same.

If the Department of Defense were to be honest—and I use that word advisedly—were to be honest in following the mandate of the President in protecting our Minuteman sites, they would seek to protect only the two sites, maybe Whitman. Phase 1 provides for deployment at Malmstrom and Grand Forks, now in Phase 2 at Warren Air Force Base. But they are going beyond that. They ask funds for five more sites in this bill. There is money in this bill for five additional sites. There is one for Warren in here and four beyond that. The next phase will include another four sites, making 12 in all. So we are moving away from the representation the President made when he discarded the Sentinel last year.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I understand around Moscow the ABM system has been partially completed with some 64 or 67 launchers. Is my understanding correct that that is as far as the Soviets have progressed?

Mr. YATES. To the best of my knowledge it is true. And I know from testimony before the Committee on Appropriations that our officials in the Department of Defense are not concerned about the Soviet ABM. Our Minuteman could completely overcome them by a satura-

tion attack whatever ABM system the Soviets are able to construct.

Mr. FRASER. I might tell the gentleman I listened to the testimony which suggests that half of the payload of one submarine equipped with Poseidon missiles could overrun the total existing ABM defense around Moscow. Half the payload of a single submarine of Poseidon missiles could overrun the entire Soviet ABM defense around Moscow. Will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. YATES. I am sure that is true. Yes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to thank the gentleman and compliment him on the brilliant statement he is making today, showing again the defects of the system. However, one of the things I would like the gentleman to bring out is the important question of what is going on in the SALT talks. The question there seems to be that there is going to be some kind of an agreement, and here we are going forth with an appropriation of vast sums of money. How will we eliminate this waste if, as we all hope, there is an agreement on ABM in the SALT talks with the Russians?

Mr. YATES. I myself believe that the most important part of those talks is not the ABM system but, rather, the MIRV. That is the most important thing. I think the ABM discussions are only a warmup for MIRV, because I am sure, just as our officials know how ineffective the Safeguard ABM would be in trying to resist a Russian attack, so, too, am I sure the Russians know how ineffective their system would be in attempting to resist an attack by the United States. That is why you see the report as you did in yesterday's press to the effect that the Russians and the United States may agree upon limiting the ABM systems to Washington and to Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Before taking up the justifications for this system, let me point out there still have been no intercepts by Spartan or Sprint missiles of any ICBM's in any test. All we know is that the Department of Defense said several years ago under exact and highly controlled conditions it was able to intercept a missile fired from the Vandenberg missile base in California with an antimissile fired from Kwajalein, but the Department of Defense has not told us how many times they attempted this experiment. They have not told us how many times it failed. And they still have not used the Spartan or Sprint. So, without completing the basic research necessary, the Department of Defense is now engaged on a full-scale deployment in the country. Before research is completed they are engaged on a full-scale deployment in the country.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is making a

very fine statement and has hit upon a point which I think cannot be overemphasized. Over the last 10 or 15 years it seems to me we should have learned a lesson, and that is this: that we do not deploy or buy a weapons system until it is tested and proven according to specifications and according to what it is designed to accomplish.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. In those instances where we have gone ahead, as the gentleman has described, and after the acquisition of additional sites and the missiles are in place, we still have not proven this to be an effective system as of today.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we have had weapons system after weapons system that cost many millions more than originally anticipated. Now we are going to slip into the acquisition of another system and it will cost three or more times more than has been projected.

Mr. YATES. I will state to the gentleman that last year in urging this system Secretary of Defense Laird said that the Russians were engaged in a huge buildup of missiles and we had to have the ABM in order to protect our missile sites. This year there is a different story. He says now we will have to build individual radars in addition to the ABM's in order to protect our missile sites.

Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that the Department of Defense is finally on the right track. If they go through with the Safeguard deployment and build this enormous, highly complex radar system, they are building a system that is extremely vulnerable, that can be knocked out by cheap Russian missiles, not the SS-9's. There are no hard placements for the Safeguard radars. If you destroy the eyes of the Safeguard, you have ruined the entire system. There is an alternative, one alternative is to construct a small radar for each missile. If we want to protect our missiles and we ought to really concentrate on that by building a small radar for each missile instead of having an overall general kind of deployment which is supposed to protect everything and actually protects against nothing.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that the experts on whom the Department of Defense frequently depends for advice like Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Garwin have stated that the huge radar complex is not only unnecessary but ineffective and that a complex of small radars, with one radar protecting each missile, would be much more effective at a fraction of the cost. And the Spartan would no longer be necessary. They would use the Sprint.

Mr. Chairman, if the purpose of the ABM is to defend our Minuteman, it should be designed for that purpose. The Safeguard nationwide area system is not designed for that purpose, and will not do the job.

The second reason for deploying the Safeguard is that the Chinese are expected to have a nuclear missile ICBM capability within the decade and the sys-

tem is needed to protect against that threat.

I cannot understand why an ICBM deterrent supposedly satisfactory to hold off a much more sophisticated Russian missile threat cannot have the same force against the Chinese as well. But it is said that the Russians fear our deterrent and, therefore, we must protect it.

Do not the Chinese fear our deterrent as well? Do they not know they would be committing national suicide beneath a wave of nuclear-headed missiles coming from this country, from bombers, from Polaris-firing submarines, if they were to threaten to attack this Nation.

But, apparently, the Department of Defense believes the Communist Chinese are not as rational as the Russians.

Mr. Chairman, it is stated on page 52 of the Appropriations Committee hearings for this year:

We know from past experience that the Asian Communists are tenacious opponents and are willing to take great losses of life in achieving their objectives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I do not know which expert in the Department of Defense supplied that answer for the record. It is stated that, therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that our ability to deter Communist China with our strategic offensive forces is considerably less certain than in the case of the Soviet Union. Certainly, since Korea the Chinese have been considerably less belligerent in their military adventures than has the Soviet Union. It has had border forays with the Russians and with the Indians; it has threatened to take over Quemoy and Matsu, but never fulfilled the threat. It has been relatively quiet. Why, then, does this unnamed expert from the Department of Defense believe that the Chinese somehow would be provoked into flinging a flight of missiles toward the United States, knowing what the terrible retaliation and possible total destruction would be?

Even assuming that the Chinese were to develop a missile force of 25 missiles or so. It could overcome any Safeguard missiles by sending them en masse at any single target.

As Dr. Richard Garwin pointed out recently:

If we assume that 12 Spartan farms are adequate, then each one must have enough interceptors to handle the entire imagined Chinese force. If one assumes that the Chinese will have 25 ICBM's at a certain time, and if two Spartans are required per Chinese ICBM, then 50 Spartans must be allocated to each farm and some 600 for the total system. Unfortunately, outside the atmosphere, straps and junk and perhaps tank fragments provide many reasonably realistic aim points for the Spartan missiles, so that a more likely number of Spartans required per enemy missile is 10 or 20. This, together with the need for defending against concentration of the small Chinese missile force, would demand some 3000 to 6000 Spartans in the United States.

And, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the gravity with which the Department of

Defense looks at the Chinese threat. Yesterday in the Washington Post it was said that the Soviet Union and the United States might agree that IBM sites would be limited to protecting Washington and Moscow. If that is true, if they agree on that, what happens to the Chinese threat if we have ABM sites agreed to be built only for Moscow and Washington? What happens to the rest of the country?

If there is a Chinese threat, how can this administration agree to let it lie open to the possibility of attack from the Chinese Communists?

The third reason advanced for the deployment of Safeguard is that we must protect against destruction of our bomber bases so that the bombers can take off to retaliate. Presumably the missiles which are aimed at our bomber bases under this threat would be from submarines, because if they were from land-based missiles our warning system would advise us in plenty of time to permit the bombers to take off. If this kind of attack took place would not our own ICBM's be used? When did the Department of Defense abandon the concept of deterrent?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is asserted that the Safeguard will act as a protection against the possibility of an accidental launch of a missile from a foreign land. We find great difficulty in envisioning, and I find great difficulty in envisioning a national ABM catchall over this country which would protect every corner of the United States from an accidentally launched missile. In order to provide that kind of protection the ABM system must be much broader in its coverage, and the entire system would have to be on a perpetual alert.

Who in the long chain of command, from the President down to the ABM operator who pushes the button, will make the decision that the nuclear-tipped antimissiles are to be fired—and how many? How much time will be available for each decision along the chain?

Mr. Chairman, there was a great protest throughout this country against the proliferation of nuclear-warheaded Sprint and Spartan missiles within our shores. The President's rejection of the Sentinel and his limitation of the system to two fairly remote sites at the time of his announcement hushed that protest. But apparently the shrinking of the ABM system to those two sites was only temporary, and now the Department of the Army is engaged in a whole nationwide system before we have even stopped to consider how effective the results will be.

Why must the Safeguard be expanded, and its expense escalated, without some tangible proof that the system will work? Even its proponents should want to wait to see what the results of deployment at the two missile bases in North Dakota and Montana will be.

It should be pointed out that those who oppose the deployment do favor research funds that are in this budget, and the research on the ABM should go forward. Our opposition is to deploying the system which may very well be a sham

rather than the protective device that it is represented to be.

We cannot afford to spend billions of scarce dollars on such a system. The United States does not improve its national security by building weapons systems which are not needed and do not work.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, ranking member of the subcommittee (Mr. McFALL).

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has previously authorized phase I of Safeguard.

This House, after much debate, authorized phase II of Safeguard and phase II is now pending in the other body. The outcome, of course, is uncertain.

I can understand why the opponents of the Safeguard system grasp at every opportunity they have to present their case against Safeguard. It is an important matter that should be debated before this House and before the Congress and, of course, to be determined by the American people.

I would just like to make clear, as briefly as I can, what the subcommittee that is presenting this bill for the consideration of the House has done—why we have done it—and with the details of exactly what we have done, so that those of you who are going to vote on this will understand what you are voting on at this time.

Most probably, because of the previous all-inclusive debate that the House has had on this subject almost everyone's mind is made up on the question of whether or not Safeguard is necessary for the security of our country.

But at every point in the process, of course, we must make the decision again. I believe the committee has an obligation to make clear to you exactly why we are doing it and what we are doing.

As indicated in our report, the Committee has approved new obligational authority for military construction for the Safeguard program in the amount of \$357 million and \$8,800,000 for family housing to support Safeguard.

There are those who ask "why build Safeguard?" I say because our national security demands that we do nothing less than move ahead with the modest and prudent modified phase II deployment recommended by the administration this year.

It is a sound and well-thought-out program that provides us with options to satisfy one or all of several important objectives: It will help preserve the retaliatory capability of our land-based deterrent forces, both Minuteman and bombers, against the Soviet threat, and it is a step toward a system which will defend our people against the ICBM threat from Red China or against an accidental attack launched by any country.

Today, of course, the Chinese have no ICBM force, and today we clearly have sufficient retaliatory power to deter the Soviet Union from a missile attack upon this country. But what concerns me, and must surely concern us all, is our ability to continue to be safe from attack

through the foreseeable future. Unfortunately, the hard facts make it very clear that we have no basis for complacency about the potential threat of 5 to 7 years from now. These facts show that the Soviet Union, during the 5 years between 1965 and 1970, have quintupled their strategic offensive missile launchers. They have about 1,500 today as compared to only about 300 5 years ago. During these same 5 years the United States has maintained its 1965 level of around 1,710 strategic missile launchers which includes submarine-launched missiles. This relative Soviet momentum and its implications for the strategic balance of the mid-1970's is indeed cause for grave concern.

In addition, we must not overlook the steady progress of the Chinese Communist nuclear weapons test program and their recent launching of a satellite. These developments are clear evidence of a potential ICBM capability on their part—one which might lead to nuclear blackmail against us, if we have no ABM defense.

Insofar as the Soviet threat is concerned, there are alternatives to Safeguard that we could adopt; for example, we could buy more Polaris submarines, more bombers and more Minuteman missiles. But such a lessening of the restraint we have shown in offensive weapon buildup would most certainly complicate the problems of arms control during this critical period of the SALT negotiations, and the adoption of such an alternative would mean ignoring the potential Chinese threat.

The full costs of other alternatives are not known, but they are apt to be equally expensive. As a point of reference, the Minuteman system, through fiscal year 1971, will have cost about \$13 billion to build. A decision to resite Minuteman, whether in hard sites or on mobile launchers, would not be cheap. There are funds in the fiscal year 1971 budget to begin studies of various Minuteman point defense systems. However, their radars would still not be as hard as a missile silo. There is no guarantee that a point defense of Minuteman would be any cheaper than a Safeguard defense of Minuteman. An address by Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., on May 12, 1969, makes this clear:

The NIKE-X R. & D. program, upon which both Sentinel and Safeguard were based, always had a Sprint missile for point defense of targets, specifically Minuteman and cities. We have, from time to time, examined specialized systems, designed only to hard point defense, with the hope that we could find something much cheaper or much better. But we haven't found it.

The committee's hearings indicate that the cost to build and operate an additional 40 Poseidon submarines is estimated to be approximately \$8 billion. The Navy's ULMS system is expected to cost around \$10 billion.

In the bill we have before you we have provided the following money:

For Grand Forks, \$41 million to complete construction.

For Malmstrom, \$149 million, for major construction to completion.

For Whiteman, \$127 million for land

acquisition, major construction to completion.

For advance site preparation for five phase II sites, \$15 million for design and land acquisition as required.

For R. & D. support, at Kwajalein, \$3 million to continue R.D.T. & E. construction.

For mission depot facility and area offices, \$5 million for major construction or renovation to completion.

For standard design, \$17 million—a total of \$357 million. This is broken down into phase I and phase II as follows:

Phase I, \$169 million.

For the Whiteman site, \$127 million.

For Sprints at Grand Forks and Malmstrom, \$35 million.

For advance preparation, five sites, \$15 million.

For other costs, \$11 million. This includes modification of an existing Army depot and added military construction supervisory costs.

I am convinced that the modified phase II Safeguard deployment is the best solution to our dilemma. It will give us the hedge we need against the uncertainties of the future, and, at the same time, will not be provocative to the Soviet Union, since it does not threaten their deterrent. In short, it is a sensible and modest investment in the future security of our Nation.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McFALL. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Again talking about the relative balance between the Russian strength and our strength, I was not too clear what the gentleman's point was in relation to symmetry or asymmetry. Are you saying that the Russian's strategic deterrent which is assured destruction capability no longer applies in that kind of situation? Do we not have a second-strike capability?

Mr. McFALL. I am saying that the Russian progress has been accelerating while ours has been maintained in approximately the same strength. I have not said anything about the symmetry or the asymmetry of the Russians. The Russians still have, as we have, the ability to destroy us and we them.

Mr. COHELAN. Then the gentleman agrees, does he not, that we still have, notwithstanding the numbers cited, a second strike assured destruction capability; is that correct?

Mr. McFALL. I am not sure we would have this in view of the continuing buildup of the Russians, the way the Russian SS-9 and the SS-11 is continuing. If they continue the way they are, then I would think our Minuteman deterrent would be threatened and that one of the reasons for Safeguard is to protect our Minuteman deterrent against some kind of first strike from the Soviet Union. It would not be any kind of threat to their deterrent, because I do not believe our cities could be protected against any kind of extensive launch by the Soviet Union of a number of the 1,500 vehicles which they have.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. SIKES) on his leadership of this subcommittee. He not only has a masterly understanding of the problems of defense, but he makes it a joy to be on the subcommittee.

The military construction appropriation recommended in this bill is under \$2 billion. Our construction needs in this country are tremendous. Our total backlog of military construction need is about \$23 billion; at the annual rate of less than \$2 billion, it would take a dozen years just to make up for our backlog—even if we did nothing for our future defense needs. Although some might quarrel with individual items, no one could say we have spent ourselves blind in any way. It is a modest appropriation request.

I address myself today to the problem the military intelligence functions which the Army proposes to move from Fort Holabird, Maryland, to Fort Huachuca in Arizona. The Military Construction Subcommittee held hearings and conducted an on-site investigation of the facilities at Fort Holabird and at Fort Huachuca. The subcommittee found that the Army has given insufficient consideration to the total facility implications of the move. On this basis, the Appropriations Committee report on the military construction appropriation bill recommended that the Army "further review its plans to move intelligence functions from Fort Holabird to Fort Huachuca."

When I first heard of the proposed move of these intelligence functions, I was resigned to it as part of the general economy cut, which I have long supported. We need to save all the money that is not absolutely necessary to our defense, because the taxpayers in this country are carrying a tremendous burden, and any excess military spending must interfere with the economic and social development of this country.

In addition, with this huge \$23 billion backlog of construction needs, it is important that we spend our money wisely on the things we need, since we will never be able to spend enough to accomplish all the essential projects.

However, when I looked into the proposal to move the intelligence functions from Fort Holabird, I found this was not an economy move at all, but a very expensive geographical move, one that would cost \$50 million to \$60 million. Included in the costs are \$12.5 million, for transferring and moving, and the temporary construction costs, much of which would have to be replaced later on with permanent facilities; \$33 million for 5-year construction costs at Fort Huachuca; and \$15 to \$20 million for base housing at Fort Huachuca. As justification for this expenditure, the Army claims there will be a \$2.5 to \$3.5 million saving annually.

No businessmen would invest \$50 million to \$60 million to save this modest annual amount, especially when we consider the United States is paying 7 percent interest on the money borrowed to build such installations. If we count in the interest—and how can we justify not doing so—the annual cost would be

someplace between \$5 million and \$8 million, vastly greater of course than the savings which the Army claims. And we have all learned to look with a somewhat skeptical eye on military claims of cost savings from any kind of installation or procurement.

Moreover, the move is not warranted, even for the training needs of the Army. Although the Army has claimed that the classroom facilities at Fort Holabird are inadequate, the commander of the base told the subcommittee that his office had not requested the move and regarded the classroom facilities as satisfactory. We looked through the classrooms, and found them in good shape.

The Army claims that Fort Holabird is inadequate for the electronic surveillance training. The commander of the base did confirm that Holabird is inadequate for this type of training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The committee found—and this is in the committee report—that the Army gave insufficient consideration to using Fort George Meade as an adjunct to Fort Holabird, where classroom work can be done.

In other words, we felt that the classroom work could continue at Fort Holabird, with its millions of dollars worth of such facilities, and that any additional electronics surveillance training could be moved to Fort Meade.

I wish to point out that only a year and a half ago the Army looked into the whole question of moving the facility to Fort Meade and made a special report on the subject. Only a year and a half ago the Army wanted to move the intelligence functions at Fort Holabird to Fort Meade, just a short distance away.

The Army admits that most of the field intelligence training could be carried on at Fort Meade. But they object to the time required to go back and forth. I have checked that distance, and it is 14 miles from gate to gate. That is not a very long distance to go, it seems to me, to carry out 5 or 6 days of training, during a several week training period.

The combat surveillance training with Mohawk aircraft cannot be conducted at Fort Meade because of the congested air space, the Army claims. They feel the air space is saturated, and strictly controlled by the FAA. I have checked with the FAA. They have not been asked by the Army to make such a recommendation, and do not know what they would recommend if asked.

The Army tells us one thing, and then we find out they have not really checked into the facts.

Earlier the Army claimed that radar and ground sensor training could not be carried on at Fort Meade. The Army has now admitted in a memorandum, that radar and ground sensor training can be carried out at Fort Meade.

In addition, Fort Holabird and Fort Meade are close geographically to the intelligence complex that is located in the Washington area. In fact, one of these activities, the National Security Agency

is located at Fort Meade. Both installations are just a few miles from the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley, Va.; the Defense Intelligence Agency; and the Army Security Agency.

Moving the Intelligence School to Arizona would be moving it several thousand miles away. It would be very difficult to get back and forth.

Some of the people who work at Fort Holabird have written to me and pointed out that if the intelligence center moves, its files and the information from these activities must be sent back and forth continuously at great expense.

I want to quote one additional statement that was made to me by one of the experienced personnel at Fort Holabird, because I think his statement has brought a lot to bear on the question of whether the Army is improving its effectiveness by moving the intelligence unit from Fort Holabird at the expense of \$60 million several thousand miles away. He said:

Having been employed as a civil servant at Fort Holabird since 1956, six years after the U.S. Army Intelligence School was opened in 1950, I would like to point out some information concerning the proposed move to Fort Huachuca, Arizona. To my estimation and past observance, I feel that the proper functioning and implementation of USAINTS will be set back approximately 4 to 6 years. If the proposed move is carried through, the Intelligence School will function in name only for approximately 4-6 years until the school is properly organized and settled both physically and scholastically. *FOR USAINTS to be set up and function in an orderly and proper manner it took from 1950 to 1956 at Fort Holabird.*

For all of these reasons, I feel that this would not only be a very expensive move, but it would disrupt both for a number of years in the future and perhaps for all time the intelligence work that is being carried at Fort Holabird.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) as they relate to the ABM.

While I do not oppose the appropriation of funds for further research and development of the Safeguard system, I believe there are too many questions about the workability of this system which should be answered before we vote additional funds to expand it.

I am greatly concerned also about the cost of this system. The legislation before this House today would appropriate \$357 million for Safeguard. Proponents of the system tell us the total cost of the 12-site system would be \$10.7 billion. But, testimony indicates that the total cost is at least \$11.9 billion, excluding operating costs, the cost of warheads for the improved Spartan missiles, the AEC budget, and other research activities.

I think it would be valuable, Mr. Speaker, to point out just how we got where we are today on the matter of ABM costs.

On March 14, 1969, President Nixon announced his position in favor of the Safeguard system. At that time he said:

The present estimate is that the total cost of installing this system will be \$6-7 billion.

The frequently quoted administration cost figure was \$6.6 billion.

In early May 1969, it was revealed that the \$6.6 billion cost of the system did not include \$1.2 billion for the warheads, money included in the Atomic Energy Commission budget.

On May 22, 1969, it was revealed that another \$2.5 billion had to be added to the total cost of the system for research and development. This made the total cost of the system \$10.3 billion, including the cost of the warheads.

On May 22, 1969, it was also revealed that if it was later decided to extend the Safeguard system to cover Alaska and Hawaii, the cost of the program would increase \$450 to \$500 million.

On December 1, 1969, Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, issued a report on cost overruns indicating no overrun on the \$4.185 billion cost of phase I, that part of Safeguard which has been approved by the Senate in August and the House in October.

On December 16, 1969, Senator HATFIELD revealed, and the Department of Defense acknowledged, that the overrun on phase I was \$277 million.

On February 24, 1970, Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard announced that the cost of phase I had increased from \$4.1 to \$4.5 billion.

On April 8, 1970, Mr. Packard told members of the House Appropriations Committee that the cost of phase I had increased another \$100 million, from \$4.5 to \$4.6 billion. At that time he indicated that the total cost of the system without the warheads is now estimated to be \$10.7 billion, a cost overrun of \$1.6 billion over the \$9.1 billion estimated cost 1 year earlier.

In his April testimony Mr. Packard also acknowledged that in addition to not including the \$1.2 billion for warheads, the \$10.7 billion total does not include \$158 million for research on advanced radars, an unknown amount for warheads for the improved Spartan missile, or operating costs which will range from \$100 million per year for a two-site system to \$350 million per year for a 12-site system.

These figures indicate that the cost overrun of this system has averaged over \$130 million per month during the past year.

Furthermore, the total estimated cost of phase II deployment has almost doubled from the first announced figure of \$6.6 billion to at least \$12 billion, with millions more to be added in for the improved Spartan missile, operating costs, and perhaps the extension of the system to Alaska and Hawaii.

I have serious doubts too that costs for the ABM will stop here. Deputy Secretary Packard has conceded that inflation and design improvement may cause "some continuing cost growth of this defense."

With a system as complex as Safeguard, future design changes would certainly seem to be a reasonable expecta-

tion. Inflation will surely be a factor also, just as it is with nondefense expenditures.

In light of this it is difficult to doubt that Mr. Packard's concerns for continuing cost growths will be justified.

And it is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that while I favor continued research on the ABM system, I do not favor deploying a system with as many doubts about it as this one has. We should have learned by now that simultaneous research and deployment equals cost overruns par excellence.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman and commend him on the work he and his committee are doing in behalf of our defense.

I want to say that I am grateful for the energetic and expert service the gentleman from Florida has given this House. His expertise on the far-flung military installations of this country and his detailed knowledge of these installations surely is unequaled.

I note that in the committee report the committee decided to delete for the time being funds to construct a large jet aircraft engine overhaul facility at Kelly Air Force Base. The committee feels that the Air Force has failed to provide adequate justification for the construction of the facility at this time, and has directed the service to conduct further studies of the project and the need for it. However, my understanding has been that this engine overhaul facility is very much needed and is vital to the long-range needs of the Air Force.

My personal feeling is that wherever possible the military services should maintain their equipment in their own shops, rather than use outside contractors. In this case, I am concerned that delay of the engine overhaul facility would deprive the Government of any capacity to overhaul such large engines as the TF-39. Although I am far from being an authority on this subject, I believe that the facility will be required sooner or later.

I know that the committee, and especially the chairman, are familiar with this matter and share my concern. I yield to the chairman's unexcelled knowledge and expertise in this matter, and respect his judgment, and only desire to inform him of my understanding of this matter, and to convey my concern about it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require to respond to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

I applaud his interest and his hard work. I know the importance of what he is seeking to achieve. I assure him that this subcommittee has a sympathetic interest in his project and that the matter will continue to have our careful consideration as additional facts are made available.

I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise

to express myself in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in expressing my support for the bill H.R. 17970, I am pleased to note that the committee has reduced appropriations for military construction programs for fiscal year 1971 by almost \$138 million below budget requests. While total new obligational authority is slightly above the amount in last years' appropriation bill, I hasten to point out that the increase results specifically from two items which are essentially nonmilitary in nature—namely, family housing and water pollution abatement projects.

On the subject of family housing, I am pleased to note that 150 family housing units have been authorized for Great Lakes Naval Training Center in my congressional district. This will help resolve the housing shortage which the officers and men of the Navy are experiencing at this great naval training center. The cost for this housing is substantial—with a total of \$4,350,000 allocated for the family housing needs at Great Lakes. While this is not sufficient to meet all of the housing requirements, it will go a long way toward enabling the families of those who are serving in the Navy to avoid being separated—and will help relieve the strain on private housing in the surrounding areas.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased to note that the committee has recommended funds totaling more than \$19 million for other improvements at Great Lakes, including more than \$12.5 million for water pollution abatement facilities to be coordinated with the comprehensive project of the North Shore Sanitary District, which is now underway. This recognition of Federal responsibility to help reduce water pollution in Lake Michigan is most gratifying—and fulfills a promise made by President Nixon when he visited my congressional district earlier this year.

Mr. Chairman, I also am pleased to note the appropriation of funds for a vitally needed naval hospital corps school totaling almost \$3 million. Approximately \$3.5 million is appropriated for other improvements at the naval training center.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the studies which are now underway to phase down the Army operations at Fort Sheridan. In this connection, I note that funds for the sewage treatment facility have been eliminated in the authorization bill, as well as in this bill. It is my expectation that Fort Sheridan will continue to fill an important role in our defense program and that the necessary funds for water pollution abatement will be available after this subject is clarified and the future status of Fort Sheridan is more accurately determined.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware also of the controversial aspect of funds for continuing work on the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM. It has been convincingly represented to me that the development of this system is essential for our national safety and that the ABM itself is a defensive capability intended to protect American lives and property against enemy nuclear attack. On that basis—and after the most careful study

and thought—I am satisfied that appropriation to the extent set forth in this bill is necessary.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). I wish warmly to associate myself with his remarks.

As you know, for many years now I have been taking strong exception not only to the deployment of this system but to the long leadtime items that were talked about many years ago. The record is well documented on this.

In the full Committee on Appropriations early this week I had an opportunity to make what may be my swan song on this question. I cited a work which will be published this month by Dr. Herbert York which is entitled "Race to Oblivion." It is a brilliant statement of the history of strategic weapons development in our country. Among other things, Dr. York points out some of the gross mistakes that we made in the course of missile weapons development since sputnik, and goes into great detail about the Thor missile and about the Jupiter missile citing some of the statements that were made by the Department of Defense in support of those systems at that time. The main thrust of this very important paper, though, is in opposition to the deployment of the ABM system. So I hope, as I have urged my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in my remarks made the other day, that as we approach this complex problem of strategic weapons development, we take a more critical approach and study these questions even more intensely than I think we have in the past.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I will advance again argument in support of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have serious reservations about the priorities involved in the military construction bill which is before us today. I am concerned both with what has been included in this legislation and with what has been left out. I make specific reference to the lack of funds for the Chelsea Naval Hospital in Chelsea, Mass.

This facility serves the entire New England area and does so with a structure that is 129 years old. It is the primary reception station in the region for wounded Vietnam veterans. The present building was intended for no more than 350 beds but nearly twice that many patients requiring beds are now being treated by the hospital. This number approaches the maximum limit which the hospital is authorized to hold. I toured this facility recently and saw firsthand the effect of crowding two men into a space originally designed to hold just one.

Since 1966, efforts have been underway in the Congress to replace the present building with a seven-story hospital complex. In that year, we authorized, as a result of an amendment which I had introduced, \$9.3 million. Of this amount,

\$9 million was approved for funding. Two years later, an amended authorization was requested for \$2 million—an amount which the Senate then cut in half. Eventually, \$1.3 million was appropriated.

In the meantime, officials at the hospital had cleared up various local problems and early last year were ready to put the contract out for bids. However, as a result of rising inflation, indications were that the low bid would exceed the \$10.3 million total appropriations. I was informed that an additional \$1 million would be necessary before construction could proceed. The Department of Defense was notified and promised to give the matter serious consideration in developing the fiscal 1971 request that is before us today.

When the request was released in March of this year, no funds for Chelsea Naval Hospital were included. I was told that this was due to the fact that rising costs over the course of a year had raised the need from \$1 million to nearly \$6 million. Consequently, because of "existing priorities," the Bureau of the Budget had not included these funds in its request for military construction.

I question these priorities. The bill before us today will provide funds for new landing strips, recreational facilities, and officers' clubs, but it does not provide the funds which are necessary to build this new hospital for which the need has been so clearly demonstrated. I agree that we must practice some economy in Federal spending, however, I question the wisdom for practicing it at the expense of the hundreds of sick and wounded GI's who utilize the facilities at Chelsea Naval Hospital.

I fear that, if no one at the Department of Defense or at the Bureau of the Budget sees fit to recommend the necessary funds, the inflationary spiral will only push the costs higher. I know that, in the past, the Armed Services Committee has always recognized the very great need for a new hospital in Chelsea, and I am aware of the pressure under which they were placed this year on this legislation, but I would hope that positive and final action can be taken during the coming months which will enable construction of the proposed facility to begin next year at the latest. I regret that we are not able to take that action here today, and I also regret that for the reasons outlined above, I am forced to vote against this bill.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make clear certain items in this bill regarding the comparison of authorization and appropriation requested for the naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va.

In the fiscal 1968 program, the Congress authorized and funded projects for the naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va., which included:

Pumping improvements for dry-	
docks, 1, 2, and 3.....	573, 000
Radar overhaul facility.....	573, 000
Total	1, 236, 000

These items could not be awarded within available authorization and were not started by October 1, 1969, when the authorization was automatically re-

scinded under the provisions of section 805(a) of Public Law 90-408.

These projects have been included again in the fiscal 1971 program at a higher estimated cost. Since the previous authorization has been rescinded, new authorization in the full amount of the project estimates is required. However, the \$1,236,000 previously appropriated by the Congress for these items is still available and when combined with the funds recommended by the committee in this year's bill will allow the Navy to proceed with construction of the full scope of projects approved for the naval shipyard at Norfolk.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the inclusion of funds in this bill for deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system.

In early 1968, the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), and I were the first three Members of Congress to publicly oppose the deployment of an ABM system. We were pretty much alone then. We are not alone anymore.

As congressional knowledge and public awareness of the ABM system have increased, so has opposition to its deployment. Only through a massive administration campaign to equate ABM support with patriotism and only with a tie-breaking vote by the Vice President could the President win congressional approval of two ABM sites last year. I am confident that the administration proposal to expand the system to five new sites will not fare as well this year.

My opposition to ABM deployment is not partisan, Mr. Chairman. I opposed deployment of the Sentinel ABM system recommended by the Johnson administration, and I am no less opposed to deployment of the Safeguard system.

Neither is my opposition based on ideological considerations. I have said countless times on the floor of this House that the safety and security of all our citizens must always be our first priority. I have always advocated a first-class defense for this Nation.

I am opposed to ABM deployment because I do not believe, first of all, that this system has been or is likely to be perfected. On March 17, 1970, I inserted in this Record an editorial from the New York newspaper Newsday concerning the ABM. I quote from that editorial:

In order to be credible, the enormously complex ABM system of defense—which depends on a precise, chain-reaction sequence of detection and destruction of attacking missiles—must function at 100 percent efficiency, with no margin for error. It is no use to talk of knocking out, say, five of eight enemy ICBM's, because the thermonuclear warheads of the other three would wreak death and damage of catastrophic proportions. The ABM is thus unlikely to deter a fanatic enemy unless he is convinced he cannot possibly penetrate its defenses. There is a deep division of opinion within the scientific community over whether the ABM can ever provide such a guarantee. Yet we continue to posit that guarantee as our goal.

I do not believe we can afford such a risk, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we can afford to spend untold billions of dollars on a defense system whose credibility is, at best, questionable. If we are

to have a first-class defense—and I believe we must—then it had better be effective, practical, and credible. The ABM meets none of these criteria.

Some may argue, Mr. Chairman, that the ABM may someday be perfected. That is their privilege. I am willing to provide funds for research on this and other possible defense systems as long as there is a chance for success. I will not support, however, the expenditure of funds to deploy a system that is obviously not perfected.

How many failures must we have, Mr. Chairman, how much money must we waste before we realize that production and deployment of any defense system should only come after completion of the vital research work involved? How long will it be before we realize that unlimited appropriations, insufficient research, and hurry-up deployment will not provide us with an effective defense? How long must we condone the waste of billions of dollars on preventable cost overruns because we are told it is in the national interest to waste money on defense?

I oppose deployment of the ABM system, Mr. Chairman, because I sincerely believe that we can spend our money more effectively on other defense items and in other areas. I am truly sorry that those who pick apart appropriations for non-defense programs are often willing to give the Pentagon a blank check. I am dismayed by those who brand advances in health, housing, and education as "boondoggles" but are unwilling to use the same criteria when considering the defense budget.

I think the time has come for this Congress to be consistent and to live up to its responsibilities. Let us fight to end the ridiculous farm subsidies given to wealthy farmers. Let us put a stop to the outrageous misuse of funds by certain antipoverty organizations. Let us eliminate the inequities in our system of taxation. Above all, let us abandon the costly and unfortunate practice of treating the Pentagon like some "sacred cow" and instead chart a new course of efficiency and economy in defense spending.

Where defense is concerned, I want billions for the best but not one cent for waste. Because of this, I oppose deployment of the ABM.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, although the Appropriations Committee has deferred \$6,736,000 for an important undersea technology laboratory for the Naval Undersea Research and Development Center in San Diego until more information can be received from the Navy, I am hopeful this will be resolved in time for the Senate to approve funds for this project so that the House can consider it later in conference with the Senate on H.R. 17970.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I can only deplore the shortsightedness and lack of perception of the Army in neglecting to even ask the Congress for funds for construction at Fort Polk, La., during fiscal year 1971. I say the Army is shortsighted because our military leaders are allowing an excellent military post to further deteriorate

despite past events which have proven Fort Polk necessary to the national defense. The Army shows its lack of perception by not looking ahead to the years when this military installation most certainly will be needed again as it has periodically for the past 30 years. Despite its long history as an indispensable and important training base for American troops through three conflicts, there is yet only one building on the entire post constructed with appropriated funds as a permanent structure, and it was made permanent only because no engineer could devise a means to build it as a temporary building.

I am appalled at the Defense Department's attitude toward Fort Polk, especially in view of all the promises made to me and to the people of Louisiana over the years, promises which were apparently designed to lull us into a more cooperative spirit. Louisiana has indeed been cooperative throughout the 30-year history of the past, and the Army has not kept the first of its commitments.

All of this is still more appalling in view of the facts contained in a news article published this week in various Louisiana newspapers which I have just received, outlining the relative costs to the taxpayer for the training of soldiers at Fort Polk and her sister posts around the country. If the Army is truly interested in saving money I recommend action on the basis of this data. The article follows:

FORT POLK, LA.—It costs less to train an Infantry soldier at Fort Polk than at any other training center in the nation.

Combat commanders have long recognized the quality of soldiers trained here and now it is documented that soldiers are being turned out at mammoth savings to the taxpayer of up to \$1,000 per man. Fort Polk trains over 60,000 men annually.

Figures compiled by the Comptroller, U.S. Continental Army Command, Fort Monroe, Va., show significant savings at Fort Polk in a dozen military occupation specialties (MOS) over other training centers.

One example is that of an Infantry Direct Fire Crewman. According to the keeper of Continental Army Command pursestrings, it costs \$1,690.94 to turn out each soldier in this MOS at Fort Polk.

Conversely, the same source sets the price tag at \$2,639.94 at Fort Gordon, Ga.; \$2,239.00 at Fort Dix, N.J., and \$1,922.00 at Fort Jackson, S.C.

Fort Polk trains light weapons infantrymen at a cost of \$1,474.67. This is \$226.81 less than Fort Lewis, Wash., is able to train the same MOS and \$645.33 less than Fort Gordon.

Continental Army Command statistics covering total direct and indirect costs per trainee during Fiscal Year 1968-69 show Fort Polk's costs substantially lower than those of Fort Ord, Calif.; Fort Lewis, Fort Gordon, Fort Dix, Fort Jackson, S.C., and Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

In its 30-year history Fort Polk has trained well over 10 million soldiers for the Army. Even today the demand for well trained Infantry soldiers is heavy. But the spiraling cost of defense has been held down at Fort Polk with no loss in training effectiveness.

General William C. Westmoreland, Army Chief of Staff, summarized this feeling while in charge of Allied military operations in Vietnam:

"Fort Polk has a fine reputation in Vietnam and it certainly has a fine reputation with me.

"The many hundreds of young men I have

talked to who received basic combat training in the United States, plenty of whom were trained at Ft. Polk, spoke very highly of training in general, but those trained at Ft. Polk were particularly complimentary as to the realism of their training," he said.

Captain Joseph F. Trimble, a combat veteran of Vietnam, is typical of those in charge of training here.

Two letters addressed to Capt. Trimble by former trainees illustrate their high regard for the caliber of Ft. Polk instructions.

After being in combat, Pfc. James R. Rivard wrote: "I feel that your training must have been superior as I feel a lot more confident over here than men from other training forts."

"I certainly am proud I was at Ft. Polk," wrote Pfc. Jerry Austin after a week of training in Vietnam. "The introductory training I received at Ft. Polk is being repeated here in Vietnam," he said.

A number of factors affect the cost of training in southwest Louisiana. Ideal weather helps lessen the drain on taxpayers' dollars because there is no requirement for special seasonal clothing. Construction and fuel costs are minimized by the mild climate. Loss of vital training time due to inclement weather is almost nonexistent.

Food costs are reduced since in warm climates the caloric intake of soldiers is less than in cold climates; the health record is better at Ft. Polk than other military posts offering Basic Combat Training, and is the only such installation in America to have gone two years without a single death from meningitis.

Diversified terrain makes superior training possible at Ft. Polk. The 200,000-acre military reservation duplicates land formations of North Africa, Western Europe, Southeast Asia and Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, although there are some great disappointments in the appropriations for military construction which I personally would soon correct, I offer my support for the bill at this point, urging my colleagues to approve it.

I have taken special note of the appropriations slated for construction at England Air Force Base at Alexandria, La., which is in my own district, leading me to compliment the Air Force for its program of steady and effective development of this airbase. Each year the Air Force makes an effort to institute some improvements to the physical facilities there, and I have no doubt these are accompanied by even greater improvements in the installation's mission and in individual performance.

The bill should be approved.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against passage of the bill before us today, the military construction appropriation bill of 1971. Under the archaic rules of the House, this is the only way I can register my protest on the record against the \$365 million appropriation contained in this bill for the antiballistic-missile system.

There are parts of this nearly \$2 billion bill that I do support. If we are to move toward a volunteer military establishment, it is clear that we will need to provide adequate pay allowances and housing for those in our Nation's Armed Forces. At present, we are not providing adequate programs of support in either the area of pay or housing. I have estimated that up to 150,000 servicemen and their dependents are receiving a level of pay that, by definition, places them in the poverty category. Money provided in

this bill for improved military housing is needed and should help to encourage enlistment and retention of career personnel in the armed services.

However, the continued development of the ABM system is so wasteful and so dangerous to the peace of the world, that I cannot support a bill which includes money for its expansion.

And this bill does provide for the expansion of the ABM system. Without any assurance that the ABM will actually operate as planned, the two-site Safeguard program is now being expanded in this bill to an eight-site missile system. How much more will the system be expanded next year? How many more billions will we be asked to pour down the drain next year? How soon will we be needing another missile system to protect the ABM?

It is expected that the total request for ABM in the coming fiscal year will be \$1.6 billion. I do not object to expenditures for research and development for this project. I do object to the deployment of such a weapons system because it is an expenditure of enormous sums of money for a weapon which—as technologically developed today—cannot do the job, and second, because it will lead to further arms races and world instability at a time when we are praying that the SALT conference can bring a lessening of the world's tensions and the armaments race.

Members of the Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committee, who have given great study to this matter, have pointed out that if the Soviet Union maintains their ICBM force at approximately the present level, there will be no need for the ABM to protect our missile force. If the Soviets improve the accuracy of their ICBM's and expand to MIRV's, then the ABM system will be hopelessly outclassed and outnumbered—and there will be no sense in spending tens of billions of dollars on this defense system which will not defend. What about ABM construction to guard against a third party attack—such as one from Red China? Members of the committees again point out that ICBM technology is developing rapidly, multiple warheads are being provided and decoys developed which can easily foil any areawide defense provided by the type of ABM system that we have developed to date. It simply makes no sense to install a weapons system which is already being surpassed by the weapon it is meant to stop.

In the horrible, sickening logic of the nuclear age in which we live, our defense rests on convincing the potential enemy that any attack on us is suicidal, that no matter what attack an enemy launches on us, we will have the force and power to make a return attack which will be fatal to the attacker. There is today, and in the foreseeable future, no defense against our seaborne missile force—our submarine Polaris fleet. Thus we are preparing to spend billions and billions of dollars to defend only one of our deterrent arms, our stationary missiles—which are rapidly becoming obsolete because of increased ICBM accuracy by both our country and the Soviet Union.

What will further ABM deployment do to the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks now going on in Vienna? There is no way of telling, but I believe that it will seriously impair their chances for success. A further round of action and reaction will develop between the two super powers and the chance for stopping the unbelievably deadly arms race may be lost forever. Although it may be contended that we are appropriating money for an expanded ABM system to protect our missiles with a deterrent force which survives an enemy attack, the Soviets may well believe that we are building a bigger system as part of a plot to attack them first. We know this is not true; we know that our only desire in this world is peace—but the Soviets are looking at our actions, not our words. As a result, therefore, of any expanded ABM system on our part, they will counteract by developing more MIRV's and bigger bombs—thus the dangerous, multibillion-dollar process goes on.

Consideration of this appropriation for an expanded ABM can wait until we see how SALT is proceeding. We must not throw away what may be one of mankind's last great hopes for peace just to build a weapon which will not accomplish its purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the legislation before us. I think it shows the careful study that is characteristic of the gentleman from Florida and his committee.

One point I wish to comment upon in particular. The hearings at page 308 disclose an inquiry about the movements within the naval air technical training command. It was proposed originally to move about 3,000 students in this program to Memphis from Jacksonville, Fla.; and then, in order to do this and to make room at Memphis, it was suggested that 1,500 students be moved from Memphis to a new center to be established at Meridian. The hearings developed, and properly so, that this is not a proper course of action; and that instead the students removed from Memphis to make room for those being moved from Jacksonville should be put in Jacksonville.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that when the military move into an area, as they have in Jacksonville, that it is a great blow to the economy when they move out; and this should not be done absent very compelling reasons. There obviously is no very compelling reason to start a new base in a third location when men are moved from Jacksonville to Memphis, forcing the latter to make room for them by moving others from Memphis. The committee, and particularly its chairman, Congressman SIKES, are to be congratulated for correcting this error in planning before it had gone too far and before funds were expended to bring this about.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest most strongly the inclusion of \$357 million in new obligational authority for Safeguard ABM construction in fiscal 1971 in this appropriation.

I can see no justification, either from a strategic or an economic standpoint, to appropriate funds at this time for advance preparation of five phase II area

defense sites in addition to the hard-point sites at Malstrom, Grand Forks, and Whiteman. The committee claims that denial of the funds will delay operational readiness dates for these sites by a year. It appears to me that such a delay is very much in our national interest at this time, particularly in light of encouraging reports emanating from the strategic arms limitation talks that progress is being made on agreements to limit ABM sites and to curtail development of MIRV. If we are indeed carrying these negotiations forward in good faith, it is unwise at this time to proceed with further ABM site development at a heavy cost to the taxpayers. Repeated cutbacks in funds for important domestic programs have been justified by the inflationary impact of Federal spending, yet we are now being asked to appropriate more than \$350 million for a system which expert opinion claims will never be effective for its intended purposes in any event.

Mr. Speaker, every year the Pentagon comes up to the Hill with a different justification for ABM. First it was for protection against Russian attack. Then a possible missile assault from the technologically primitive Chinese arsenal was advanced. And finally, we were warned about the need for protection against possible accidental attacks from any source. The committee in its report is attempting to coalesce this confusion by citing all three potential dangers as reasons for pushing forward with a broadened ABM program. It is time to apply commonsense to this perennial controversy, and we can do so without in any way harming the security of our Nation. Since there is no proof that the radar systems on which the ABM would depend would themselves survive a missile attack, there is no reason to believe that the ABM will ever function as intended. In the positive spirit of the SALT negotiations and our general initiatives for peace throughout the world we should defer further work on this system. Our nuclear submarine fleet provides ample deterrent threat to any nation which might conceivably make the insane move of launching a nuclear attack on the United States, and I am convinced that we would do ourselves and the cause of international peace a favor by denying the ABM funds in this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the military construction appropriation bill for 1971. In the face of ever pressing domestic needs crying for attention from every corner of this country I do not believe an appropriation of \$1,997,037,000 for military construction can be justified. This figure, moreover, represents an increase over fiscal year 1970 appropriations of \$435,747,000. Especially unwarranted are the funds recommended for the Safeguard missile system. For years the antiballistic missile has been some rather dubious technology in search of a rationale. Its latest guise is no more convincing than any of the earlier justifications. America, in reality, cannot afford to squander these millions, nor the future billions of dollars this program will cost in the years to come. The needs of her people are too great

and the future security of this Nation will not depend so much on our weaponry as on their well-being.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the debate that is taking place on this bill. I would be the first to say that H.R. 17970 contains many important and worthwhile military construction projects and programs. I would say categorically that I support at least three out of four of the projects funded in this bill and requiring most of the \$1,997,037,000 which the bill appropriates.

In addition to funds for the service academies and funds earmarked for Vietnamization and support of the South Vietnamese Army, I heartily support the \$75,000,000 appropriation for pollution abatement construction projects on military installations. I have seen firsthand some of the air and water pollution abuses taking place on military bases, and I applaud the determination of the Department of Defense and the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee to act on this problem.

However, Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a flaw which to me at this time, outweighs all of its good points. I am speaking of the \$365 million included in this bill for deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system, including \$8 million for housing at ABM facilities.

These funds will be spent to continue construction at the two-phase I ABM sites begun during fiscal 1970 with the \$14 million that was appropriated last year, and to begin construction of radars and ABM launching sites included in the six new phase II program.

Despite the President's assurances last year, when he rejected President Johnson's plan to defend population centers with Sentinel ABM sites, that only two hardened Minuteman ICBM sites would require ABM protection, I voted last year against any deployment funds for the Safeguard program. I felt that inadequate assurances had been offered: First that the Safeguard would be a workable defensive weapon and second, that its effect on the new phase of the strategic arm race had been measured carefully enough. The answers available then or now to these questions do not, in my mind, justify an expenditure at this time of nearly half a billion dollars in the next fiscal year for this new program.

I have supported and will continue to support funds for research and development of a workable ABM system; should the clear need arise for America to take this step we should be ready. But I do not believe that readiness is achieved by deploying these eight sites when it is not clear that the ABM sites themselves will not be more vulnerable to attack than the offensive missile silos they are protecting.

If this were an earlier era, I would probably make my statement in opposition to this phase of the appropriation and to this program and vote for the bill on final passage because of my support for other programs included in it.

I no longer feel this is responsible. For despite serious questions raised by a number of colleagues about the wisdom of the Safeguard program in gen-

eral, and the wisdom of expanding what was to be a two-site program by four-fold in a single year into an eight-site program, no procedural opportunity has been offered to obtain a recorded yeand-may vote on this \$365 million item. The only way remaining for us to record strong opposition to this project in this amount of money is to oppose the bill on final passage.

The challenge which is really facing us on this measure is not whether the House of Representatives will agree to spend money to abate pollution, or to improve the service academies, or to help speed Vietnamization. We will and must do these things. Our challenge is to rise up and be counted against a controversial new program in which \$365 million is beginning to look very much like the tip of an iceberg which will cost tens of billions of dollars, which will help to perpetuate the imbalance between defense and domestic spending, which may not serve any defensive purpose, and which may hinder the progress of SALT talks now in progress in Vienna. This is our challenge. Do we accept with a nod of our heads and with rhetoric the divided judgment of the Appropriations Committee without the opportunity for a record vote?

I think this challenge is of overriding importance in our consideration of H.R. 17970. Thus I will cast a "nay" vote when the roll is called.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, and in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, \$637,909,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 166]

Addabbo	Culver	Hays
Annunzio	Daddario	Hébert
Ashbrook	Dawson	Hollifield
Ashley	Denney	Jarman
Aspinall	Dent	Kirwan
Barrett	Dickinson	Kuykendall
Blaggi	Diggs	Long, La.
Biester	Dwyer	McCarthy
Blatnik	Edwards, Ala.	McDade
Brademas	Edwards, La.	McMillan
Broyhill, N.C.	Erlenborn	Martin
Broyhill, Va.	Esch	Mayne
Bush	Fascell	Michel
Celler	Fish	Moorhead
Chisholm	Ford	Murphy, N.Y.
Clark	William D.	Ottinger
Clausen	Foreman	Passman
Don H.	Fountain	Patman
Clay	Gaydos	Pelly
Conable	Gibbons	Philbin
Conyers	Hansen, Wash.	Pike
Corman	Hastings	Podell
Cowger	Hawkins	Pollock

Powell
Pryor, Ark.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Ruth

St Germain
Satterfield
Scheuer
Schwengel
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton

Stuckey
Taft
Thompson, Ga
Ullman
Weicker
Whitehurst
Whitten

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17970, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 337 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 2, line 7, strike out "\$637,909,000" and insert "\$284,109,000".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out the funds for the deployment of the Safeguard ABM. Those of us who are opposed to deployment favor programs for research on the ABM, and in the course of my remarks I will point out that there are alternatives to the deployment of the Safeguard ABM which offer much more promise and hope for perfecting a system than does the Safeguard ABM.

Mr. Chairman, Congress does have a function to perform in reviewing our military posture. It is our responsibility to insist that to the greatest extent possible the \$70 billion to \$80 billion that we approve annually for weaponry for the Department of Defense shall not be ill conceived, unproven and irrationally hurried weapons systems. That is why I have offered my amendment today to strike the funds for the Safeguard ABM system which I say to the House is ill conceived, is unproven and is being irrationally hurried into deployment before adequate research has been done upon it.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the Safeguard ABM will not do—will not do—the things that the Department of Defense says that it is intended to do. And Department officials, if pressed, will concede the system will not perform the functions they hold out for it.

It is admitted in the testimony before the Appropriations Committee that the system will not protect against an all-out Soviet missile attack. It will not protect against the so-called Chinese threat if and when the Chinese threat comes into being—it is nonexistent today—it will not protect our bomber bases from missiles fired from submarines, it will not protect against the accidental launching of a missile. It will do none of these things.

The Department of Defense itself concedes that it will not do many of these things. That is why in testimony before the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee Secretary Packard had this to say, and listen to this: He says:

If we do have to take further steps, we have options available.

This is a concession by the Department of Defense, that further steps may be necessary in order to do the protective things that they have outlined. In other words, "if we have to take further steps" we have these options.

For example, we have under consideration a new, smaller, less-expensive radar and data processor aimed specifically at close-in defense of Minuteman.

Why do they not continue the research on that before they deploy the Safeguard?

He further says:

Deployment of this equipment with additional Sprint interceptors is a possibility. Also, we are actively working on ways of rebasing Minuteman missiles in harder silos or on transporters. Further, we shall continue to study additional forms of ballistic missile defense, such as those previously mentioned.

A longer range program for enhancing the survival of our deterrent is the Undersea-launched long-range missile system, for which we now have an active research and development program.

Does it make sense to engage in this multibillion dollar system deployment, knowing that it is ineffective, when we may wind up using a different antiballistic missile system? I think we ought to stop right now. I think we ought to weigh the alternatives before this full commitment. I think that we ought to strike this appropriation from this bill.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of my amendment striking out the funds for deployment of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for an amendment to delete the \$357 million construction funds for the ABM.

The committee's minority report states the reasons very clearly.

(1) Its costs are too high; (2) its capabilities are most marginal; and (3) its effect on the strategic arms race is potentially explosive.

The expansion of the ABM is a tragic waste of money on unproven hardware. This system will not work and adds nothing to America's security. In fact, it will actually reduce our security by recklessly fueling the arms race at precisely the moment when a major breakthrough in the SALT talks is at hand to bring it under control. A massive deployment of the ABM would leave the United States open to the misinterpretation as to whether it might really be building a first strike nuclear capability.

If other nations then feel the need to protect themselves we will have set off another cycle of action-reaction. Billions of extra dollars will be spent. Fifty billion dollars, more than twice the cost of putting a man on the moon, is the projected ABM cost. But these billions will yield no greater security for America. Rather, their inflationary impact will weaken job security and dollar security even further.

It is ludicrous that increased expenditures on the ABM are not regarded by the President as inflationary after he vetoed expenditures on health and education because he held them responsible for "spending ourselves poor". In this distortion of national priorities by a near-obsession with military hardware, I share the anguish of Senator MANSFIELD who asked:

Where will it all end?

But the most immediate effect of the President's shortsighted decision will be to speed the already declining economy into our worst recession in well over a decade. The vast sums of money earmarked by the President for ABM will almost certainly have to be used instead for economic recovery before the year is out.

Moreover, the President should spell out his apparent intentions to put ABM sites in heavily populated areas of northern and southern California. These sites obviously will become Russian and Chinese targets in the event of open intercontinental missile warfare, and since the ABM will not work, millions of Californians in urban areas will be less secure than they are now.

Deployment of the ABM also creates fear of accidental nuclear explosion. Considerable anxiety is being generated among a great many citizens in California and yet they cannot even be certain that the ABM will provide protection to them.

The President wants to increase the ABM program now to \$1.5 billion, five times more than the administration is asking to help cities fight crime, and nearly twice as large as the amount being asked to fight water pollution.

We have already spent, since the end of World War II, over \$20 billion on missile systems which were never completed or when developed were found to be obsolete. Furthermore, the advocates of the ABM have been unable to agree with certainty as to justification for its immediate deployment.

I urge the Members of the House to join with me today to end this madness by deleting the funds for ABM construction.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be as brief as possible. During general debate I pointed out that this issue has already been debated and voted on twice this year. We also voted on it last year, and here we are again. I commend the gentleman from Illinois for being so persistent.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief points. First, the members of the Committee on Armed Services, and members of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittees on Military Construction and Defense have all heard and considered detailed testimony on this issue. They almost all agree that this is the correct approach. We can obtain a body of scientific opinion, both pro and con, on this issue. This is possible on almost any issue.

The gentleman says it will not work. I do not know that it will not work, and

maybe the gentleman does not know. But just let me say that if the gentleman from Illinois is wrong we could lose the country. If the gentleman from Michigan is wrong, we lose the money.

Now, if I had to make that choice, I would prefer to lose the money. I prefer to be on the safe side. I am not convinced that the arguments presented by the gentleman from Illinois are any better than the arguments presented by the other side.

As a matter of fact, after attending the hearings and considering the facts I am in favor of the position we present in this bill. But, apart from that—let me reiterate again—if I am wrong we may lose the money, but if the gentleman from Illinois is wrong we could lose the country.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, it is not the gentleman from Illinois who is asserting that the system will not work; that is the testimony of Dr. Foster and Secretary Packard before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have listened to Dr. Foster and Mr. Packard. They are the ones who supported this item in the bill. As a matter of fact, this item was presented in a slightly different form under a Democratic President—

Mr. YATES. That does not make it right.

Mr. CEDERBERG. No; that does not make it right, but it also does not make it wrong.

Mr. YATES. That is right, but Dr. Foster and Mr. Packard both agreed that an all-out Russian attack cannot be stopped.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If I am going to make a choice I am going to choose the safer course. If we follow my course we might lose some money, but it may save the country. If we follow the choice presented by the gentleman we could lose the country.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make an observation that if the ones who are trying to save the money that will be spent for this system would have been as dedicated about saving money in every other boondoggle that has come before us, then it would not have been necessary to raise the debt limit the other day.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I believe the gentleman has made his presentation over the years, and I realize that testimony and arguments have been presented on both sides of this question. But I want to ask the gentleman what he feels will happen if there is an agreement made in Vienna, vis-a-vis the MIRV weapons system, as is now being discussed. And, as to the ABM, what are we going to do if we are to successfully go ahead with those discussions?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me say to the gentleman that I cannot answer that

question because I am not privy to what the agreement might be. I am hopeful that some kind of agreement will be made that would make it possible to scale down the kind of threat we now face from the Russians. I cannot tell the gentleman what that agreement might be, but I have confidence in the people who are trying to complete it. I do not know anyone who wants to spend money for defense, including the ABM, except as may be required in the best interests of our country.

I have great respect for the gentleman from California and for the gentleman from Illinois. I do not want to spend this money—you do not want to spend it—but if we spend it and I am wrong, we will only lose the money. If we do not spend it, we could lose the country.

Mr. COHELAN. Notwithstanding our disagreement, the gentleman is very knowledgeable in this field, and has been very useful for many, many years on his committee. But what are we going to do if they agree to scrub the system? Do you not feel it will be better to postpone this?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am more concerned about what might happen if they discontinue the system. If we complete the SALT talks, and if we have an agreement, something can surely be worked out. But what if we do not effect a meaningful agreement? Then we would have a time lag that would definitely not be in the best interests of the country.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman must know that options are still open and it still brings us back to the fundamental question of whether or not we have an assured destructive capability or a second-strike capability. I think the gentleman knows that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I know, but if we are going to make a mistake, I want it to be a mistake on the safe side.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think one answer to the gentleman from California is, and this should be understood, that the money will not be spent next year. This is new obligational authority. Part of it will be spent in future years.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have complete confidence in those who are running the Department of Defense and as to how they will spend this money.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. Chairman, I have fought the deployment of an ABM system since the 1966 Nike X decision. The names and some components have changed but the central question has not been answered: will the entire system work? The answer to this simple yet central question has not been satisfactorily answered, yet we are going ahead deploying a multibillion dollar system that does not seem capable of completing its assigned mission.

We must remember that the Safeguard ABM is a composite of five individually and supposedly interlocking components: two distinct missile sys-

tems—Spartans and Sprints—two different radars—MSR and PAR—and a highly sophisticated data processing system. There has been little further information that the data processing component will work at all. This is crucial because the information collected by PAR will not be transferred by the processing system to MSR which coordinates antiballistic missiles to intercept the incoming missiles.

In this years hearings on military construction, Deputy Secretary Packard said—page 72 of hearings:

We are concerned about the development of computer systems and the software . . . The computer program is designed so that it will have the capability of being expanded later if necessary . . . I am confident that we will be able to achieve an adequate computer capability.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this testimony is devastating. What it means is that we do not now have a basic computer and data processing capability for ABM and yet we are asked to deploy it. Without this component the entire system will not work.

Thus the central question—Will the Safeguard system work?—is in serious doubt.

There are other disconcerting aspects of this system. Its "search for a mission"—the Chinese in 1968, the Soviets in 1969, the accidental launch, and the Chinese in 1970—eloquently bespeak the uncertainty of this multibillion-dollar experiment. Still other strategic questions have not been answered: How can Safeguard ABM "protect" against a low altitude attack, or shipping nuclear weapons into a harbor under a neutral flag?

There is another very recent development that should enter into these debates today. There are persistent reports that the SALT talks will agree to limit an ABM to Washington and Moscow. If this turns out to be the case, has DOD planned to avoid waste in other site locations? We do not have any information on this.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently urged that the deployment of strategic weapons such as ABM and MIRV could have a devastating effect on the SALT negotiations. Yesterday, I spoke on the decision to deploy MIRV in the light of tentative agreements to limit MIRV's in the SALT talks. The other information that SALT negotiations might limit ABM to Moscow and Washington, D.C., has not generated any new positions by the administration on the deployment of phase II of the Safeguard ABM. This is an unconscionably compounded tragedy. Not only does the system not work, but we are in the process of deploying it in areas that might not be allowed if the SALT treaty is negotiated.

As important is the total cost of this system, which according to current estimates is over \$12 billion—quite a cost overrun for the initial cost projections of \$6.6 billion.

I have fought the ABM deployment from its inception. It is untested as an entire system, it is costly, it is of doubtful strategy value, it is a waste of our Na-

tion's precious assets. As I have mentioned in prior debates—

This is not a question of national security. This is a question of condoning massive waste in the military sphere and refusing to look at the pressing needs of the people in our cities.

I am not, nor have I ever been against security, but national security involves more than massive defense expenditures; it requires the reallocation of our spending priorities to our critical domestic problems. Thus, I do not favor a wasteful defense budget or one that leads to an escalation of the arms race. The ABM is the most visible symbol of these twin evils in defense planning. It does not work and it is costly.

I urge the Members to support this amendment and only appropriate funds to test a single prototype of the ABM and not deploy it to many additional sites without adequate testing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House to charts that have been prepared in accordance with the Department of Defense programs. They show the almost identical deployment between the Safeguard and the Sentinel. They are almost the same deployment. The difference is minimal.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is designed to limit the ABM program entirely to research and development. Such an action would make a farce of the ABM program and of the years of effort and would mean that the many millions of dollars expended would be wasted money.

We have been working on an ABM system since 1956 and on the development of some of the components of the Safeguard system since 1963, all of it until this year in the research and development stages. The obligations up to and including fiscal 1970 for ABM programs have been \$5.2 billion. Over \$4.1 billion of this has been for R.D.T. & E. If we have learned anything at all, we should now be ready for deployment and that is taking place in a very limited way. If we are not going to have deployment, let us forget the whole thing. Let us stop spending money needlessly.

The objective of research and development in defense programs is to perfect improved weapons systems. There has never been a case where we simply carried on experimentation for the sake of experiment. The amendment would

accomplish exactly that. It would mean carrying on experimentation for the sake of experiment, with no prospect ever of achieving an effective weapons system. It may be possible to have a more ridiculous proposal, but I doubt it. The success of experiments shows we are ready for limited deployment. If we change now to another system such as additional Poseidon submarines, it means more delay—and we already are late.

If you would look at the record of the hearings and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find the following statement:

Without some measure of protection against missile strikes against the United States, an open invitation exists for any belligerent to risk inflicting a crippling blow if it should appear to be sufficiently in their interests to do so.

We anticipate that the ABM program will provide a level of protection for our own strike capability and some protection for the people of our cities. Thus, in the event of a hostile strike, a substantial measure of death, damage and destruction could be averted. I do not know how to place a dollar value on that accomplishment, but I will guarantee it would save human lives and much more than the cost of the Safeguard system. It would give us a chance to survive as a Nation which otherwise we would not have.

I am sure that the House has noted from the morning headlines that the Soviets have now stationed missile-launching submarines off Greenland, with their missiles targeted on the Northeastern United States. They already have missile-launching submarines on site with missiles targeted on the eastern and southern coasts of the United States.

Shall we ignore this ominous situation?

To adopt this amendment is to ignore the presence of the Soviet missile-launching submarines off our coast.

For whose benefit?

I want protection for this country—not wishful thinking. Any measure of protection is better than no protection.

Yes, I know we have disarmament talks in progress. I hope they are successful. I hope they are even partially successful. But let me respectfully remind my colleagues that we have had 1,500 talks with the Soviets and you can tick off on the fingers of one hand the significant achievements of those 1,500 conferences. Go ahead with all the talks you want. Push for disarmament. I wish you well. But I urge that we in Congress help our Nation to keep its powder dry while the talks go on.

An overwhelming defeat for this amendment will show the Soviets that more than talk is required. Meaningful action on disarmament can speedily be reflected in cutbacks in our own weapons program, including ABM. Adoption of this amendment would simply give the Soviet ABM system a longer lease on life and remove the incentive for meaningful disarmament talks. We might present an attack on the U.S. because our enemies no longer could consider us defenseless.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief, but I also am a member of the Defense Subcommittee, and I have heard the testi-

mony to which the gentlemen have made reference.

We depend for our deterrent against attack in this country on missiles underground and under the ocean. We have the Polaris and the Poseidon and ground installations in the North Central United States. I think we owe it to the people of this country to maintain as strong a deterrent position as we can. This second stage Safeguard ABM system is designed to deter the enemy, as the distinguished gentleman from Florida has said, from thinking they can knock out our missiles on the ground in the United States.

If we wait and see before funding long lead time items, until we have a test and evaluation of an actual ABM intercept, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Illinois here this afternoon, it can defer the realities of a Safeguard system of the limited type sought for as much as 5 to 10 years.

I think such a delay is contrary to the best interests of our people. In the long run what I hope will happen will be we will transfer our retaliatory deterrent to submarines in the ULMS program, because ULMS will need no ABM system, and we will have a continuing capability that will assure that any enemy that launches against us will be able to be wiped out. They will know this, and then maybe we will get into and be able to maintain a nuclear checkmate position worldwide. At this juncture in our affairs, however, we certainly owe it to the people of this country to see that this missile deterrent of ours is maintained and strengthened. One way to do it is to continue with this modified ABM system at this time.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement on time. I do not want to cut anyone off, but I believe the Committee would like to move along.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous consent requested of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike all funds from H.R. 17970 for deployment of the Safeguard program: The opponents of Safeguard seem to have three worries.

First, they are worried about what effect deployment will have on the SALT talks. In answer to that let's not forget there might never have been any SALT talks, or any agreement by the Soviets to even meet to talk, had it not been for our decision on the deployment of the first phase of the Safeguard system.

Second, the opponents are so very worried that the system will not work. Well, our enemies seem to have made it work. Does anyone believe Soviet armies would be stupid enough to spend money if it would not work. Surely we possess as

much technological capability as the Russians. The truth is our tests have been going on during the past year. This information has been classified and quite properly has not been mentioned here, but the great majority of this past year's tests have been successful.

Third, there is worry about the cost. As has been pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan, if the opponents are wrong, and the system will work and yet we fail to deploy it—then we are in real bad shape; if they are right and the system does have some defects then all we have lost is the cost up to the point the system proves defective.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing we can say for the opponents of the Safeguard system. They are not only insistent but believe in perseverance. The question we are considering today was debated last year by the Armed Services Committee, and later by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee; then the same issue has been debated again this year by the Armed Services Committee and by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and now finally by the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

In other words we have been up the hill and down the hill, and up the hill and down the hill again. Once again in our debate today the central issue is whether we may take the risk to lose some money, on the one hand, or take the infinitely greater risk to lose our country on the other. There is only one course to take on this or almost any other issue, and that is the safe course. If we adopt this crippling amendment today, we ignore a grave threat to the United States. Today we are not debating Vietnam or the Cambodia incursion but the defense of America or protection of ourselves. We owe it to the people of this country to keep the credibility of our deterrent. If we delay to deploy the Safeguard, then we suffer a serious loss of time, which cannot be regained or recovered.

There has been adequate debate. There has been full and complete discussion. Perhaps there has been even too much argument over this issue. We have the same old opponents, the same old arguments. It is interesting to note that those who argue against the ABM are the same ones who are against providing funds to insure the safe withdrawal of our troops from South Vietnam. But this same source of opposition to military procurement of this kind seems to be most interestingly withdrawn and be strangely dissolved when our military hardware is needed for presently existing confrontations in other geographical areas of the world.

The time to end the debate over the Safeguard is long past due. The reason is that for far too frequently and for far too long we have charitably and generously provided our enemies advance notice of our intentions. As my colleague from Missouri has so appropriately put it, we telegraph our intent to punch the enemy before it ever happens.

We have plowed the ground. There is nothing new. Let us not forget the time is late. Our enemies have an ABM.

On matters of national defense the late distinguished Speaker Rayburn so eloquently said he would rather live in an America with less affluence than to be a rich man in some other country. We have a gross national product that will soon reach one trillion dollars. We can afford what it takes for defense. We must not and we cannot worry about the cost if it means saving this country. If all of us would only stop to think we would not ask the price of survival.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to make three quick points.

First, Secretary Laird has based a great deal of his argument for the ABM deployment on the projections for the deployment of the Soviet SS-9's. The country has not been informed that there have been no new starts on SS-9's since last September or October. This changes the whole picture. It greatly weakens the case for Safeguard.

Second, there is a serious question about whether the hardware being contemplated for Safeguard is the right hardware. Many technical experts argue that, while it is possible to construct a system of ABM's to protect the Minutemen, they should be short-range and should not include the long-range Spartan. What happened here was that a system developed for nationwide defense was applied to a different task.

Third, the testing cannot be completed, cannot take place. I have seen the Kwajalein test site. They can test only one or two missiles at a time. The problem of testing for a complex attack is insoluble.

I understand that one reason why the Bell Laboratories refuse to undertake any further contract, after the present contract, is that they have concluded that the software problem of developing computers for a complex attack is insoluble.

I urge adoption of the Yates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that important issues like the antiballistic missile tend to polarize in the extremes. It seems that one must be labeled as either an all-out proponent or opponent of an ABM system. Logical positions in between the two extremes are totally ignored when in fact a valid middle stance can be taken. This describes my personal position on the system.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe that our deterrent strategic system must be safeguarded and protected. If a potential enemy has the knowledge that we can survive a first strike and still have the capability of retaliating, it is probable that he will not initiate the first attack.

For a long time we were relatively secure because of our deterrent missiles like Polaris and Minuteman. But later it appeared that possible enemies were developing and deploying overwhelming power which rendered the Minuteman

vulnerable. This was the reason for the decision to deploy phase I of the Safeguard system.

I supported the deployment of antiballistic missiles at Malmstrom and Grand Forks Air Force Bases. I support continuation of the development at these two sites, as well as at Whitman Air Force Base, because they are designed and intended to protect our Minuteman deterrent capability.

Yes, there are technical doubts, but in view of the urgent time requirements imposed upon us by an unsettled world, I believe we must proceed with the deployment of ABM's at these three sites.

But beyond this point I must take issue with the administration, the majority of the Armed Services Committee on which I serve, and the majority of the Appropriations Committee. I feel very strongly that we need not rush into deployment of ABM missiles at the five additional sites proposed.

This proposal is based upon a completely different philosophy of defense than that which justified the first three sites. This deployment would not be for the purpose of protecting our deterrent capability. Rather, it would be for protection against a Chinese threat and protection of certain population centers. Here, I do not believe the time factor is as urgent as in the first three sites and I feel that we can wait for another year's development and, hopefully, a diplomatic breakthrough in the SALT talks.

If China develops a nuclear power, the deployment of Polaris and Poseidon submarines into Asiatic waters can act as a deterrent against the developing Chinese capability, just as it did against the developing Soviet capability. They can give us time just as they gave us time to respond to the Soviet threat.

Furthermore, by injecting a totally new concept and philosophy into our defense at this time, we will introduce an additional complicating factor into the delicate SALT talks now in progress.

I have heard some military authorities venture the opinion that overconcentration of our strategic missiles and our antiballistic missiles into a narrow continental corridor will only serve as an inducement to the Soviet Union to risk a first strike. Their nuclear capability is well dispersed. Ours is concentrated into a narrow corridor. Obviously a dispersed-launch capability has a greater probability of successfully initiating a first strike against a highly concentrated target area. The time has come when we should stop concentrating our power into that narrow corridor and disperse it at sea.

I cannot support the Yates amendment because it uses too broad a brush. It would eliminate timely protection for our Minuteman missiles and I cannot in good conscience be a party to such an act. I do state, however, that this is far enough. I sincerely hope that we will pause and reflect before embarking upon a broad and expensive plan which is based upon a totally new concept of defense and one which has not been completely thought out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. OBEY, COHELAN, and YATES yielded their time to Mr. GIAIMO.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

I was very interested in the comments of my distinguished colleague and friend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) who stated several minutes ago that he is interested, and I believe properly so, in the protection of the United States and not in wishful thinking.

I, too, feel exactly this way. Yet, I believe we put a different interpretation on this. Unless we are assured that we have a perfected ABM defense system, the highest possible example of wishful thinking that we can wish upon the American people is to sell them a bill of goods that they have a good defensive ABM system when in fact, the ABM system will not be effective in case of an attack. The American people will then be putting their eggs into a defective basket which will be found wanting when it is needed. They will indeed have been lured into a sense of false security.

Let us look at the testimony of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Hon. David Packard, on page 4, part 4 of the hearings where he says:

Also at Kwajalein the Spartan interceptor had satisfactorily completed the first phase of development testing. We have had 15 launchings of which 11 were completely successful, 2 partially successful, and 2 failures. Our Sprint interceptor is being tested also satisfactorily at the White Sands missile range. We have had 38 launches of which 19 were completely successful, 9 partially successful, and 10 failures.

Now, I submit to my colleagues apply this kind of a defense record to an attack on the city of New York or any other major city in this Nation and assume that the Russians or the Chinese or anyone else sends over a host of missiles and of our ABM missiles launched against them 19 are successful and 10 are failures. I submit to you that an ABM system which does not knock out 100 percent of those incoming missiles has still resulted in the destruction of New York City or any other major population area of this Nation and that we will have in fact accomplished nothing.

And, mind you, these tests were done under perfect conditions, not under sudden attack by a very real enemy desiring to invade our defensive system by using all kinds of modern decoy techniques and devices to avoid our defensive system.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Does not the gentleman agree that the basis of our whole strategic posture is the second strike capability?

Mr. GIAIMO. Of course, and also our dependence on mutual deterrents. The safety of this Nation depends, I am convinced, on the adequacy of our offensive missiles and our second strike capability.

I believe we are engaged in wishful thinking if we cause the American people to believe that we can build a defensive system which is going to give us adequate protection. A defensive system in missile warfare must be 100-percent effective. Otherwise it does not work. It does not matter whether we have one missile coming into New York City or we have three missiles. We get into arguments of overkill and everything else but the fact of the matter is that if one lands, millions and millions of Americans will be killed. Deterrence must depend upon our offensive capability of retaliation.

I will take second place to no one in my desire to see the United States have an adequate defense, but the time has come, in my opinion, in this Congress when we must question the Department of Defense and its expenditures of money. We can no longer allow the Department to hide behind the argument that "If you cut this in any way, if you question us in any way, you are somewhat less than loyal, you are somewhat less than willing to give us a 100-percent defense position for this Nation." This is just not so. Time and time again we have seen examples of waste in the Department of Defense which they will sweep under the rug and say "We had to do this in the interest of national defense." Of course, reasonable men understand that in preparing an adequate defense with new and experimental programs, there must be some waste, but you and I and this Congress have an obligation as never before to make greater efforts to see to it that this waste, this experimentation with questionable programs is held to a minimum.

We cannot just constantly go on presenting greater and greater tax bills to the American people so that we can spend billions of dollars for an F-111 airplane and billions of dollars for a C-5 transport airplane and billions and billions and billions of dollars for the ABM system and then have some person in the DOD come before the American people blithely and say, "The program did not work. But we are \$5 billion or \$10 billion poorer because of the fact that it did not work." We cannot in good conscience as legislators continue to allow the Department of Defense to come up here and not have to justify these programs. We cannot any longer shirk our duty. We must question much more intensively the DOD on many of their programs which are highly questionable. The DOD must be held to the same degree of accountability that we demand of every other agency of the U.S. Government.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted. I want to take a few minutes to consider in detail one aspect of the controversy over ABM and MIRV, because I believe we are very close to a peril point of vast import for the whole world. One hesitates to use the overworked word "crisis" to describe anything short of the onset of world war III. But we have a crisis, in the most literal sense, at the Strategic

Arms Limitation talks now in progress in Vienna.

If an agreement is reached to limit the development and deployment of strategic weapons like ABM and MIRV, we can hope to extend the mutual deterrence that has bought time to try to resolve major conflicts without a major war.

If we fail, however, we can look forward to a destabilizing spiral in the arms race that will further imperil the security of the world and lead to even greater squandering of money and energy on weapons that nobody wants except those who profit from making them and those who see power and prestige in possessing them.

Given these stakes, it would be tragic if the Nixon administration seeks to retain a misleading statistical margin in overkill capacity at the price of a substantial reduction in the possibility of getting an agreement in Vienna. We teeter toward oblivion reciting slogans about security.

My concern about developments in Vienna was not quieted by a story in the Washington Post on May 14 reporting that the administration is linking an arms agreement with an expanded ABM system and the introduction of multiple warheads on our nuclear missiles.

The story said:

The Nixon Administration strategy for winning Senate approval for these weapons apparently is to make a vote against them look like a vote against an arms control pact. It was based on a statement Secretary of Defense Laird made May 12 before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Secretary Laird, predicting success at SALT, said the accuracy of that prediction depended on Congress's willingness to go along with the President's desire to expand the Safeguard defense system and deploy MIRV on our Minuteman III missile force.

In effect we are asked to believe that we can have an agreement limiting strategic arms and the arms we need to agree to limit at the same time, a feat that would make eating our cake and having it too look relatively simple.

As with the decision to invade Cambodia, this latest test of the limits of our credulity leaves us feeling like Alice in Wonderland.

"There's no use trying," said Alice, "one can't believe impossible things."

"I daresay you haven't had much practice," said the Queen.

"When I was your age, I always did it half-an-hour a day. Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast."

The kind of "willing suspension of disbelief" that the Queen recommends to Alice may be necessary for poetic faith, as Coleridge said, but political faith cannot rely indefinitely on such stretchable imaginations. If the Nixon administration learned no other lesson from its predecessor, it should have learned that one.

One cannot believe impossible things, and the effect of Mr. Laird's statement was to spread gloom among even the most sanguine about the sincerity of the administration's desire to arrive at a significant arms agreement in Vienna. The

revelation on CBS News May 25 that installation of Minuteman III missiles with multiple warheads has been in progress in North Dakota since April 18, two days after resumption of the SALT talks, did little to dispel this gloom.

Equally disturbing was a passage in Mr. Laird's speech of April 20 to the Associated Press editors in New York, in which he said that any delay in deploying MIRV or in expanding ABM would involve "intolerable risks" to American security. In view of the administration's stated goal of seeking an agreement with the Soviets to limit the deployment of strategic weapons systems, one hoped that Mr. Laird was speaking for himself, or that he had his signals crossed, or that "clarifications" would follow hard upon newly sown confusion. But the President quickly dashed these hopes with his enthusiastic endorsement of Mr. Laird's remarks.

The Secretary's anxiety about "intolerable risks" becomes more comprehensible when considered in the perspective of the discouraging history of arms negotiations. I. F. Stone, the intrepid journalist who next to President Eisenhower has done as much as anyone to alert the Nation to the "military-industrial complex," suggests in an article in the April 9 issue of the New York Review of Books that Mr. Laird may be trying to help pull us back from the "dangerous" brink of an arms agreement.

I want to cite a portion of Mr. Stone's article that sheds interesting historical light on our present situation:

Nineteenth-century Britain had its "gaps" and its Joe Alsops, too. Recurrent appeals to lift the burden of armament and divert the funds to eradicate the slums and other social evils were countered with recurrent panics about enemy build-ups. In these the British Admiralty, the shipbuilders, and the gunpowder manufacturers played a hidden part, making use of frenetic newspapermen in their orbit of influence, as the Air Force lobby with the aviation, electronics, and shipbuilding industries do today. Antiwar political leaders and journalists exposed these scares then as now, but with no permanent effect.

The strongest and safest country in the world, and the one with the largest navy, was a victim of the worst invasion nightmares, just as today the strongest nation on earth seems to spend more time than any other worrying about its security. There were six "panics" between 1847 and 1892, all fomented for their beneficial effect in boosting military and naval expenditures. . . .

These panics illustrate the tactic, still in use today, of projecting some fantastic possibility and treating it as if it were a reality. The earliest precursor of our latest equivalent, the Nixon-Laird scare about the Soviet SS-9, was the panic created by Lord Palmerston and the Duke of Wellington in 1847 when they seized on some dockyard expansion in France to picture England in danger of what we would now call a "first strike." Palmerston insisted that the shift to steam navigation had "thrown a bridge across the Channel," suddenly filling the ancient moat which had so long protected England from invasion. The seventy-seven-year-old Duke of Wellington, then doddering, said 50,000 men could be moved across this bridge undetected in a single night from Cherbourg and make a surprise attack on London the next morning! This "bridge of steam" was the first of many graphic but wholly fallacious metaphors which have sup-

plied the melodrama for armament scares ever since.

There is, of course, room for argument about the intentions of the present administration so far as arms control is concerned. Mr. Stone is convinced that they are essentially cynical, but he nevertheless finds that the perpetual running of arms races is explained by an "alliance of primitive instinct, private interest, and technological momentum, in a world without law." These last two factors, technological momentum and a lawless world, have a powerful effect on the defense decisions of the most well-intentioned statesman, who must make these decisions in an insecure, every-man-for-himself international environment where a technological innovation in a rival's arsenal could mean defeat and destruction of his own country.

There have been no improvements in international law and order significant enough to nullify Rousseau's observation that the anarchical condition of the international state system and the conflicts of interest and insecurities bred in such a precarious situation condemn its members to a "state of war."

In such a state of affairs, national security becomes the principal preoccupation of any statesman, and it is no wonder that the "security dilemma" between improving one's own military security and improving the security of the world by risking—no matter how slightly—that military security has been generally resolved in favor of the former.

But even with the benefit of the doubt that Mr. Laird's notion of "intolerable risks" stems from the kind of obsessive concern with security that affects defense planners, it is at best the product of an outmoded set of calculations.

We have been in the nuclear age long enough to understand that the security of the world is closely intertwined with the security of the two superpowers who have it within their power to destroy it, and that given this fact the "security dilemma" faced by decisionmakers takes on a new formulation and the question of risks acquires a new perspective. Mr. McGeorge Bundy recently testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as follows:

It is wholly false to suppose that the national security is always served by adding strategic weapons and never by their limitation. In the world of the 1970's the truth is more nearly the opposite. We have more than enough strategic weapons today. The addition of new systems which will inevitably produce further Soviet systems is not the road to safety for anyone in any country.

But it is necessary to observe that Secretary Laird may have been guilty of something more than merely outmoded thinking. There is something disingenuous, to say the least, about his account to the editors of the development of the Soviet SS-9 missile. I am inserting in the RECORD at the end of my speech Mr. I. F. Stone's thoroughly documented refutation of Mr. Laird's argument, a refutation that appeared in the June 4 issue of the New York Review of Books and that deserves careful study by those concerned about the trend in the arms race.

The Secretary told the editors that he

was releasing "maximum information" so the American people could see "that we are literally at the edge of prudent risk" in delaying deployment of new weapons.

He said:

In 1965 there were no operational launchers for the large Soviet SS-9 missile, which, in its single warhead version, can carry up to 25 megatons. Today I can report to you that there are some 220 SS-9s operational with at least 60 more under construction . . .

If this means anything, it means that there has been a sudden jump in SS-9 missile-site construction by the Soviet Union. The reality, however, is more nearly the opposite. On May 7 a top secret Pentagon report based on photographs taken from our Samos satellites over the Soviet Union was leaked to the Washington Post. The report revealed not an abrupt increase in SS-9 sites, as Secretary Laird implied, but rather a tapering off. The Soviets, according to this report, actually built fewer sites in 1969 than they did in 1965—66 sites in 1965 compared to 54 in 1969.

This information only substantiated doubts about the secretary's arguments raised by the way he arrived at the conclusion that the United States has been losing strategic superiority to the Soviets. He said that between 1965 and 1970 the Soviet Union "has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers from 500 to about 1,700" and "virtually quadrupled" the millions of tons of nuclear explosives in its strategic arsenal. He did not add that it has been accepted for some time among strategic thinkers and in Pentagon circles that neither of these indices means very much, that what matters in weighing the strategic balance is the number and accuracy of nuclear warheads that can be delivered, and not the number of launchers or the gross megatonnage.

I thought that Secretary McNamara, in his 1967 San Francisco speech announcing the decision to proceed with a limited Chinese-oriented ABM, had laid to rest the notion that Mr. Laird now tries to resurrect as the basis for his argument. I want to quote Mr. McNamara in full on this subject because his remarks not only serve to rebut Mr. Laird, but suggest as well something about the state of mind of those who view potential arms agreements primarily as threats to the defense budget.

Here's what Secretary McNamara said almost 3 years ago:

Many commentators on the matter tend to define nuclear superiority in terms of gross megatonnage or in terms of the number of missile launchers available.

Now, by both these two standards of measurement the United States does have a substantial superiority over the Soviet Union in the weapons targeted against each other. But it is precisely these two standards of measurement that are themselves misleading.

For the most meaningful and realistic measurement of nuclear capability is neither gross megatonnage, nor the number of available missile launchers; but rather the number of separate warheads that are capable of being delivered with accuracy on individual high-priority targets with sufficient power to destroy them.

Gross megatonnage in itself is an inadequate indicator of assured-destruction capa-

bility, since it is unrelated to survivability, accuracy, or penetrability, and poorly related to effective elimination of multiple high-priority targets. There is manifestly no advantage in over-destroying one target, at the expense of leaving undamaged other targets of equal importance.

Further, the number of missile launchers available is also an inadequate indicator of assured-destruction capability, since the fact is that many of our launchers will carry multiple warheads.

But by using the realistic measurement of the number of warheads available, capable of being reliably delivered with accuracy and effectiveness on the appropriate targets in the United States or Soviet Union, I can tell you that the United States currently possesses a superiority over the Soviet Union of at least three or four to one.

Furthermore, we will maintain a superiority—by these same realistic criteria—over the Soviet Union for as far ahead in the future as we can realistically plan.

I want, however, to make one point patently clear: our current numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable, accurate, and effective warheads is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require.

Moreover, in the larger equation of security, our "superiority" is of limited significance—since even with our current superiority, or indeed with any numerical superiority realistically attainable, the blunt, inescapable fact remains that the Soviet Union could still—with its present forces—effectively destroy the United States, even after absorbing the full weight of an American first strike.

With that passage from Secretary McNamara's 1967 speech in mind, one cannot help but be skeptical when Secretary Laird raises the twin spectres of Soviet increases in megatonnage and missile launchers to argue that we will run "intolerable risks" if we delay scheduled deployment of MIRV and the next phase of Safeguard ABM. As Mr. I. F. Stone points out, the Secretary's own testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, which was released 9 days after the AP luncheon, showed that we retain the same overwhelming 3-to-1 superiority in deliverable nuclear warheads that we had in Secretary McNamara's day.

Aside from the issue of how best to calculate the strategic balance, this passage from McNamara's speech touches on an even more fundamental reason for rejecting Mr. Laird's specious arguments: the fact that given the present nuclear standoff, arguments about "superiority" are on a level with determining how many angels can stand on a pinhead. Whether we are strategically "superior" to the Soviets remains the most academic of questions as long as they can survive any test of that superiority with enough firepower intact to destroy us, and vice versa.

Mr. McGeorge Bundy, in his testimony before the Senate subcommittee, made the same point in another way. In examining the various criteria used to determine the relative strategic standing of the superpowers, he said:

The main proposition which we need to understand in order to limit the dangers of the nuclear age is that enough is enough. The Soviet Union and the United States have long since reached and passed that point. Each is now able to do totally unacceptable damage to the other, no matter how a nuclear catastrophe begins. Sane political

leaders on both sides know this reality for what it is. It is of course possible that some still unknown technological development is likely in the present decade. So we have enough and more than enough, and we are on the edge of a most unstabilizing and dangerous escalation. Now is the time to stop.

Enough is enough, and now is the time to stop. These are the essential points that we must hold to no matter how many sophisticated—and I use that word in its classical pejorative sense—arguments are thrown out to confuse the issue. It is this nuclear satiety on both sides that provides both a compelling reason as well as the occasion for the United States and the Soviet Union to disengage from the mindless "actions-reaction" dialectic whose ultimate synthesis will be a nuclear Armageddon.

Now is the time, when both sides are secure in the knowledge that for all practical purposes they are even, to halt a race that leads to nothing but greater and greater expenditures and greater and greater risks. As the recent American Assembly on Arms Limitation put it in its report:

At present there exists a roughly equal and relatively stable nuclear balance between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. A rare coincidence of favorable political and strategic conditions provides a real but fleeting opportunity for agreement between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to halt the arms race in both quantity and quality of weapons, and then to diminish the threat to mankind posed by existing weapons.

It is a fleeting opportunity and one that may be lost forever if we go ahead with the deployment of MIRV or with the second phase of Safeguard ABM, or if the Soviet Union extensively tests the SS-9 with multiple warheads.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason to lose this opportunity by allowing ourselves to be panicked out of an arms agreement by those who see their bureaucratic and financial interests threatened by such an accord. We have already seen that Soviet increases in megatonnage and missile launchers have done nothing to change the strategic balance. It takes only a layman's understanding of nuclear-age strategy to see that MIRV and ABM are not only unnecessary but dangerously destabilizing.

The paramount objective of our nuclear strategy is to deter a nuclear first strike by maintaining a second-strike capability as economically as possible, and thus to preserve the mutual deterrence that exists between us and the Soviet Union. This stable situation would be jeopardized should one side acquire, either intentionally or inadvertently, a first-strike capability.

Thus in judging the merits of a weapons system, we must ask if we need the weapon to maintain our second-strike capability, or whether the proposed weapon would upset the balance of terror.

The wisdom of the decision to outfit our missiles with multiple warheads depended on the judgment that the Soviets were moving toward deployment of a heavy ABM system, which, it was argued, raised doubts about our ability to strike an effective retaliatory blow against them in the event of a Soviet first strike.

MIRV's, that reasoning goes, would be able to penetrate an ABM system and thus were considered necessary to maintain the credibility of our deterrent.

But since this decision was made, it has become clear that the Soviets are not deploying a heavy ABM system. The Tallinn system, once assumed to be part of a budding heavy ABM system, is now known to be without significant ABM capability. The Galosh system around Moscow employs technology we discarded 10 years ago and is, in any event, a small system. The Soviets are not deploying any other ABM system at this time, and should they decide to deploy a heavy ABM system at some time in the future, the lead time necessary to do so is longer than that required to deploy an American MIRV force. Thus, the MIRVing of our missile force can, at the very least, be postponed without jeopardizing our retaliatory capability. Indeed, there is absolutely no security reason to go ahead with the deployment of MIRV in June or to equip our submarines with a MIRVed Poseidon in January, as the administration seems hellbent on doing.

There is still time to stop the deployment of MIRV. Additional flight testing is needed to make them operational, and an agreement not to deploy them can still be monitored by surveillance satellites. The Soviets are almost 2 years behind us in testing MIRV's, so a freeze on testing—and therefore on deploying—they can hardly be said to leave us at a disadvantage. But a failure to implement such a freeze quickly can leave everyone in deep trouble permanently, since an ICBM equipped with MIRV is indistinguishable from its un-MIRVed counterpart, at least from the vantage point of a surveillance satellite. Given Soviet aversion to onsite inspection, once MIRV's are deployed there will be no way to determine the extent of deployment and thus agreement to limit or abolish them becomes enormously difficult, if not impossible, to monitor and enforce.

The ABM system is equally unnecessary to maintain our second-strike capability. ABM spokesmen have argued for its deployment on the grounds that it is needed to defend a portion of the land-based Minuteman missile force against a possible Soviet attack and to defend our population against the threat of a Chinese attack later in the decade. Neither capability is required, and even if they were neither could be achieved with the proposed Safeguard system.

Additional defense of our land-based Minuteman force, already buried in hardened silos, is unnecessary because there is no threat, either actual or potential, to our ability to retaliate in the event of a nuclear attack. Secretary Laird and other ABM proponents have argued that ABM deployment is necessary to defend against a possible first-strike knockout blow from the new Soviet blockbuster missile, the SS-9.

But such a scenario is more than improbable; it is impossible. In the first place, a successful attack on our land-based missile force would have to destroy all or almost all of our 1,000

Minuteman missiles plus our 54 Titans. Should even a few ICBM's escape, they would be sufficient to inflict an unacceptable degree of damage on the attacker. But even if the Soviets could eliminate our ICBM force, we would still have 450 intercontinental bombers and 656 missiles on our Polaris submarines with which to retaliate.

No sophistry can obscure the fact that neither the SS-9 nor any other presently conceivable addition to the Soviet arsenal can threaten our retaliatory capability. Safeguard—even if it worked—is simply unnecessary to assure the continued credibility of our second-strike capability, and thus to assure our ability to deter a Soviet nuclear attack.

Just as unnecessary is an area or population defense against the Chinese, who should be able to launch a nuclear attack against us by the end of the decade. But a Chinese attack against the United States—even when they are able to launch one—would be an act of national suicide on their part, and no rational argument can be concocted that rates our ability to deter the Chinese less than our ability to deter the Soviets. An area defense against a mad Chinese dictator eager to eradicate China as swiftly as possible is therefore fortunately as unnecessary as it is impossible.

For it is clear that even if Safeguard were necessary to maintain our deterrence capability, it simply would not work at this stage of its development, even without the accelerated offensive countermeasures that the Soviets would surely take. In short, ABM cannot perform its theoretically assigned function of protecting our land-based missile force.

Consider the testimony of defense analyst Dr. Jeremy Stone on this point:

Highly complicated computer programs, sensitive radars, and missiles filled with electronic equipment are supposed to be regularly shooting down hundreds of incoming missiles in an environment with radar-blinding fireballs, electronic-disrupting blast and X-ray effects, and earth-shaking detonations.

And Dr. George W. Rathjens of MIT has told the Senate Armed Services Committee that simply a few more months of SS-9 production would allow the Soviets to overwhelm Safeguard with enough warheads left over to imperil Minuteman, if that were their intention. The Rathjens testimony, incidentally, reflected the growing realization that technological developments, especially improvements in missile accuracy, are rendering fixed, land-based ICBM's indefensible, regardless of hardened silos or defensive systems.

Indeed, it is ironic that almost all the arms-race problems we face have come about because powerful political and bureaucratic pressures have resisted the obvious solution to the projected vulnerability of Minuteman; namely, switching the bulk of our strategic offensive capability to Polaris submarines.

We have it on Mr. McNamara's authority that the original decision to install 1,000 land-based Minutemen was based on faulty intelligence about Soviet capabilities. Had the assessment been more accurate, we might have settled for a few land-based missiles to supplement

the invulnerable second-strike capability of our Polaris fleet.

Because of the bureaucratic propensity to mistake what exists for a necessity, we have compounded that original error by spending huge sums to refurbish strategically obsolete weapons with superhard silos, ABM's, and multiple warheads.

If logic prevailed over vested interests and inertia, land-based missiles would be scrapped as they became vulnerable in favor of the mobile, invulnerable Polaris submarines. A lot of money would be saved. So would some measure of stability in the arms race, since there would be no cause for new concern about our seeking a first-strike capability. Yet, our second-strike capability would be more secure than ever.

Understandably, those who are trying to sell us ABM are more interested in the sale than in the details of the warranty or in the open-ended price tag attached to their defective goods. In 1967 we were told we could have the Sentinel ABM for under \$4 billion. Now we are up to \$12 billion, and best of all from the point of view of the salesmen, the demand for ABM is potentially insatiable. As my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. PIKE) put it the other day:

What we have here is the most ineffective and cost-ineffective weapons system in history.

But more senseless and more tragic than the waste of money would be the effect of deploying MIRV and ABM on the stability of the mutual deterrence that exists between us and the Soviets. And that is why I have said we are voting on this amendment at a time of unnoticed but almost unparalleled crisis. For the deployment of ABM and MIRV must add new and very combustible fuel to the arms race, fuel that can imperil the second-strike capability of both sides.

ABM and MIRV are interrelated in a way that compounds the action-reaction phenomenon associated with arms races. ABM is being sold as a defense of both land-based missiles and population. The latter sales pitch, with its claim of lowering the number of "hostages" one side could kill in response to a first strike by the other side, amounts to a threat to the second-strike capability of each.

Both sides respond to this threat by devising means of penetrating ABM to insure their ability to deter attack through the capability of inflicting an unacceptable degree of death and destruction in a retaliatory strike. So MIRV, with its capacity to penetrate ABM, is sold as an insurance measure. This is exactly what happened when reports of a Soviet ABM led to Secretary McNamara's decision to begin work on Minuteman III and Poseidon.

But MIRV, in addition to insuring a second-strike capability against an ABM system, could also be used to knock out an opponent's land-based ICBM's in a counterforce strike. Owing to the exchange ratios of MIRVed missiles, the side striking first would have a tremendous advantage. Because of these ratios, for example, if each missile on both sides

had five warheads, the launching of a single missile by one side could potentially destroy 25 of the other side's land-based warheads.

This threat, in turn, becomes a talking point for ABM, and so the vicious cycle grinds on, as we are reminded again by Secretary Laird's current campaign to sell Safeguard as a protective measure against the threat of a MIRVed SS-9.

And so it goes on and on, with ABM's calling forth MIRV's and MIRV's calling forth ABM's. Dr. Herbert F. York described this relationship this way in his testimony last month before the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee:

ABM and MIRV are thus inseparable; each one requires and inspires the other. Separately or in combination, they create uncertainty in each of the nuclear powers about the capability and even the intentions of the other. These uncertainties eventually lead in turn to fear, overreaction, and further increases in the number and types of all kinds of weapons, defensive as well as offensive.

With an abundance of MIRV's and ABM's on both sides, the Stangelovian scenario of a first strike, especially in a crisis situation, becomes plausible enough to heighten insecurity on both sides and undermine the mutual deterrence on which the modicum of security we have enjoyed has rested.

Short of this lies a range of dangerous developments. It is probable, for example, that the Soviets will counter our deployment of MIRV by adopting launch on warning procedures for their ICBM's to bolster what they will doubtless perceive as a sagging deterrence posture.

This would make the fate of the world depend more than ever on technology that has been proven fallible, on sophisticated radars and computer systems never sounding a false alarm of an American attack. One only has to recall the time a few years back when a flock of geese was mistaken on our radar screens for a Soviet bomber fleet to appreciate how much closer to doomsday a decision to "launch on warning" would bring us. Yet the Soviets are likely to adopt this inexpensive and easily implemented move because it would save them the trouble and the considerable cost of restructuring their strategic forces to maintain the credibility of their second-strike capability. They are not likely to be persuaded by the Pentagon that our MIRV's, because they have a lower yield than Soviet multiple warheads, are not and should not be perceived as counterforce weapons, but rather as an additional component of our retaliatory arsenal. Since accuracy is just as important as yield in destroying silo-based missiles, the Soviets must assume that normal improvements in accuracy would quickly give our MIRV force a counterforce capability. Should they counter this threat with a decision to "launch on warning," the world will have entered what might well be the penultimate phase of the nuclear age.

The time to get off this mindless merry-go-round into oblivion is now, and the place to do it is Vienna. The optimum solution for both sides would be a ban on both MIRV's and ABM's. There is no

doubt that the security of the world, as well as the national well-being of the United States and the Soviet Union, would be greatly improved if neither had either of these weapons.

But if the best solution proves unattainable, there are other agreements that could at least temper the anxieties and slow down the escalation that must accompany the continued uninhibited development of MIRV and ABM.

One possibility that has found proponents in arms-control circles would take as its guiding principle the fact that stability, which in the nuclear age depends on the mutual deterrence that comes with each side possessing a secure second-strike capability, would be enhanced if both sides relied primarily, if not exclusively, on submarines. I discussed some of the reasons for this earlier.

Failing an outright ban on ABM and MIRV, this principle could serve as the basis for an agreement that would ease and perhaps ultimately solve the problems associated with both weapon systems. Land-based missiles would be phased out, and with them would go the need for ABM and other expensive devices to lessen their vulnerability, in favor of missiles housed in submarines.

If an agreement cannot be reached to ban MIRV, a limit on the number of nuclear-armed submarines each side could deploy would at least allow each to keep track of how many warheads the other had targeted against it. This would ease one serious consequence of MIRV—the insecurity caused by not knowing how many warheads the other side could unleash.

As the distinguished columnist Mr. Joseph Kraft has written in discussing this possibility, since submarines can be tracked, "each side's pearls, so to speak, would be in a limited number of oysters. And each side would know exactly how many oysters were available to the other side."

Mr. Kraft seems to think there is hope that the administration, having rejected the advice of Mr. Gerald Smith—its own dedicated chief of the Arms Control Agency and of our delegation in Vienna—that we propose a mutual suspension of developments in offensive and defensive strategic weapons, might at least propose this more modest approach.

But even if the administration were willing to try this route, the Russians might well not be willing to do so, knowing that our missile-launching submarine force is superior to theirs, and that we are probably ahead in antisubmarine weaponry as well.

I have not yet discussed the problems posed by the contrast between our avowals and our actions. Perhaps the most serious of these is the atmosphere generated by such inconsistencies. The Soviets are difficult enough to deal with, the world situation is poisoned enough, the problems posed by legitimate national concerns are complex enough, that working out a significant arms-control agreement would be a task of Herculean proportions under the best of circumstances. How grim it is to have to

add to all these difficulties the odd proclivity of this administration to say and do things that suggest that any desire it may have to reach an agreement is subordinate to a stronger desire to maintain a meaningless nuclear "superiority."

President Nixon could have given a clear signal that we were seriously interested in reversing the historical trend of the arms race by following the advice of the Senate and proposing a mutual freeze on strategic nuclear weapons. He chose instead to give the opposite signal. He refused to delay the testing of MIRV and the deploying of ABM at least for the duration of the SALT talks, despite the clear fact that such a delay would have no adverse effect on our security. He lends his prestige to the specious and scary Laird arguments for expanding ABM and pushing on with scheduled deployment of MIRV in June. This vote today will add another obstacle to reversing course.

We are told that we must continue to deploy the ABM as a trading card to get the Soviets not to continue deploying their ABM. Will the administration assure us in that context that it is not true that the Soviets have offered to scrap their ABM if we will scrap ours and that we have rejected that proposal?

A few days ago, it was revealed that on April 22, 6 days after the Vienna talks had resumed, Secretary Laird issued a secret memo calling for monolithic support in the Department of Defense for the deployment of MIRV and ABM.

This memo deserves to be quoted as another indication that the decisionmaking process in this administration is shutting itself off from dissenting views and, indeed, from reality itself.

Mr. Laird wrote:

I want you to understand there must be no speculation which would indicate, or even imply, that a MIRV or ABM deployment moratorium is desirable.

It is hard to escape McGeorge Bundy's conclusion that—

There are times and topics for toughness with Moscow, but SALT in April is not one of them, and many of those who urge this tactic are men who do not want SALT to succeed. It will be very hard to get a good agreement even if we do only what we have to do. It will probably be impossible if we provide unnecessary ammunition to Soviet weapon-lovers by pressing our own deployments relentlessly throughout the talks.

So now it is up to Congress to cry halt to further escalations in weaponry, at least until it is clear that the administration is seeking, not rejecting, a reasonable agreement, and that it is the Russians who are unwilling to accept such an agreement. If that is in fact the case, if the Russian position is also dominated by those who fear an agreement more than they fear no agreement, then SALT is doomed, and so, alas, may we all be.

We lose nothing by trying to reach an agreement. We can lose everything if we fail to try. Between alternatives like those, there is no rational excuse for failing to try. And that is what we do if we reject this amendment today.

The article referred to follows:

MEMO TO THE AP EDITORS: HOW LAIRD LIED
(By I. F. Stone)

Secretary of Defense Laird's recent speech to the editors of the Associated Press on April 20 recalls a legendary exploit in military-political annals: the villages Prince Potemkin built for Catherine the Great's tour of the Russian countryside. Laird's description of the Soviet nuclear arsenal bears about as much relation to reality as the rosy-cheeked peasants trotted out for inspection by the delighted and bamboozled Empress.

The inner circle of the Kremlin, hearing from Laird that the US is in imminent danger of becoming a second-rate power, that its nuclear forces have declined so far as to put us (in Laird's words) "literally on the edge of prudent risk," must wish—like Catherine's courtiers—it were only so.

Secretary Laird began his address by commending himself on his honesty. "When I assumed office fifteen months ago," he told the AP editors at their annual luncheon, "I immediately established as a top priority goal the restoration of credibility in the Department of Defense." Ever since, he assured them, he had followed "President Nixon's desire to make more information available to the American people." Copies of his address were placed beside the plates of the 1500 editors who heard him, and they were urged to take the copies home for further dissemination. Rarely has an Administration been so anxious to spread bad news.

I have prepared this article as if to serve as a memorandum for the AP editors who heard the Secretary. It sums up one Washington newsman's efforts to check on Laird's presentation. The hope is that AP editors will be led to recheck all of this for themselves, to put their staff men onto the Pentagon briefing officers and the documentary sources herein covered, and then report the results of their own investigation to their readers.

The Laird address struck the theme of an alarmist campaign soon joined by the President himself and the Pentagon's chief of research and development, Dr. John S. Foster. The immediate purpose is to stem the growing effort in Congress to block the ABM and MIRV. The Administration's campaign also reflects a fear of public pressure for a moratorium in the deployment of ABM and MIRV in order to assure the success of the SALT talks. (The Senate on April 9 voted 72 to 6 for a resolution urging Nixon to propose a mutual freeze on strategic nuclear weapons.) A measure of Laird's frantic mood is the memo he sent his Pentagon aides two days after the AP speech stamped "Secret . . . Sensitive."¹ The text which leaked to the Washington Post, May 10, said:

It has come to my attention that misleading and even erroneous information is being disseminated concerning our negotiating positions at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Vienna. In particular, information which indicates the desirability of a moratorium on MIRV and ABM deployment is harmful.

I do not believe that Department of Defense officials have been involved in indicating any positions which could be construed as favorable to a MIRV or ABM deployment moratorium. I want to be sure you understand, however, there must be no speculation which would indicate, or even imply, that a MIRV or ABM deployment moratorium is desirable. [Italics is original.]

This secret memorandum puts in perspective the alarms which followed from Dr. Foster and the White House. In a speech April 23, Dr. Foster told the American Newspaper Publishers Association that "the Soviet Union now is about to seize world technological leadership from the United States." President Nixon in a briefing that evening for

Congressional leaders warned that the Soviet Union might soon become the greatest military power on earth and then "the American position in Europe and the Far East will crumble overnight."² This campaign hardly provides the ideal accompaniment for the SALT talks, which reopened in Vienna only four days before Laird spoke. If it were true that America is in such imminent danger of becoming a second-rate power, we ought to be spending billions more on arms, not talking about disarmament or arms limitation at Vienna. That seems to be the message Laird is trying to get across.

The Washington Post in a brilliant editorial May 1 has already exposed the fact that Dr. Foster's alarms rested in no small part on two sentences from a recent speech by Soviet Communist Party Leader Brezhnev. These were quoted out of context as if he were talking about the nuclear arms race. The Washington Post reproduced the passages in between the two sentences and commented that from Dr. Foster's presentation, "you could hardly have guessed that the speech was made by party chief Brezhnev on the occasion of presenting an award for superior production to the Kharkov tractor works, or that it was entirely devoted to peaceful industrial and agricultural progress in the Soviet Union."³ Laird's presentation, as we shall see, is equally selective.

The heart of Mr. Laird's address was that "for the past five years the United States has virtually been in neutral gear in the deployment of strategic offensive forces, while the Soviet Union has moved into high gear in both deployment and development of strategic nuclear weapons" as part of "a major effort since 1965 to change the balance of power." He said, "The United States then, unlike the situation today, clearly occupied a superior position."

If the AP editors check for themselves they will find it impossible to reconcile this over-all picture with the figures Laird himself presented to the House Armed Services Committee only a month before his AP luncheon address. A good place to start in checking this is with the new Armed Services Committee hearings on our military posture. They were released just nine days after the AP luncheon Laird gave that committee the annual comprehensive review that every Secretary of Defense has been making to Congress since the later Eisenhower years. In this Laird "posture statement," at page 6874, there is a table comparing the number of "force loadings," i.e., nuclear warheads, deliverable by the two superpowers. Laird told the committee the Soviet total was 1,350 compared to 4,200 for the U.S. We had more than three times as much deliverable nuclear destructive power. How in the light of his own figures could he tell the AP editors we no longer had superiority?

Laird's assertion that for five years "the United States has virtually been in neutral gear in the deployment of strategic offensive forces" does not stand up under examination. In the past five years, for example, we have expanded the number of warheads on our Polaris fleet by 250 percent. Laird hides this dramatic expansion by the way he puts the comparative figures in the table to which we have just referred. He gives the figure for SLBMs (submarine-launched ballistic missiles) on both sides in "launchers." He gives the Soviets 110 and ourselves 656, a 6-1 disparity in our favor. But if the figures are given not in launchers but in the number of warheads on those launchers, the disparity in our favor is 15-1. How can our deployment during the past five years be called "virtually in neutral gear" when the number of warheads on our nuclear submarine fleet has expanded so dramatically in that period?

This expansion is given added importance by the fears that increasing accuracy may soon make all land-based missiles vulnerable to first strike attack, no matter how deeply

buried in hardened silos. A first strike strategy, however, is still made suicidal by the fear of retaliation from bombers and submarine-launched missiles. It represents a huge step forward in protecting the US deterrent when the number of warheads it can launch from undersea has been increased so enormously. I did not become aware of this until *Jane's Weapons Systems 1969-70*, a new publication in the famous *Jane's* military handbooks, arrived recently from London. At the top of page 107 it disclosed that 448 of the 656 launchers on our Polaris fleet are now outfitted with the A-3 missile.⁴ The somewhat earlier *Jane's Fighting Ships for 1969-70* had already disclosed (at page 387) that the A-3 missile, "capable of delivering an explosive force of between 0.7 and 1 megaton," has three separate warheads.

These A-3 missiles are not MIRVs, i.e., multiple independently targeted "reentry vehicles" but only MIRVs, i.e., simply multiple warheads in a cluster. But they triple the punch and destructive power on each Polaris launcher. There are no similar triple-headers yet deployed on the other side.

So if the number of our A-3 launchers is multiplied by three and added to the remaining single-warheads on the 208 A-2s, we have a total of 1,552 warheads on our fleet as compared with the 110 Laird gives for the Soviets.

The A-3 also represents a sharp increase in range. The A-2 has a range of 1500 miles; the A-3, 2500. According to *Jane's Weapons Systems* this is the result of "a major re-engineering of the basic missile to achieve a 60 percent increase in range for approximately the same weight and dimensions as the A-2 model."⁵ "It has been calculated," says the SIPRI *Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmament* (p. 102), "that replacing the A-1 with the A-2 results in doubling the target area. The A-3 expands the A-1 target area by a factor of six. Polaris A-3 also provides six times as much ocean for the submarine to hide in." That is hardly standing still. When Pentagon press spokesman Jerry W. Friedheim chimed into the Laird alarm campaign with a "background" press conference on April 23, he unintentionally revealed that even the latest model Soviet subs are far behind ours in range. He said he would "not be surprised" if there were at least one of the latest model Soviet nuclear "Yankee-class"—the Pentagon's own Pentagonistic term—subs cruising offshore in the Atlantic within 1200 to 1500 miles of the United States, the maximum range of its missiles.⁶ That is roughly half the range of the Polaris A-3. So the Soviets are far behind us in range, too.

The Friedheim background conference inadvertently disclosed another area in which Laird was less than candid. Friedheim showed color pictures of a Soviet multiple-warhead (not MIRV but MRV) test. Laird did not tell the AP editors that while the Russians are just beginning to test MRVs, we began to test MIRVs two years ago⁷ and will soon begin deploying them. The Minuteman 3 with three independently targeted (MIRV) warheads is scheduled for deployment in June. And the Poseidon missile, which can carry from ten to fourteen independently targeted warheads, is to begin replacing the Polaris A-3 on our nuclear submarines next January.

Far from being in neutral gear, the Navy seems to be moving full speed ahead. It already has under development a new underwater monster as a successor to Poseidon. It is building a test and evaluation submarine for ULMS (Improved Underwater Launched Missile System). This submarine, as the new edition of *Jane's Fighting Ships* describes it,⁸ "would be 'on station,' i.e., capable of targeting major Soviet cities and military complexes, even before it cleared harbour and would have an operating area which includes most of the Atlantic, the Pacific and Indian Oceans." This deployment for a

Footnotes at end of article.

missile submarine *Jane's* adds, "would make such a craft virtually invulnerable to any Soviet ASW [anti-submarine warfare] threat."

In addition, while the Poseidon missile "has double the payload and twice the accuracy" of the A-3, the longer range missile being developed for ULMS "could be a completely new weapon or an improved version of the Poseidon." On April 30, during the debate on the 1971 defense authorization bill, Congressman Leggett (R., Cal.), one of the "Fearless Five" dissidents on the House Armed Services Committee, revealed for the first time that the ULMS would have 24 missile launchers as against the 16 on Polaris. How can our strategic weapons program be termed in neutral gear with such momentous projects under way?

Indeed by the mid-1970s the Soviets will find themselves even more behind than now unless a freeze is negotiated or they step up the pace of their arms effort very sharply. The latest *Strategic Survey* just issued by the Institute for Strategic Analysis in London says that by 1975 the number of deliverable nuclear warheads in the American strategic arsenal will be "about 11,000" while the Soviet, "which has already begun to develop its own multiple warhead system, could presumably increase its numerical strength by some similar percentage." If the expansion of the Soviet force is by the same percentage as the US, the Soviets will have some 5,000 deliverable nuclear warheads by 1975, or less than half as many as the US. That, too, doesn't sound like we are in low gear.

The AP editors can see just how far behind the Soviets are, and how thoroughly they were being gulled by Laird, if they recheck for themselves the two-page "balance sheet" Laird gave them to show what has happened in the last five years to the strategic balance between the US and the USSR. The balance sheet shows that the Soviets are indeed overtaking us in numbers of land-based missiles—but it also discloses inadvertently how many of their missiles are types we consider obsolete. A re-examination and recheck of the balance sheet will also throw some fresh light on that bugaboo, the Soviet SS-9 missile, the 15 to 25 MT monster, which is now supposed to threaten us with a first strike.

Laird began by saying that in 1965 the Soviets had "about 220 launchers for the relatively old-fashioned missiles—SS-6s, SS-7s, and SS-8s—somewhat similar to our Titan. We had 54 Titans in the inventory at that time." We have the same number now. Laird says that "in this category of old-fashioned multi-megaton weapons" the Soviets still have a 4-1 advantage. Then he says that in 1965 the Soviets had no SS-9s whereas today they have 220 with at least 60 more under construction, while we have no counterpart: "So in this area the Soviets have and will maintain a monopoly."

I went back and reread that opening section of the Laird balance sheet with fresh understanding after I stumbled on a revealing passage in Part 1 of the new House Appropriations Committee hearings on the 1971 defense budget which were released just two days after Laird's speech to the AP. In Part 1 of the hearings, at pages 596 and 597, the AP editors will find this colloquy. The questions (and the astringent final comment) were by Congressman John J. Rhodes of Arizona, a ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Rhodes: Is the SS-9 a liquid-fueled missile?

General John D. Ryan, Chief of Staff, US Air Force: Yes, sir.

Mr. Rhodes: Are there not tremendous logistical problems connected with the launching of a missile like this?

General Ryan: Our Titan II is also a liquid.

Mr. Rhodes: That is one of the reasons we changed.

This colloquy is revealing in three ways. It brings sharply to attention that the SS-9 is liquid-fueled. Except for Titan II, all our other liquid-fueled missiles—Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, and Titan I—were phased out long ago. In the second place General Ryan did not deny it when Representative Rhodes said there were "tremendous logistical problems connected with the launching of a missile like this." He merely replied that Titan II was also liquid-fueled. Nor did General Ryan deny the implication of Representative Rhodes' final remark, "That is one of the reasons we changed." So the SS-9 turns out to be of a type we abandoned long ago as cumbersome and inefficient.

Indeed, rummaging around in past hearings, I found the SS-9 described as an imitation of the Titan II. More than two years ago, when the SS-9 was still classified, Dr. Foster, then as now the Pentagon's Director of Defense Research and Engineering, told the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on the Status of US Strategic Power.¹⁰ "I find the Soviets reacting to our moves. We have deployed a Titan I and then subsequently a Titan II in a hard silo. The Soviet Union has followed with the deployment of most recently the [deleted] which is very similar to Titan II." The deletion could have referred only to the SS-9, and I have been so assured by an informed source.

The reason we allow the Soviets a virtual monopoly—as Laird puts it—in this type of missile is that we consider it outmoded.

A few years ago the Pentagon was boasting of our superiority in developing the solid-fuel missile. But when I asked the briefing officer in the Pentagon who specializes in this question whether the liquid-fuel missile was as efficient as the solid-fuel, I was assured, to my bewilderment and surprise, that it was. But when I pulled off the shelf the Air Force ROTC manual on Aerospace Weapons Systems¹¹ and read the passage which follows, he said he meant his answer in a very strict sense. Liquid fuel indeed has more thrust than solid fuel but this advantage is outweighed by the other disadvantages it imposes on missiles fueled by it. This is what the ROTC manual says:

None of the early liquid propellant missiles are satisfactory for the popular concept of "push button" warfare since they lack stability of fuel and require considerable human attention in their preparations for launching. Other disadvantages are the lack of mobility, large size, and high cost of production. Continued research, utilizing lessons learned in the use of the liquid-propellant ICBMs and IRBMs, resulted in the production of the SM-8 Minuteman.

Mobility, hardening [of the silo in which the missile is placed to make it less vulnerable to attack], quicker firing, lighter weight, smaller size and lower cost make the Minuteman almost a different weapon compared to the other, first generation, ballistic missiles. The three-stage solid-fueled Minuteman was developed to be scattered throughout the United States in hardened underground silos or mounted on mobile railroad cars travelling over the nation's vast railway system. [Will the passenger soon lose his train to the missile? IFS.] Its solid fuel also permits it to be loaded and ready to be launched in seconds if necessary, since the entire countdown can be completed in advance, leaving only the actual firing to be actuated on signal. Even the firing signal can be given by remote control.

With this as background we are better able to assess Laird's balance sheet of land-based missiles. He gives the Soviets a total of 1240 land-based missile launchers. He divides them into three categories. The first is made up of 220 of what he calls the "relatively old-fashioned missiles—SS-6s, SS-7s, and SS-8s—somewhat similar to our Titan." These seem to be what might be called Model T missiles. The Pentagon press office

told me that none of them were in hard silos. (It took all of an afternoon to get information on the SS-6. Apparently it is not included in the manual on Soviet missilery used by the Pentagon press office. The briefing officer who finally answered my question about it said it took so long to answer because the SS-6 is now regarded as a space launch booster rather than as a weapon!) So 220 of the 1240 Laird gives the Russians are the earliest, most cumbersome, and most vulnerable type of rocket, resembling our Atlas or our Titan I.

The second category is the SS-9 which, as we have already seen, is a larger version of the Titan II. The size of the Titan II warhead is classified but it has generally been described as between 5 and 10 megatons. The SS-9 is described by Laird as between 15 and 25 megatons. It is not the early type of liquid-fuel rocket. It is fueled by "storable liquid" like Titan II, as Secretary of the Air Force Seamans explained¹² later in the colloquy with Representative Rhodes, and as Rhodes understood. Storable liquid represents a considerable improvement over the original liquid fuel. But neither General Ryan nor Secretary Seamans denied that there were great logistical difficulties in the use of storable liquid. The whole subject is wrapped in secrecy but as one expert told me, "It's not like solid where you can pour it and forget it, like concrete." The liquid is highly corrosive; the plumbing has to be flushed out from time to time; the firing may require from ten to twenty minutes. The firing is not virtually instantaneous, as with the solid-fuel rocket.

Some light on the difficulties Congressman Rhodes may have had in mind may be found in McNamara's posture statement of January 23, 1967. He said the US was keeping its fifty-four Titan missiles for a few more years because their 6100-mile range enabled them to reach certain targets in the USSR beyond the range of the then current Minuteman but that the same targets would be within the reach of the new Minuteman 3 and Poseidon. "The Titan II," McNamara reported, "is very expensive to operate, at least \$600,000 per missile annually and probably closer to \$1 million when the indirect costs of this relatively small force are considered." He spoke of the need to buy boosters for "testing and reliability demonstration" and of "six follow-on tests per year," i.e., one every two months. If the SS-9 is like our Titan II, it might best be described as an Edsel. So a total of 440, or more than a third of the 1240 land-based missiles with which Laird credits the Soviets are of this older variety, ranging from 5 to 25 megatons, trying to make up in megatonnage for what they lack in flexibility of handling and in accuracy.

The third category of land-based missiles with which Laird deals appears at first sight to be like Minuteman. "In 1965," he said in his balance sheet, "the Soviet Union had no [italics in original] relatively small ICBM launcher comparable to our Minuteman. . . . Today the Soviet Union has over 800 such launchers operational, and a projected force that could exceed 1,000 within the next two years. These launchers include both the SS-11 and SS-13 missiles." This sounds as though the Soviets have almost caught up with us in the small solid-fuel missile like Minuteman, of which we have 1,000. But those who look more closely—and it is important to look very closely at everything Laird says—will see that while he gave the impression these missiles were solid fuel he did not say so explicitly.

The misleading impression was created by saying that the Soviet missiles were like Minuteman, and the impression was strengthened by the way the Pentagon press office handled inquiries about it. The briefing officer who gives out information about Soviet missiles insisted over and over again to me in two days of telephone calls that of the two types Laird mentioned—the SS-11 and

the SS-13—the first was solid fuel and the second was classified. The fact that descriptive details about the later model were classified led one to believe that it must be more advanced—solid fuel or better.

I told the briefing officer I had difficulty reconciling this with *Jane's Weapons Systems* and with the new *Strategic Survey* by the Institute for Strategic Studies in London. The former (at page 629) merely said, "There is some evidence that [Soviet] missiles using solid fuel motors are in a late stage of development and these have faster reaction times," i.e., than the liquid-fuel missiles. The somewhat more recent *Strategic Survey* went a little further and said, "The first Soviet solid-fueled missile is already being deployed." Eight hundred missiles cannot be deployed overnight, like toy soldiers. The silos take many months of construction, and are clearly visible by reconnaissance satellites. But the Pentagon press officer retorted scornfully that Laird's word was better than *Jane's* and the *ISS*.

After picking up considerable evidence, oral and written, to the contrary, I finally accused the briefing officer of giving out false information, though perhaps unwittingly. "I know you fellows have a job to do," I said, "but I did not think you would give a false answer to a direct question. I think the handbook you are using on Soviet missiles is phoned up." This led to an angry outburst in which he said he would inform Daniel Z. Henkin, the Pentagon's information chief, of my charges. I said I welcomed that and would like Henkin to call me. Within ten minutes, the same briefing officer called back apologetically and said that Laird himself in testimony last year to the House Appropriations Committee had described the SS-11 as liquid, not solid, fuel and the SS-13 as solid fuel. I had myself discovered this passage the night before and was preparing to use it against the Pentagon.

The incident shows how easily a reporter may be misled by the Pentagon press office if he does not do a good deal of independent research on his own. According to the briefing officer, the handbook he was using was revised as a result of this exchange to make it conform with Laird's earlier testimony. AP editors can find this testimony for themselves on page 8 of the special briefing, "Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System," May 22, 1969, before the House Appropriations Committee. Laird said:

"Currently about two-thirds of the Soviet ICBM force consists of SS-11s, a small Minuteman-sized, liquid fuel missile. With its currently estimated warhead yield and accuracy, this weapon does not pose a threat to our Minuteman forces. The Soviets have just started to deploy a new solid-fuel ICBM, the SS-13. But again this missile, with an even smaller warhead yield and no better accuracy, constitutes even less of a threat than the SS-11 to our Minuteman force."

So it is obvious from Laird's own testimony that most of the 800 "Minuteman-type" missiles to which he referred in the speech to the AP are liquid-fuel missiles inferior to our Minuteman. They have just begun to deploy a solid-fuel missile like Minuteman while we are about to deploy Minuteman 3, which will carry three MIRVed warheads.

I will not weary the reader by taking apart all the half-truths and disingenuous nonsense in the Laird speech. But I would like to touch on two points, one melodramatic, the other fundamental. The former is in that portion of his balance sheet where he says that Soviets have tested a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System "and could have an operational version already deployed" while the US has "developed nothing comparable." Dr. Ralph Lapp tells me that not a single operational analysis at the Pentagon has shown that an FOBS has military value for the US. I would like to see AP editors check this out for themselves through their own sources.

A more fundamental point is raised by Laird's assertion, which made sensational headlines, that while "the Soviet Union has virtually quadrupled the total megatonnage in its strategic offensive force," the US in that same five-year period "reduced its megatonnage by more than 40 percent." This makes it sound as if we are falling fearfully behind. In fact, these figures are only an index of Soviet technological backwardness.

"More popular attention has traditionally been given," says the latest *Strategic Survey* by the Institute for Strategic Studies, "to the explosive power ('yield') of nuclear warheads than to the accuracy with which they can be delivered. Yet, when blast is the measure of effectiveness (as it is when attacking missile silos), the effects of improving accuracy are dramatically greater than the effects of increasing yield. . . . [I]mprovements in the accuracy with which warheads are delivered have something like five to six times more effect than do proportional increases in the yield of the warheads themselves. Doubling the accuracy thus has about the same effect as multiplying the yield by ten. . . . [O]nce high accuracy has been achieved by a missile system with small warheads (50 to 100 kilotons), small increases in that accuracy will produce large increases in effectiveness." This is why the US, instead of increasing the number of its missiles, has been improving their accuracy, and why we (and the Russians, too, though more slowly) have been moving steadily in the direction of smaller warheads.

A concluding observation from the *Strategic Survey* will make this clearer. It says improving the CEP¹⁸ of a 5 megaton warhead from 3,000 to 1,500 feet gives about a 20 percent increase in the probability of destroying a hardened silo, while improving the CEP of a 200 kiloton warhead from 1500 feet to 750 feet gives about a 50 percent increase in that probability. The 200 kiloton weapon is superior in this sense to a 5 megaton weapon, though the latter has 25 times its explosive power or megatonnage!

It is the improvement in accuracy and guidance which is threatening to make the land-based missile obsolete, by rendering it vulnerable in the near future to direct attack. In this race the U.S., by every indication, is ahead. Dr. Herbert York, former head of research and engineering at the Pentagon, has said that accuracy has increased 400-fold since the V-2 and tenfold since the ICBM program was initiated fifteen years ago, and that a twofold further increase in accuracy would make the MIRVed Minuteman a first strike weapon, and a fourfold increase would make a first strike weapon of Poseidon. "It is very easy," he said of this picture, "to imagine what the Russian Casandras are saying."¹⁴

The most dramatic development ahead is in our ABRES (Advanced Ballistic Missile Reentry System) program, now funded at \$105 million, which would put maneuverable wings on the missile and a guidance system mapper in its cone to adjust its flight path, enabling it to home in on the target.¹⁵ The view from the other side is more fearful than anything Laird painted for the AP editors because if you add improved accuracy and guidance to the vast multiplication of our warheads by MIRV, the Soviets are in more imminent danger than we. The chances are that we, rather than they, will be the first to achieve a first strike capacity.

The whole alarmist campaign launched by Laird, Foster, and Nixon is pitched to the maintenance of superiority whereas early in the Administration Nixon had promised to base arms policy on "sufficiency." Both sides now have more than ample power for deterrence. If superiority is to become the goal, then neither side will ever have a sufficiency. Endless arms race at ever greater cost is the prospect.

The SALT talks must fail if this is how

the Nixon Administration approaches them. The AP's editors owe it to themselves and their readers to recheck Laird's alarms and explain their significance for the arms race and SALT.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Bernard Nossiter, *Washington Post*, May 10. James Reston, in *The New York Times*, May 11, said that his paper had received a copy of the same recent memorandum but had decided not to publish it. "The incident suggests," he commented, "that the opposition within the Pentagon has now reached the point where even highly classified documents are being purloined and distributed to the press." If the pressure rises. *The New York Times* may even begin to print them.

² Evans and Novack, *Washington Post*, April 27. See also John W. Finney's account of the same briefing in *The New York Times*, April 28. Notes taken by those present are circulating with White House permission on Capitol Hill, and have even reached my office.

³ See also the equally hard-hitting *Washington Post* editorial April 22 on the Laird speech to the AP.

⁴ "There are a total of 336 A-3 and 208 A-2 missiles assigned to the Atlantic fleet. One hundred and twelve A-3s are assigned to the Pacific fleet." *Jane's Weapons Systems 1969-70*. First year of issue. Sampson Low, Marston & Company, Ltd., London, 1970.

⁵ p. 106.

⁶ The Pentagon sees Soviet submarines off our coast every spring before the annual defense authorization bills come up in Congress. It is curious in this case, however, that Friedheim did not say a nuclear sub had been spotted but only that he would not be surprised if one were there! When we asked how many nuclear subs we had cruised in the Atlantic we were told this was classified. When we asked why it was classified, we were told "because we don't disclose that sort of information!"

⁷ The first flight test of the Poseidon missile, which is MIRVed, according to *Jane's Fighting Ships 1969-70*, p. 387, was as far back as August 16, 1968.

⁸ Foreword to the 1969-70 volume, p. 76.

⁹ *Jane's Fighting Ships 1969-70*, p. 387.

¹⁰ Part 1, p. 110.

¹¹ May 1961, still the only edition publicly available, published by the Air University, pp. 26-7.

¹² See Part 1, page 597, House Appropriations Committee hearings on the 1971 defense budget.

¹³ Circular Error Probable. "This is the radius of a circle," the *Survey* explains, "centered on the exact target, within which 50 percent of the warheads delivered by that type of missile can be expected to fall."

¹⁴ See page 41, *SIPRI Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmaments*, 1968/69.

¹⁵ This is what the *Strategic Survey* alludes to when it says (p. 32), "The development of terminal guidance systems, which allow the individual warhead to be stored during reentry and which alone would be capable of achieving a CEP as small as 750 feet, is thus of particular importance in the case of missiles with smaller warheads."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and wish to commend the last speaker in respect to what he said.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) in respect to his statement whether in his opinion he feels that on balance we have made progress in terms of increasing the effectiveness of this system in view of the history of the last 7 years? I do not think we have in all deference to the

good faith of the gentleman. I submit that whenever there is disagreement between representatives of the Department of Defense, our generals and the Congress as to whether or not a missile system or a weapons system will be good or bad, that we are in a position to rely alone on saying if we are going to be mistaken, we should be mistaken on the side of getting the new system, because the mistake would be less in that regard than the other one.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that in this day and age the people of this country will not accept the action of this Congress in binding them in making such a choice. I think we have to exercise our discretion. I think we have to tell the military and the Department of Defense that it is completely unacceptable to continually come to Congress and present such choices to us by saying, "Make a mistake if you will make it on the side of defense, but ignore the other aspects of the question."

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I will state to the gentleman that the Armed Services Committee has questioned the Department of Defense on this. Our subcommittee has questioned them on it. The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has questioned them on it at least twice and it has been questioned on the floor of the House more than once this year. We also questioned it twice last year. In other words, there has been sufficient questioning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, if we are mistaken in either direction a holocaust can destroy civilization as we know it. The only argument that has been made against the amendment that recognizes this fact is that made by the gentleman from New Hampshire. Deterrence is the only thing that can protect civilized society in the United States and the Soviet Union from that kind of holocaust. It would not be with the ABM system that is now being advocated and which places us on the threshold of competition for a first strike capability. It has nothing to do with defense as opposed to no defense. The question is, whether we go into a second phase of competition for a first strike capability. If we do so, we start the beginning of the end unless we can settle this thing in the SALT talks. If SALT fails, we then enter into a race to Armageddon in the name of achieving national security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that if the committee is wrong we lose money. If Mr. YATES is wrong we lose the country. With all due respect to Mr. YATES' position, I submit we have discovered more than one way to lose this country, after observing the present administration for 1½ years and the operations of this Congress for the last 6 years and

while comment would be improper, I believe the other body is in session today, I think there may be several ways to lose this country. One is through writing checks. Some feel we should not be so excited about things such as this ABM expenditure since we are spending money in other areas. However, Mr. Chairman, some of us are concerned when those on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue become excited enough to veto the expenditure of \$600 million on education, but can swallow \$60 or \$70 billion on defense spending or over \$100 billion spent in Vietnam without a murmur.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had too much argument about too many different things at the sacrifice of precious time by the same old dispensers of the same old bromides who change color depending on geography, whether it is the Far East or whether it is the Near East.

As far as the SALT talks are concerned, one who engages in a contest with a porcupine is most liable to get stuck. Obviously, I have little hope in consorting with an avowed aggressor. There has already been too much said and we have telegraphed too many punches and part truths, without concept of or recognition for the need and security of military information.

Never has so much been said, by those so poorly informed, about things which never should have been mentioned in the first place, if I may paraphrase Sir Winston Churchill. If one lacks proof for this, the geographical change from Fort Warren, Wyo., to Missouri, is evidence per se.

I have served on the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services from its inception. This thing we consider is a defensive measure and can be done; it will deter the aggressive opposition or cost them beyond their capability to build. If it becomes a question of saving country or saving money, there is a deeper question—that of saving lives, or social experiments. If we are to gamble, I for one am going for country, and saving the 20 to 60 million additional lives; it is known the Safeguard will accomplish whether FOB, or threat of the Chinese or Russian Communist missile.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN).

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, do I have time to speak on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from South Carolina is entitled to be recognized.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I believe in saving America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the Defense Subcommittee and the Military Construction Subcommittee on Appropriations have not been careless about money. In the past 3 years we have saved the Nation \$12.5 billion by reductions in defense programs. We look very carefully at every expenditure proposal that comes before us, and we have looked very, very carefully at the ABM.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is significant that administration after administration after administration, starting with President Eisenhower, has recommended a program to defend America against intercontinental ballistic missiles. Surely they were not all wrong. We have plowed this ground many times. There is absolutely nothing new in this question before us. It boils down very simply to whether we are going to have an ABM, or nothing? The time is late. We should have had one long ago. Our enemies do have an operational system.

Now, what is wrong with defending America? You do not ask the price of survival. It is failure to survive that we should be thinking about.

The late Sam Rayburn said, "I would rather be a live American with an empty pocketbook than a dead one with a full pocketbook." He was right.

But that is not the issue here. We can afford this program. A nation with a trillion-dollar economy can afford whatever it needs for defense if it is needed for America's survival. And that is the only question: We will have a better chance to survive if we have an ABM system. We should not delay it any longer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES), there were—ayes 26, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, and in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$285,672,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYMAN: On page 2, line 16, strike out "\$285,672,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$287,357,000", and add after the word "expended," line 17, the following: "Provided, however, That the increment of said funds applicable to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, shall be available for expenditure only at such time as the closure order applicable to that yard shall be rescinded."

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering provides \$1.685

million for essential line item work at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard to be available for expenditure during fiscal year 1971 only if and when the closure order with respect to this yard is rescinded. The amendment increases the overall amount appropriated to the Navy by this sum with the aforementioned express limitation.

At page 20 of the committee report there appears an inaccurate statement that none of the original \$5.68 million authorized for Portsmouth Naval Shipyard could or would be expended for other than design during fiscal year 1971. The Navy has advised me, since publication of the committee report, that \$1.685 million of these funds which are for steam line extension, electrical shop improvements, and engineering offices, should be available and can be utilized virtually immediately upon rescission of the closure order.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is the oldest Navy yard in the United States. It has three drydocks and an ongoing capability for repair and overhaul of nuclear submarines that is of the finest quality in the United States. It also has the added capability and technical proficiency of converting nuclear-powered submarines from the Polaris missile system to the Poseidon missile system.

These existing facilities and ongoing capabilities will be needed for the foreseeable future for the repair and overhaul as well as conversion of our underseas nuclear fleet which is one of the principal retaliatory deterrents on which this Nation relies to prevent an attack upon our people. It would be folly to scrap this R. & O. capability and drydock availability in the face of the fact that nuclear-attack submarines have to come in for R. & O. every 3 years and ballistic missile submarines every 5 years.

The original decision to close Portsmouth made 6 years ago by then Secretary of Defense McNamara was a cost-motivated, nondefense-oriented decision. It resulted in large measure from the fact that new construction costs at Portsmouth were high, derived from repeated interruptions of new construction schedules by temporary naval priority assignments by the Navy Department requiring the taking of personnel away from the new construction assignments then at the yard. In the meantime, the emphasis has changed at this yard so that the Navy's program for it is now exclusively repair and overhaul and no longer new construction.

This is an entirely new function and, on this basis, with an appropriately lessened onboard complement in the vicinity of 6,000 personnel, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has a continuing role in the naval shore establishment of vital importance to the operational capabilities of our underseas fleet. This role is to keep it in good repair, to overhaul it, to convert it as necessary, and to have this outstanding capability and these excellent facilities available on a continuing basis to the U.S. nuclear submarine fleet.

As I have said previously, there is no question but what the money for these line items will be needed if and when

the order to close the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is rescinded. I expect a final decision on this will be made before the end of this year and I believe the closure order will be lifted. The money should be available at that time for these needed utility items.

In these circumstances, I urge the adoption of this amendment at this time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must state to my colleagues that I take the floor in opposition to the amendment with a great deal of reluctance. There is no Member of the House who has worked harder for his district, or who is more genuinely sincere in providing adequate defense facilities than the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire. He is my very warm friend. I count him one of the most valuable members of the Committee on Appropriations and of the Subcommittee on Defense. I wish it were possible for me to support his efforts. But, Mr. Chairman, I cannot do so, in view of the evidence and the testimony before us.

The first problem is the fact that these are not budgeted items. Actually I feel there is a need for these projects. But the Portsmouth yard is under a closing order. The announcement was made some years ago that the Portsmouth yard is to be closed by 1974. There has been no change in that picture. I hope there will be. I think there is a need for that yard. Even though there was no budget request before us, the committee explored very carefully the possibility of constructing the projects within the next fiscal year in the event we received word that the Department of Defense had changed its plans to close the yard. This has not occurred.

Departmental witnesses stated that even if these projects were approved and funded, it is questionable that the planning could be completed and the projects placed under contract during fiscal 1971.

In other words, we can have another look at the needs of the yard next year. In the meantime I hope the Navy will decide to keep the yard open. I do not believe we will lose any time. I wish the gentleman Godspeed in his effort to have the yard remain open. I certainly shall support efforts to have the facilities at Portsmouth improved when we know the yard will continue in operation.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. The two items to which the gentleman made reference do not require contract specification or definition, and the amendment is very specific in its limitation that none of the funds authorized for the two projects shall be available for expenditure until such time as the closure order applicable to the yard is rescinded. My point is that if we do not do this and the yard closure order is rescinded, let us say, in September, if the gentleman's position is adhered to, they could not implement even the steam line and the electrical shop repairs that

are necessary until well into the fall of 1971; there would be no funds and substantial delay would occur.

Such a delay would be inimical to the interests of the Navy and inimical to the interests of the yard. The amendment does not call for appropriation in excess of authorization. In fact, only about one-fourth of the authorization. The matter of budget action was considered before the authorizing committee and resolved in favor of Portsmouth.

I urge the gentlemen to accept the amendment, recognizing the limitation on the spending of the money involved.

Mr. SIKES. In answer to the gentleman, may I read from the testimony at the hearings:

Mr. SIKES. When do you think you would award a contract for each of these projects in the event it were found that the yard would remain open?

Admiral ENGER. I will have to split my answer, sir, for the three projects. In the case of the Engineering Management Offices and the utility improvements we perhaps could complete the design and award a contract within perhaps a year.

He said, "Perhaps."

Again, Mr. Chairman, these are not budgeted items. I am very sympathetic, but I do not feel it represents orderly procedure on the part of the committee to accept nonbudgeted items when we cannot even be certain the projects can be placed under contract within the period of the next fiscal year, or that the yard will continue in operation beyond 1974.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would just like to clarify the statement I made earlier with respect to Admiral Enger's testimony. I have since checked with the Navy, and have been informed that the testimony, insofar as it indicated delay would be involved until next year, was inaccurate, and that the utility items could and would be implemented. They were included by the Navy in their line-item justification. The question of the authorization and the budget was taken up before the authorizing committee and it was authorized. Again, I ask the gentleman to allow these utility items with the express limitation provided.

Mr. SIKES. I have read the testimony in that respect. I cannot go back of the evidence which was submitted. I urge that the amendment be rejected.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WYMAN) there were—ayes 32, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that

that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17970) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. TALCOTT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TALCOTT moves to recommit the bill H.R. 17970 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 308, nays 57, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—308

Abbutt	Bow	Clawson, Del.
Abernethy	Brademas	Cleveland
Adair	Bray	Collier
Addabbo	Brinkley	Collins
Albert	Brock	Colmer
Alexander	Brooks	Conable
Anderson,	Broomfield	Conte
Tenn.	Brotzman	Corbett
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Mich.	Coughlin
Andrews,	Brown, Ohio	Cramer
N. Dak.	Broyhill, N.C.	Daniel, Va.
Arends	Broyhill, Va.	Daniels, N.J.
Aspinall	Burke, Fla.	Davis, Ga.
Ayres	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Wis.
Baring	Burleson, Tex.	de la Garza
Barrett	Burlison, Mo.	Delaney
Beall, Md.	Burton, Utah	Dellenback
Belcher	Byrne, Pa.	Dennis
Bell, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	Derwinski
Bennett	Cabell	Devine
Berry	Caffery	Dickinson
Betts	Camp	Dingell
Bevill	Carter	Donohue
Blester	Casey	Dorn
Blackburn	Cederberg	Dowdy
Blanton	Chamberlain	Downing
Blatnik	Chappell	Dulski
Boggs	Ciancy	Duncan
Boland	Clausen,	Edmondson
Bolling	Don H.	Edwards, Ala.

Ellberg	Kyl	Roberts	Edwards, La.	McMillan	Reid, N.Y.
Erlenborn	Kyros	Robison	Esch	Mann	Reuss
Eshleman	Landgrebe	Rodino	Fascell	Martin	Riegle
Evans, Colo.	Landrum	Roe	Fountain	Mayne	Rooney, N.Y.
Evans, Tenn.	Langen	Rogers, Colo.	Gaydos	Michel	Roudebush
Fallon	Latta	Rogers, Fla.	Gibbons	Moorhead	Satterfield
Feighan	Leggett	Rooney, Pa.	Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Schwengel
Findley	Lennon	Rostenkowski	Hawkins	Ottinger	Stafford
Fish	Lloyd	Roth	Hays	Passman	Steiger, Wis.
Fisher	Long, La.	Ruppe	Hébert	Patman	Stratton
Flood	Long, Md.	Ruth	Henderson	Pelly	Stuckey
Flowers	Lukens	St Germain	Jacobs	Philbin	Ullman
Flynt	McClory	Sandman	Keith	Pike	Vander Jagt
Foley	McCloskey	Saylor	Kirwan	Pollock	Weicker
Ford, Gerald R.	McClure	Schadeberg	McCarthy	Powell	
Ford,	McCulloch	Scherle	McDade	Price, Ill.	
William D.	McDonald,	Scott			
Foreman	Mich.	Sebelius			
Frelinghuysen	McEwen	Shipley			
Frey	McFall	Shriver			
Friedel	McKneally	Sikes			
Fulton, Pa.	MacGregor	Sisk			
Fulton, Tenn.	Madden	Skubitz			
Fuqua	Mahon	Slack			
Galifianakis	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.			
Gallagher	Marsh	Smith, Iowa			
Garmatz	Mathias	Smith, N.Y.			
Gettys	Matsunaga	Snyder			
Gialmo	May	Springer			
Goldwater	Meeds	Staggers			
Gonzalez	Meicher	Stanton			
Goodling	Meskill	Steed			
Gray	Miller, Calif.	Steiger, Ariz.			
Green, Oreg.	Mills	Stephens			
Griffin	Minish	Stubblefield			
Griffiths	Mink	Sullivan			
Gross	Minshall	Symington			
Grover	Mize	Taft			
Gubser	Mizell	Taylor			
Hagan	Mollohan	Teague, Calif.			
Haley	Monagan	Teague, Tex.			
Hall	Montgomery	Thompson, Ga.			
Hamilton	Morton	Thomson, Wis.			
Hammer-	Moss	Tiernan			
schmidt	Murphy, Ill.	Tunney			
Hanley	Murphy, N.Y.	Udall			
Hanna	Myers	Van Deerin			
Hansen, Idaho	Natcher	Waggoner			
Harsba	Nelsen	Wampler			
Harvey	Nichols	Watkins			
Hastings	Obey	Watson			
Hathaway	O'Hara	Watts			
Hicks	O'Neal, Ga.	Whalley			
Hogan	Patten	White			
Hollifield	Pepper	Whitehurst			
Hosmer	Perkins	Whitten			
Howard	Pettis	Widnall			
Hull	Pickie	Wiggins			
Hungate	Pirnie	Williams			
Hunt	Poage	Wilson, Bob			
Hutchinson	Poff	Wilson, Charles H.			
Ichord	Preyer, N.C.	Winn			
Jarman	Price, Tex.	Wold			
Johnson, Calif.	Pryor, Ark.	Wright			
Johnson, Pa.	Pucinski	Wyatt			
Jonas	Purcell	Wylder			
Jones, Ala.	Quie	Wyllie			
Jones, N.C.	Quillen	Wyman			
Jones, Tenn.	Rallsback	Yatron			
Kazen	Randall	Young			
Kee	Rarick	Zablocki			
King	Reid, Ill.	Zion			
Kleppe	Reifel	Zwach			
Kluczynski	Rhodes				
Kuykendall	Rivers				

NAYS—57

Adams	Green, Pa.	Nix
Anderson,	Gude	O'Konski
Calif.	Halpern	Olsen
Ashley	Harrington	O'Neill, Mass.
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Podell
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Rees
Brown, Calif.	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Burton, Calif.	Horton	Roybal
Button	Karth	Ryan
Carey	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Celler	Koch	Schneebeli
Cohehan	Lowenstein	Stokes
Culver	Lujan	Talcott
Diggs	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Mass.	Vanik
Eckhardt	Mikva	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Ohio	Whalen
Farbstein	Morse	Wolf
Fraser	Mosher	Yates
Gilbert	Nedzi	

NOT VOTING—64

Anderson, Ill.	Chisholm	Crane
Anunzio	Clark	Cunningham
Ashbrook	Clay	Daddario
Blaggi	Conyers	Dawson
Buchanan	Corman	Denney
Bush	Cowger	Dent

Edwards, La.	McMillan	Reid, N.Y.
Esch	Mann	Reuss
Fascell	Martin	Riegle
Fountain	Mayne	Rooney, N.Y.
Gaydos	Michel	Roudebush
Gibbons	Moorhead	Satterfield
Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Schwengel
Hawkins	Ottinger	Stafford
Hays	Passman	Steiger, Wis.
Hébert	Patman	Stratton
Henderson	Pelly	Stuckey
Jacobs	Philbin	Ullman
Keith	Pike	Vander Jagt
Kirwan	Pollock	Weicker
McCarthy	Powell	
McDade	Price, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ottinger against.
Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Hayes with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Keith.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Jacobs with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Dawson.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Philbin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE EXTENDED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 17970) just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, AND THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be allowed to sit during general debate on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority leader's inquiry, we will ask to adjourn over upon announcement of the program for next week.

Monday is Flag Day, and there will be appropriate ceremonies in the House Chamber.

Monday is also Consent Calendar Day.

There are four suspensions:

H.R. 15608, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park;

H.R. 16416, to reimburse the Ute Tribe for tribal funds used to construct the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah;

H.R. 17958, to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation; and

H.R. 370, to increase the amount allowed for specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans.

Also on Monday we will have H.R. 15361, Youth Conservation Corps, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

Also on Tuesday there will be H.R. 17070, the Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act of 1970; general debate only. This is under an open rule with 4 hours of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, there will be House Resolution 914, providing for agreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 4249, Voting Rights Act Amendments, with 1 hour of debate.

Then we will continue the consideration of H.R. 17070, the Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act of 1970.

If we reach them, there are two other bills we are placing on the program:

S. 2315, to restore the golden eagle program, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate; and

H.R. 17495, Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. MILLS, has asked that we advise the House that one day next week he will seek to call up by unanimous consent nine bills unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these bills may be listed in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my attention was diverted. What are the bills?

Mr. ALBERT. Nine bills to be taken up by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Ways and Means. The chairman has asked that they be printed in the RECORD. They will be called up under unanimous consent next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The bills are as follows:

H.R. 2076, withholding of city income tax on Federal employees.

H.R. 4605, importation of contraceptive devices.

H.R. 6049, definition of metal bearing ores.

H.R. 9183, free entry of certain exported and reimported articles.

H.R. 10517, amending provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to distilled spirits.

H.R. 15979, interest on loans sold out of Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.

H.R. 16506, tax treatment of cemetery corporations.

H.R. 16745, exemption from duty of repairs to shrimp vessels.

H.R. 17473, extending period for filing claims for floor stock refunds of excise tax.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be called up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

**ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
JUNE 15, 1970**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

**DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

**IMPACT OF POLLUTION ON
CORPORATE PLANNING**

(Mr. KUYKENDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, probably the No. 1 challenge in our country today, and indeed throughout the world, is the challenge to preserve our environment. This is a war in which all humanity is lined up on one side against the single enemy—pollution. Each of us, from the 6-year-old who picks up an empty beer can from the roadside or reminds his dad not to throw it there in the first place, to the major industries, must bear our share of responsibility in the continued war on pollution.

One of my major interests since first coming to Congress has been to help create a cleaner environment. I am happy that I have had some effect in committee and on the floor of the House in sponsoring legislation or helping to get legislation enacted which is designed to strengthen the attack on all types of pollution—air, water, and noise.

There have been many discussions on the problem of pollution and, of course, there is a wide disparity in assessing the blame and in offering solutions. I believe we are wrong if we attempt to hold any one section of the country, or any industry wholly responsible for creating pollution and we are equally wrong in accepting the idea that pollution can be cleaned up by any single industry or any group. Victory in this war will take united effort, with each of us doing our part in preventing pollution and in cleaning up what already has been deposited in our rivers and streams, on the earth and in the air.

The American Management Association recently held a panel discussion on the problem of pollution. As a contribution to hearing many sides of the question of pollution and how representatives of industry view the matter, I commend the following speech by Mr. George A. Spater, president, American Airlines, Inc. Mr. Spater's remarks should be of interest to all people interested in the subject of ecology as a basis for discussing industry's role in pollution abatement.

Mr. Spater has done an outstanding job in pointing out the tremendous improvement made by the aircraft and airline industry in noise abatement over the past few years. He also pointed out the work being done and the challenge that we face in the total control of air pollution from aircraft engines.

I am afraid the speech may be a little bit too defensive in discussing the ecology role of the military aircraft since it might possibly be interpreted as justification for not getting industry's house in order, but that does not detract from Mr. Spater's well-reasoned presentations.

This very fine speech given from an industry point of view certainly recognizes that the airline companies of our Nation realize there is a problem and realize that they must play a major role in solving it:

THE IMPACT OF POLLUTION ON CORPORATE PLANNING

The English word "pollution" is derived from a Latin one meaning to make unclean. It is commonly used today to mean certain types of unpleasant man-made additions to the environment.

Nature itself has always been a major polluter in the broader sense. The year 1815 was known throughout the world as "the year without a summer" because of the gigantic quantities of volcanic dust discharged by eruptions in the Pacific, obscuring the sun in America and Europe. London in 1968 was sprinkled by a fine pink and yellow sand brought there by strong winds from the Sahara Desert. The thunder of lightning discharges, the smell of decaying animal and vegetable material, the lava and suffocating gasses emitted by volcanoes are other unpleasant contributions of nature.

Nature has a self-cleaning mechanism capable of handling a large amount of pollution, including that made by man, but no one knows how close we are to overloading the mechanism. Every thinking person is concerned by the possibility that we may be dangerously close to that point, and perhaps in some areas may already have exceeded nature's ability to cleanse. The people of the United States are producing, every year, over 218 million tons of air pollution—about 2000 pounds per year for each individual in this country. Symbolic of the spiritual seventeenth century was John Bunyan's Christian, portrayed as carrying "a great burden upon his back," made up of sins of unspecified weight. Symbolic of the industrial twentieth century is the American citizen bent over by the ton apiece each of us must carry—and not just a total of one ton apiece, but a ton apiece per year.

This pollution is from hundreds of sources. The home furnace is a pollution manufacturer; so is the incinerator. The emissions created by dry-cleaning establishments in large cities amount to 4 pounds per person per year. But the largest single source of emissions is attributable to the fuels burned by the various media of transportation. Of the 2000 pounds of emissions a year per individual, about 900 pounds are derived from transportation, mostly on the highways. It has been estimated that the airplane is responsible for about 3% of the total air pollution. Of this 3%, roughly two-thirds is the product of military and private flying. The balance, or one-third, 1% of the total, is attributable to the airlines.

I intend to discuss this 1%.

A word first about the figures I have used. Our knowledge of pollution has increased very rapidly as new and improved techniques for measuring it have become available. A study of total air pollution for the year 1967, published in the HEW Report to Congress—December 1968, concluded that the total air pollution in this country amounted to 110 million tons per year. A year later, a more sophisticated study made by the Air Quality Emissions Group of HEW concluded that the total pollution was double the earlier estimate, or 218 million tons a year. These later figures are believed to be more accurate and all the data I have used have been computed or recomputed on the basis of the most recent information available, for both total emissions and emissions by aircraft engines.

Until the first commercial jets were introduced in 1958, virtually no thought was given to the emissions of aircraft engines. In order to obtain sufficient power on take-off of these early jet engines, water was injected in the combination chamber. This created a dense black plume. It also created great comment and criticism. In actual fact, the jet engine of 1958, despite this visible black plume, was a far cleaner engine than the piston engine it replaced. The piston engine produced over 110 pounds of emission

per trip. The 1958 jet engine produced about 55 pounds, a 50% improvement. But the jet engine emission was very visible.

Then in 1961 the airlines introduced the fan jet engine. This further reduced the emissions to 49 pounds per engine per flight. An even greater advance has been made in 1970 by the engine in the big Boeing 747, which produces less than 34 pounds of emissions per flight. Thus, in 12 years, while the horsepower of engines has increased 1400%, the emissions have been cut by two-thirds. The new aircraft carry more people, so that the emissions per passenger carried have been dramatically improved. The emissions per passenger carried in the old piston aircraft were twenty times as great as in the modern Boeing 747. Expressed in another way, there has been a 95% improvement.

This record of achievement has largely gone unnoticed. And the reason it has gone unnoticed is that the major thrust of recent criticism has been directed toward the *visibility* of pollution, rather than to the measured content. The JT8D engine installed on some of the short and medium range aircraft, such as the Boeing 727 and the Douglas DC-9, although a much cleaner engine than its predecessors (that is, emitting less pollution), produces the familiar black plume—very much like that produced by water injection. The blackness of the plume is the result of the light-absorbing and light-dispersing qualities of the tiny particulates, which are nontoxic emissions, just as the blackness of thunderclouds is due to similar phenomena. The presence or absence of smoke, or the blackness of smoke, is no measure of the amount of pollution being emitted.

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize the point that much of the regulation and threat of regulation, and much of the litigation and threat of litigation, has been directed toward the *appearance* of pollution rather than to its actual content.

A favorite standard for measuring pollution is the so-called Ringelmann Scale, which requires an observer to visually compare the color of the smoke being emitted with various shades of grey in a measuring device. When government regulations set standards based on the Ringelmann Scale, the polluter may be able to comply with the regulation by using fuel additives to reduce the darkness of the smoke. The result will be less *visible* pollution, which makes the regulator happy, but this is accomplished at the cost of more invisible toxic emissions—and a much worse environment.

To repeat, the significant factor is not the color of the emissions, but its content. Content is determined by the chemical composition of the fuel and the efficiency of the combustion process. The principal unwanted products are sulphur oxides, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides and particulates (smoke). In many cases improvements can be accomplished by burning a different fuel and by improving the efficiency of the combustion.

Unfortunately, there is no known fuel change which would reduce the toxic emissions of jet engines. Jet fuel, for example, contains virtually no sulphur. Sulphur has the unhappy faculty of combining with oxygen to create sulphur oxides and then with water to form sulphuric acid. Sulphur is commonly found in fuel used in factories, power plants, home oil burners and to a small degree in automobiles.

Neither does jet fuel contain lead, which is found in automotive fuel and which combines with other chemicals to produce various toxic elements.

Further, the jet engine is already a highly efficient combustor when compared with other types of fuel burners. Thus, with no advantages to be gained from fuel changes and the only opportunities for improvement depending on the increased efficiency of an already highly efficient engine, the progress

made by the airlines in controlling emissions has necessarily been evolutionary, but nevertheless it has been remarkably effective, as evidenced by the continued reduction of emissions from 1958 to date. As matters stand today, there is no known technique or device by which further reductions can be immediately effected. Progress will depend on research efforts, and research is continuing in a number of directions.

The most promising of these directions was suggested by the recent discovery that over 60% of the pollution created by jet engines comes from the relatively brief periods when the airplane is standing or taxiing, and less than 40% while it is flying. A vigorous attack is being launched on solving the idling problem. If this is successful, and we are confident it will succeed, another substantial advance will have been made. The areas around airports will particularly benefit.

It is unfortunate that the only public familiarity with what the industry has accomplished is derived from the recent agreement of the airlines to install new burner cans in the JT8D engines. It cannot be stressed too often that this is principally an aesthetic improvement. And while I warmly endorse aesthetic improvements, they should not be allowed to obscure the real advances in the reduction of engine emissions that have been made without public fanfare and editorial backslapping.

To round up this part of the discussion, I would like to point out that the airline industry has never been inattentive to the aesthetic problem. The JT8D burner can replacement was the result of thousands of hours of test flying by four of the major airlines, following much research by the manufacturer, which was undertaken long before the current furor. The engines on the Boeing 747 and those on the DC-10 and Lockheed 1011 aircraft to be delivered next year are not only smoke free but also produce fewer invisible emissions—a triumph for both cosmetics and clean air.

The second topic I mean to discuss is noise. Noise has always been a burden to American cities. Nearly 200 years ago Benjamin Franklin, a resident of peaceful colonial Philadelphia, found it necessary to move his house from High Street to Second and Sassafras because "the din of the Market increases upon me, and that, with frequent interruptions, has I find, made me say some things twice over."

The airplane has brought a new type of noise to the areas near airports, an annoyance that we would very much like to reduce. Some things have already been done. Much more remains to be done.

First, what has been done. When jets went into service in the late 1950's, they were equipped with sound suppressors. The loss of efficiency resulting from these suppressors cost \$10,000 per plane annually.

Second, within 3 years we came along with the fan-jet engine, not only more efficient than the conventional jet and producing fewer emissions, but operating with lower takeoff noise. Almost all airline aircraft being operated in the United States today are equipped with fan engines.

Third, new aircraft currently being delivered are treated with extensive acoustical materials specially designed to reduce noise levels and alleviate the annoying high-frequency whine. The added weight of the acoustical material alone on each 747 is the equivalent of 10 passengers a trip.

Fourth, in addition to these aircraft modifications, special approach and takeoff patterns are in effect at major urban airports to minimize the noise in surrounding neighborhoods. These procedures are responsible to a large degree for existing congestion at many airports; they also increase operating costs.

These things have been done. Future progress depends on research directed at a more complete understanding of noise generat-

ing mechanisms, and of the propagation and attenuation of noise in the atmosphere, about which we currently know little. The airlines, airplane and engine manufacturers, various technical societies, and the federal government are all involved in these studies. NASA alone will spend \$14.9 million for such research projects during fiscal 1971.

We are continuing to press for each new engine to be quieter than the last. American Airlines was the first airline to include noise limits as a part of its specifications in an aircraft purchase contract. As the technology becomes available, the airplane engine will become quieter, but at no point can we foresee a perfectly silent airplane engine. Airports are going to be noisy places for some time to come.

As a consequence, there must be more effective zoning by city authorities to restrict noncompatible uses of property adjoining airports. Speculators continue to build homes and apartments directly under flight paths although they know, or should know, that the people who live in these dwellings are going to be made uncomfortable by the noise. A current example is the proposed Twin Pines Development, a state low-cost residential project to be built in the Canarsie section of Brooklyn, which would place 20,000 people 800 feet under an approach to Kennedy Airport now used to divert noise from heavily populated areas of Brooklyn. Today's morning papers announced a proposed state housing project for Floyd Bennett Field, also beneath Kennedy Airport approach and takeoff paths. It is difficult to understand how a government can justify such obvious disregard of the citizens it is purporting to protect.

To sum up: The problem of environmental control is one which must be attacked by all sectors of society: government, producers and consumers.

Government is at fault when it subordinates real improvement to apparent improvement. Government is also at fault when it fails to enact realistic standards, or to exercise governmental restraint to protect the public against incompatible uses of property.

The producers are at fault if they fail or refuse to utilize existing techniques and devices to reduce pollution. They are also at fault if they fail to undertake the necessary research to accomplish further improvements.

As to the consumers, I believe they are prepared to pay for the added costs of environmental control. They are at fault if they fail to elect public officials who will carry out the programs necessary to such control.

Corporate planning must give effect to two realities: first, there is certain to be more regulation; second, there is certain to be more demanding public pressures for environmental improvement. This means that perceptive management will make such improvements as are now possible and will demand and support research into the yet unsolved problems.

TABLE I.—ANNUAL EMISSIONS PER INDIVIDUAL IN THE UNITED STATES

	Pounds of emission per individual	Percent of total
Motor transportation.....	807	38.1
Heat, light, air-conditioning.....	443	20.9
Miscellaneous (forest fires, agricultural burning, etc.).....	362	17.1
Industrial products.....	285	13.4
Garbage and other solid waste disposal.....	109	5.1
Aviation.....	69	3.3
Nonhighway use motor fuels.....	25	1.2
Rail and ship transportation.....	20	.9
Total.....	2,120	100.0

TABLE II.—ANNUAL EMISSIONS BY MILITARY, AIRLINES AND GENERAL AVIATION

	Pounds of emission per individual	Percent of total
Military.....	36	1.7
Air carrier.....	24	1.2
General aviation.....	9	.4
Total.....	69	3.3

TABLE III.—EMISSIONS BY ENGINE TYPES (DURING TAKEOFF AND LANDING)

	Pounds of emission per engine	Pounds of emission per passenger carried †
1. Piston engines.....	111.6	14.88
2. Jet engines 1958.....	55.2	3.56
3. Fan jets 1961.....	49.1	3.16
4. JT9D engines 1970.....	33.5	.6979

† Assumes 50 percent load factor for each aircraft type.

NOTES

Emissions are for landing-takeoff cycle including all operations below 3,000 feet. Computed by multiplying the known engine emissions during each phase by average number of minutes for each operation: Idle—13.0 minutes; Takeoff—1.4 minutes; Approach—5.8 minutes.

Data derived from Northern Research and Engineering Corporation study, "Nature and Control of Aircraft Engine Exhaust Emissions" 1968, and unpublished Pratt and Whitney findings presented to the ATA.

(This table updates the information shown in Public Health Service Publication No. 999-AP-42, table 32, p. 49, by using the results of improved measuring techniques.)

Emissions during takeoff and landing cycle account for 84.8 percent of total emissions in 4-engine aircraft and 72.8 percent in 2- or 3-engine aircraft, table 42, northern research report "Engine Emissions Levels during a Landing and Takeoff Cycle."

TABLE IV.—EMISSION REDUCTION 727/JT8D ENGINE (DURING TAKEOFF AND LANDING)

	Pounds of emission per engine	Pounds of emission per passenger carried †
JT8D standard.....	25.9	1.59
JT8D smoke fixed.....	19.1	1.21

† Assumes 50 percent load factor.

Source: Computed on same basis as figures in table III.

OIL IMPORTS AND TARIFF REVISION

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert C. Dunlop, chairman of the Board of Sun Oil Co., recently testified in behalf of the American Petroleum Institute before the House Committee on Ways and Means regarding oil imports and related policy issues.

I share the concern Mr. Dunlop expressed at that time about the impact of the proposed tariff system and increased foreign oil imports upon the domestic oil industry and its capacity to serve the welfare and security of this Nation and its people as they deserve to be served.

I insert the text of Mr. Dunlop's testimony in the hope that every Member will read it carefully and ponder its import:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT G. DUNLOP, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, SUN OIL CO., PHILADELPHIA, PA., BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN BEHALF OF AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE, JUNE 3, 1970

I am Robert G. Dunlop, chairman of the board of Sun Oil Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear today with my associates to share with you our views on oil imports and related policy issues as they affect the trade expansion legislation now before you.

Mr. Ikard has forcefully demonstrated that reliable supplies of petroleum adequate to meet our basic needs are essential to the military and economic security of this nation. And Mr. Wright has raised grave questions as to whether that security would in fact be provided under the program recommended by the majority of the Cabinet Task Force on Import Control.

I shall conclude our presentation by discussing some of the specific issues which we feel require careful consideration in determining oil import policy. I will point out the significant advantages of the quota system over the tariff approach, comment on the real cost of import restraints, look at the prospects for synthetic fuels development and, perhaps most importantly, review petroleum industry capital requirements over the next 15 years relative to alternative methods of import control.

Right at the outset I want to say that we welcome this opportunity to re-examine and re-appraise petroleum import policies. Periodic policy reviews are essential to shaping and re-shaping effective strategy for the future. I would only ask that in this review we keep our eyes firmly fixed on the real objective—the objective of providing secure supplies of primary energy adequate to meet our essential needs. Import limitation is not an end in itself, but simply a tool to help us reach that objective. We must guard against becoming so deeply concerned with the mechanics of import controls that we lose sight of the energy security goal which we are really seeking.

If we think in terms of that goal, the import control issue can be brought into sharper focus. We simply need to measure alternative approaches against the goal, choosing the one which will provide the required security of energy supply at the lowest real cost to the nation.

It is significant that the members of the Cabinet Task Force on Import Controls reached unanimous agreement on the need to restrain the influx of foreign oil, while disagreeing widely on the appropriate control mechanism to be adopted. This important question—tariffs versus quotas—has been and remains one of the major issues to be resolved in connection with the overall review of the United States oil import control program.

After careful and extensive evaluation of this problem over a number of years, I want to say that I oppose the use of tariffs at this time to control the volume of foreign oil imports into the U.S.

I oppose the proposed tariff system for these reasons:

First, it is not directed principally toward volumetric control of foreign oil flowing into the United States, which is our basic need. While the quota system achieves this goal very precisely, the tariff system does not and, in fact, cannot. The Cabinet Task Force itself recognized this weakness of the tariff approach when it recommended that imports from the Eastern Hemisphere be limited to 10 per cent of domestic demand. In effect, the Task Force has superimposed a tariff plan on the quota system.

Second, the tariff system as proposed would impose itself into the pricing mechanism for

crude oil and products in the United States oil industry.

This would inhibit the ability of the industry to provide the necessary supply of petroleum from secure sources. If we are to limit imports from insecure sources to 10 per cent of requirements, we must be sure that we can attain 90 per cent of our requirements from secure sources. Mr. Wright's testimony has demonstrated that this will require a major effort.

The substitution of administrative manipulation for market forces in pricing decisions simply doesn't work. And we need look no further than the present situation in natural gas to see why. Federal control of well-head gas prices over the past 15 years has resulted in an over-stimulation of demand and a deterrent to supply. Today we are reaping the bitter fruits of that policy in dwindling supplies and the weakening of our capability to meet future needs for natural gas. This is in itself a major threat to our long-run objective of energy security. We dare not now expose the oil segment of the industry to the same handicap.

Our need is to strengthen incentives, to encourage the broad-scale development of liquid and gas reserves in North America and to accelerate the development of synthetic fuels. We will be dooming the effort to failure before the fact if we adopt a system of import control which would reduce incentive and restrict generation of capital through governmental price manipulation.

The potential for disruptive federal control under the recommend tariff plan can hardly be overstated. We suggest that provision for such arbitrary interference is not only unnecessary but is in fact a grave threat to our national goal of energy security.

A third reason why I oppose tariffs is the inherent uncertainty this approach would create as to future prices and investment opportunity. The nature of petroleum exploration is such that large, high-risk investments must be committed on a long-term basis. Finding and development programs must be instituted 5 to 10 years in advance of expected production. A tariff plan laced with uncertainty about future prices can only result in a drastic reduction of the incentive for new oil and gas exploration and development.

Finally, in our view the tariff approach will not result in significant savings to consumers as its proponents claim.

Under the quota system, most of the differential value of foreign oil flows through to consumers in the form of lower prices. Institution of a tariff would direct this flow of value to the federal government. Petroleum consumers would have to pay correspondingly higher prices unless the government chose to reduce other taxes by a like amount. The Task Force itself proposed that the money be used for other purposes such as the development of strategic reserves or synthetic fuels. This, in effect, would put the government into the energy development business to strengthen a security position which was weakened by substituting a tariff for the quota system. In our view, this provides no additional benefits to anyone.

In regard to the cost of import controls, those who choose to emphasize the gross cost to the U.S. petroleum consumer rather than the net resource cost have performed a disservice to the nation. We should keep in mind that any reasonable consideration of costs must be on a net basis, with the offsetting of economic gains and losses. Thus, multiplying total U.S. oil demand by the average cost differential between domestic and foreign crude oil exaggerates true cost. For that figure must be offset by a number of benefits which stem directly from import controls. Among these benefits are the lower prices which flow through to consumers due to lower-cost oil imported under the pres-

ent program, royalty and bonus payments to the federal government, and oil tax payments to state and local governments. Consideration must be given also to the job losses and other economic disruptions that would result from reduced U.S. petroleum industry activity.

Viewed in this light, the cost of present import controls is considerably less than opponents of the quota system would have us believe. The most reasoned and responsible comment on this matter that I have seen was made last year by Russell E. Train, then Under Secretary of the Interior. Speaking before the annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute, he said this (and I quote):

"Costs of the present program to consumers have been estimated as high as seven billion dollars based on 1975 use rates, compared with a resource cost of about one billion dollars annually. But it is this lower figure—the net cost to the nation after all transfers from one American pocket to another have been wrung out—that is the true measurement of the premium we are paying to have a reliable oil supply in support of our national security." (end of quote.)

Mr. Train went on to say that this cost appeared to him to be "quite modest" in comparison to other national security outlays. We agree.

I would like here to make the additional point that focusing on gross cost to the consumer, as the Cabinet Task Force did, unnecessarily compounds a growing national problem. The problem of our unwillingness, or inability, to recognize that attaining national goals such as energy security and environmental improvement is going to cost all of us something. The true cost is the "net resource cost," which in effect measures the reduction in goods and services resulting from the pursuit of other than economic goals. These are the costs we must consider in evaluating policy alternatives.

When attention is focused instead on gross cost to the consumer, comparisons are badly distorted, pressures for cost reduction are intensified, and the quality of policy decision-making suffers. All too frequently, this road leads to restrictive regulation which precludes creative response directed toward minimizing cost. I hope that we can avoid this in considering oil import control policy.

In our view, the quota system has proved to be a fundamentally sound and very effective approach to import limitation. Under it, the U.S. petroleum industry in the past decade had found and developed very substantial new supplies of oil and gas under very difficult circumstances. At the same time, American consumers have enjoyed the benefits of a rising volume of lower-cost foreign oil as a supplement to domestic supplies. This is not to say that the system is perfect; it is not, and we know that it can be improved. But it is to say that the quota approach to import control has proved itself in actual practice over more than a decade.

Now, for the next few moments I would like to get specific about a very important aspect of future petroleum policy—money and investment. If we accept the proposition that the real issue is not the mechanics of import control but the most effective method of building our energy security for the future, then financial resources become the key consideration. To develop the supply capability required to assure energy security in the United States, we will have to spend billions of dollars. And, frankly, right now it is difficult to see where all that money will be coming from.

In attempting to put this money problem into perspective, I will draw upon material developed by John Winger, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank and one of the country's foremost authorities on petroleum

financing. Although the supply and demand projections upon which Mr. Winger's financial requirements are based are not precisely the same as those presented by Mr. Wright, both lead to the same conclusions relative to future financial requirements.

First, let's see what the magnitude of capital requirements would be if we were to attempt to maintain the present relationship between imports and domestic production.

Mr. Winger postulates that if the United States is to maintain a minimum safe level of proved petroleum reserves and not become more dependent upon outside sources than it is now, the petroleum industry must find and develop 105 billion barrels of oil and 560 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the next 15 years. Based on past results, the industry would need to spend approximately \$150 billion over the next 15 years to find and develop that much oil and gas.

The industry is not going to have anywhere that amount of money available for such investments in the next 15 years. In fact, there is no cogent reason for expecting that it will commit very much more than the \$68 billion invested in the past 15 years. Capital is in short supply and we will have to be highly selective in deciding where and how to use it. At the present level of economic incentives, then, it is unlikely that investment in the search for petroleum will exceed some \$75 billion over 1969 to 1985 period. This would enable us in 1985 to supply just over half of our oil needs and about 55 per cent of our gas needs from domestic sources. Conceivably, we could meet the projected oil deficit with imports, but it is unlikely that we could import enough gas to meet requirements.

Now, assume that the import recommendations of the Task Force majority were implemented and domestic crude oil prices were pushed down by an average of 30 cents per barrel. What could we then anticipate in the way of investment? Mr. Winger estimates that under these conditions total outlays for the petroleum search over the next 15 years would approximate only \$30 billion. This would be \$45 billion less than would otherwise be invested.

At this level of expenditures, we would be able to satisfy only about one-third of our oil and gas needs from domestic sources by 1985. And since there are severe limitations on the volume of gas that can be imported into the United States, a larger share of overall energy demand would shift to oil. This would boost our oil needs to some 26 million barrels a day by 1985, and require that as much as 70 per cent would have to be imported.

Mr. Winger goes on to point out, as Mr. Wright did a few moments ago, that in this situation the United States would be required in 1985 to depend upon the Middle East and North Africa for a sizable share of its imported oil. Specifically the forecasts indicate the United States would be dependent upon these Eastern Hemisphere sources for almost half of its oil supplies in 1985.

We submit that this degree of dependence on petroleum sources which historically have been subject to supply interruptions poses a national security problem of the first magnitude. And even in the absence of supply interruptions, I think it is becoming apparent that such a heavy dependence on Eastern Hemisphere oil, which is largely controlled by an organized group of producing countries, would result in higher prices and the loss of anticipated savings to American consumers.

Please keep in mind that the capital investment figures I have been discussing above refer only to the finding and development phases of petroleum activity. The industry will continue to require tremendous amounts of capital for refining and other facilities beyond the wellhead over the period we have been discussing. Mr. Winger

has estimated these additional needs to total some \$77.5 billion over the next 15 years. On a combined basis, this means total capital requirements of the United States petroleum industry between now and 1985 could range from \$153 billion to \$233 billion.

I should point out that these estimates make no allowance for two factors which could substantially affect the level of capital needs in the future—continuing inflation and the national effort to improve our environment.

In regard to inflation, there is little in today's outlook that suggests any quick halt to the rise in prices. We hope that the Administration's current efforts to slow inflation will be successful. But a realistic view of the future tells us that we must expect inflation to add significantly to our investment needs in coming years.

While it is far too early to attempt to estimate the amount of money that will be required to preserve and improve the quality of our environment, we do know that the costs will be substantial.

The American Petroleum Institute estimates that right now the oil industry's expenditures for operating facilities relating to air and water pollution control are approaching a rate of one-half billion dollars annually. Obviously, this spending will grow substantially in the future.

Over and above this, the industry is now deeply involved in seeking solutions to the problems of pollution from motor vehicle exhaust emissions. Central to this effort will be far-reaching changes in refining operations to eliminate or reduce the amount of lead in gasoline. Precise cost estimates cannot now be made since fuel quality targets have not yet been established. But it is evident that total costs of solving this problem could range from \$3 billion to \$10 billion, depending on octane quality requirements.

As I indicated earlier, the outlook for obtaining the total capital required is bleak under present economic circumstances. And it would become far more so if the Task Force recommendations were implemented.

A brief look at our present situation will perhaps help you to grasp the enormity of the capital problem for the future. Historically, the industry was until recently able to provide nearly all of its capital requirements internally by plowing back some 75 per cent of its cash earnings. This is no longer true, as the experience of the Chase Manhattan group of petroleum companies demonstrates. During the past 10 years, expenditures have increased at a faster rate than available funds from cash earnings. This growing deficit has been met principally through a large increase in debt and only in part through equity financing.

As a result, the debt ratio for this group of companies has increased by 50 per cent since 1964, rising from 12.7 per cent to 19.7 per cent at the end of 1969. In dollar terms, the long-term debt position has more than doubled, going from \$5.5 billion to \$12.8 billion. And these figures do not include substantial indirect financing, which has been estimated to total more than \$7 billion.

There are severe obstacles to obtaining these growing amounts of outside capital. The industry has not enjoyed exceptionally high profits, and now it is feeling the additional impact of the 1969 tax changes and of continuing cost inflation. Coupled with the relative scarcity of capital today, these factors indicate that the petroleum industry under the best of circumstances faces difficult financing problems in the years immediately ahead. Adoption of an import control system having as an integral objective the reduction of U. S. crude oil prices would only precipitate an additional flight of capital and seriously worsen an already grave problem.

I would like next to examine with you one additional aspect of the petroleum supply

situation. I refer to the broad field of synthetic fuels development and the outlook for its contributions to our future energy supply.

Among the strengths of our nation in the long-term energy picture are the large coal and shale oil reserves which will provide the resource base for a substantial synthetic fuels industry in the future. Adding to these resources on a continental basis are the vast reserves in the Athabasca and other tar sands deposits in Western Canada. Considerable research and pilot plant work are already under way on development of fuels from shale and coal, and, of course, my company has had mining and extraction facilities in operation in the Athabasca tar sands for more than two and one-half years.

However, the present state of technology and the present economics of the energy business preclude any one of these sources from becoming a significant supply factor in the time period we are considering. It has been estimated that, given proper economic incentives, a minimum of five to six years would be required to develop multi-plant production capacity for shale oil, and that a slightly longer period would be required for multi-plant capacity for producing liquids and gas from coal.

The two points I want to emphasize relative to synthetic fuels development are these:

First, it is unrealistic and dangerous to assume that synthetic fuels can make any really substantial contribution to our domestic energy supplies during the next 10 years. And they certainly cannot be considered to be a source of emergency supply. The additional research that is required, the full testing of commercial-size plants that must be carried out, and the large capital investments that are required preclude rapid development of synthetic fuels production. And, of course, a reduction in crude oil prices would mean further delay.

However, in view of the growing gap between our energy requirements and our ability to meet demand with secure supplies from conventional sources, it is imperative that we begin now to formulate a framework of national policy for the orderly development of synthetic resources. The long lead times required dictate that a carefully planned program be initiated now if these sources are to make a significant contribution to our energy needs in the 1980's.

Perhaps I can emphasize these points by describing from my personal knowledge Sun Oil Company's costly experience with the project to develop production from the Athabasca tar sands.

We initiated research and related work on this project in the early 1960's, began plant construction in 1964, completed the facilities in 1967, and went into commercial operation in late 1968. Economically, the results to date have been very disappointing, although the technology developed has produced a very high quality synthetic crude oil. However, due to the problems involved in instituting a new technology, we have experienced a series of mechanical problems which have delayed our attaining full-scale production. These have been gradually corrected, and we are encouraged by current production levels.

I should point out, however, that the project was initially judged feasible and undertaken in the anticipation of crude oil prices having a reasonably constant relationship to the cost of production. On that basis, we have invested more than one-quarter of a billion dollars in the complex. Any reduction in crude oil prices, such as envisioned under the Task Force majority recommendations, would seriously impair our ability to develop the project into a profitable operation.

I emphatically agree with the Task Force that there would be no production from the

tar sands at or anywhere near a crude oil price of \$2.50 per barrel. And I further think that it would be virtually impossible to attain the Task Force projection of one million barrels daily by 1980 at the proposed price of \$3.00 per barrel.

This would require 22 plants the size of our facilities and an investment of more than \$6 billion. More importantly, really large-scale production from the Athabasca tar sands must await the development of economic *in situ* technology. And one company in the forefront on this technology indicates that commercial development of the method is dependent upon a price level of \$3.50 to \$3.75 a barrel.

In brief, a viable synthetic fuels industry is dependent upon the refinement of current technology, upon stable prices which are responsive to market forces, and upon the investment of very large amounts of capital. This is the route we must follow to achieve effective development of synthetic fuels for our use in the years ahead.

Before closing, I would like to make the additional point that expanding imports of oil and gas will accentuate an already critical balance of payments problem. To the extent that we strengthen the domestic industry and develop alternative synthetic sources, this growing drain on the payments balance will be reduced.

In summary, I would like to reiterate the point which I made at the beginning of my statement: Our basic concern is assuring to the maximum extent possible the development of secure energy supplies which are adequate to cover our essential needs. Or to put it another way, our concern is to limit our dependence on insecure foreign sources for energy essential to our military security and our economic growth. To achieve this objective, we feel that policy positions relating to external trade in petroleum should be reached in the light of three basic considerations:

1. The need for effective quantitative limitation of oil imports, as necessary to maintain the health and viability of the domestic petroleum industry.

2. The need to strengthen incentives for investment in finding and developing domestic petroleum resources. This will require that crude oil prices be permitted to move in response to domestic market forces and that controls over natural gas wellhead prices be substantially relaxed or removed.

3. The need to encourage the orderly development of a synthetic fuels industry capable of making significant contributions to U.S. energy supply in the 1980's and beyond.

We submit that the quota system for controlling oil imports will contribute to meeting all of these needs, and do so at an acceptable real cost to American consumers.

In relation to the specific legislation before your Committee, we urge you to extend the national security provision of the Trade Expansion Act in its present form to make possible continuation of the quota system for limiting oil imports into the U.S. We make this recommendation in the belief that this policy is in the best interests of the American people, and that it is the most effective means of assuring energy supplies essential to our military and economic security into the future.

Thank you for your interest and attention.

BRIG. GEN. ELIZABETH P.
HOISINGTON

(Mr. SHRIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today ceremonies were held in the Pentagon marking the promotion to brigadier gen-

eral in the U.S. Army of Col. Elizabeth Paschel Hoisington, director, Women's Army Corps and Col. Anna Mae McCabe Hays, chief, Army Nurse Corps.

This occasion marked the first time women have been promoted to the rank of brigadier general in the U.S. Army.

We, in Kansas, are especially proud that Brigadier General Hoisington achieved this high rank. She is a native of Newton, Kans., and I am proud to count her among my distinguished constituents.

I congratulate both Brigadier General Hoisington and Brigadier General Hays. They both have made important contributions to the armed services of our great Nation, and indeed have earned the honors and promotion bestowed upon them today.

General Hoisington is one of the great women of our Sunflower State. She came by her outstanding military career quite naturally, following in the footsteps of her family. She is the daughter of a West Point officer and the sister of three West Point graduates. Both of her sisters are married to Regular Army officers.

She began her military career 27 years ago when she was commissioned a third officer, second lieutenant, in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps at Fort Des Moines, Iowa, and received her Regular Army commission in December 1948.

During World War II, she was executive officer of the Women's Army Corps Detachment, Headquarters Command, in the European Theater of Operations, and from 1948 to 1950 she served in the same capacity at the WAC Battalion, General Headquarters, Far East Command in Tokyo.

On November 1, 1964, she became the seventh commander of the U.S. Women's Army Corps Center and commandant of the U.S. Women's Army Corps School.

General Hoisington has been awarded the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Clusters, the Bronze Star Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, and the French Croix de Guerre with Silver Star.

She holds the bachelor's degree in chemistry and mathematics from the College of Notre Dame of Maryland. Her alma mater also has conferred upon her the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Speaker, this was a historic day for the U.S. Army and for Brigadier Generals Hoisington and Hays. Through their exemplary service, they have distinguished themselves, the Army, and the Nation.

BRIG. GEN. ANNA MAE McCABE HAYS

(Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed a very rare privilege today—one, in fact, that is unprecedented in the history of our Nation. I was honored to attend ceremonies at the Pentagon marking the promotion of two outstanding women to the rank of brigadier general in the Armed Forces of the United States.

I am particularly proud to make note of that promotion ceremony because one of the two new women generals has strong family ties to my congressional district.

Col. Anna Mae McCabe Hays, promoted today to brigadier general, is Chief of the U.S. Army Nurse Corps. Her parents, the late Maj. and Mrs. Daniel J. McCabe, headed the Allentown, Pa., Salvation Army from 1932 until 1939.

She began her career as a nurse in 1938 when she enrolled in the nurse training program at Allentown Hospital.

Today, when she has an opportunity to get away briefly from her Nurse Corps responsibilities, she is a frequent visitor to the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania where members of her family still reside. She considers Hellertown, Pa., her home.

News of her promotion was greeted warmly by Mrs. Donald E. Fritchman, of Hellertown, her sister, and Daniel McCabe, of Emmaus, her brother. I share with them, and with all of the citizens of the Lehigh Valley, a deep sense of pride in the distinctive tribute paid an outstanding woman, Anna Mae McCabe Hays, by her promotion today to the rank of general.

I know I express the sentiments of all of my colleagues in recognizing General Hays and Gen. Elizabeth P. Hoisington, Director of the Women's Army Corps, for their exemplary service to our country which earned for them this deserved promotion.

I include the following material:

RESPONSE BY BRIG. GEN. ANNA MAE McCABE HAYS FOLLOWING PROMOTION

Thank you Secretary Resor and General Westmoreland for honoring the Army Nurse Corps by pinning these stars on my shoulders. I am also grateful to each of you for joining us this morning to share this memorable occasion in the history of our Corps.

I shall wear these stars with great pride but with deep humility for I know full well they represent no special merit of mine, but rather they reflect the dedicated, selfless, and often heroic efforts of Army nurses throughout the world since 1901 in time of peace and war.

There are not enough points on these stars to call to notice all of those who deserve public recognition for having played a special part in bringing them to rest on my shoulders. However, I wish to express gratitude to our President, Mr. Nixon, and to the members of Congress, particularly those who serve on the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. I would also like to acknowledge the efforts of the American Nurses' Association through the years in helping to bring this distinction to military nursing thereby enhancing the stature of the nursing profession.

The Army Nurse Corps owes a special debt to the former Surgeons General of the Army, especially LTG Leonard D. Heaton, and to my predecessors as Chief of the Army Nurse Corps. Four former chiefs are present this morning.

Finally, I wish to give foremost credit to those directly responsible today for this signal honor bestowed upon the Corps at this time in our history—the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Stanley E. Resor; the Chief of Staff of the US Army, General William C. Westmoreland; and our Surgeon General, LTG Hal B. Jennings, Jr. To them, I wish to simply say thank you in behalf of Army nurses everywhere—those on active duty, those who serve in the Reserve Components, and those who are retired.

As for myself, I shall not betray the confidence that has been placed in me. Albert Einstein once said: "I must remind myself a hundred times each day that what I am I owe to the lives of other men, both living and dead, and that I must exert myself in order that I may give in the same manner that I receive." This has been and will continue to be my philosophy as long as I am able to serve my country. I pledge I shall devote my efforts toward achieving the goals of the Army Medical Department, the United States Army, and our Nation.

Thank you very much.

[From the Washington Star, May 22, 1970]
THE WOMEN WILL BE GENERALS—IKE'S NURSE
TO GET STAR

(By Ruth Dean)

When Col. Anna Mae Hays boarded a train for the 59-mile trip from her Allentown (Pa.) home to Philadelphia to join the Army Nurse Corps 28 years ago, she little realized that a general's star awaited her at the end of that career.

"It was 28 years to the day," she said as she recalled that day and the exciting news she received May 15 that she was one of two Army women, and the first two women in the services, to be nominated by President Nixon to the temporary rank of brigadier general.

The other is Col. Elizabeth P. Hoisington, director of the Women's Army Corps. Their promotions have to be confirmed by the Senate.

"I never ever dreamed I'd become a full colonel," said the 50-year old nurse veteran of World War II duty in the China-India-Burma theater and Korea at the battle of Inchon.

"This is a tremendous uplift for Army nurses," she said. Hundreds of letters and telegrams, many from former patients and doctors she has worked with have flooded into her Forrestal Building office.

One was from the Army Surgeon General, Lt. Gen. Hal B. Jennings Jr., who was in Europe when the White House announcement was made.

"This is a proud moment in your life and in your chosen career," he wired.

Col. Hays, who was one of the special nurses at Walter Reed who nursed the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower through his 1956 ileitis attack, is proud of the 5,000 nurse officers under her direction.

DYNAMIC CORPS

"Our corps is very visible and dynamic," she said. "Seventy-five percent of our officers are youngsters, either lieutenants or captains."

Since November, 1967 when Congress passed legislation authorizing more colonels for the nurse corps and lifted restrictions against promotion to general officer rank, the ANC now has 60 colonels and almost 500 lieutenant colonels. The ANC is the oldest of the women's services and will celebrate its 70th anniversary next year.

Col. Hays is proudest of the record of Army nurses in Vietnam. There are now 750 stationed there "from the DMZ to the Delta in all types of hospitals from the larger stationary hospitals to the inflatable hospitals," she said.

Col. Hays has visited Vietnam twice and will be returning in the fall.

"We have no nurses in Cambodia and no hospitals there," she said.

But helicopters facilitate movement of the wounded to the 45th Surgical Hospital near Tay Ninh in Vietnam, which is "the closest hospital to the Cambodian border," she said.

BETTER THAN TENT

The Medical Unit Self Contained Transportable (M.U.S.T.) air-conditioned hospital is a vast improvement over the old tent hospitals she said. A former operating room

supervisor herself, Col. Hays said they are equipped for immediate surgery with the most sophisticated equipment.

"And nice clean white sheets mean so much to men so close to the front lines," she said.

To emphasize the point, she added, "any mother, or relative, can be assured their men are receiving the best medical and nursing care."

Col. Hays said the professional experience a combat nurse receives "cannot be duplicated elsewhere." It's an experience she said that "anyone interested in nursing should have. I don't think the public understands this."

The ANC chief said she did not think anti-war sentiment has cut into recruitment of graduate nurses for the corps "because nurses are professional people who deal in everyday life and death realities."

The pretty brown-haired nurse chief, who thinks her father's being with the Salvation Army inspired her to "spending my life in the service of others," retires next year at the end of her four year term.

She discounts any implication that her promotion to general can be interpreted as a moral victory for the women's lib movement. "We have 18 percent men in the Army Nurse Corps, so I felt this was a recognition of service of all our nurses," she said.

As to what significance the promotion has for herself personally, Col. Hays smiled and said, "it won't affect my responsibilities but I'll have more fringe benefits."

Those fringe benefits will include more pay and a slight modification of Col. Hays' uniform to accommodate her new general's star when her promotion comes through.

The uniform will essentially be the same as her fellow male officers, she said, "but I hope a little bit more feminine if at all possible."

A BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JEANNETTE RANKIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding features of the American political system is the way in which the sweetest and the most charming of ladies can come along, every so often, and join the fight, and lead the regiments, and raise the flag of victory—and then go back to being the sweetest and most charming of ladies.

So it has been with Jeannette Rankin, who has spoken from the heart, with fire and conviction, through all her years in the political arena. As field secretary of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, as the first woman elected to the Congress, as a leading opponent of American entry into World War I and the only voice in Congress against American entry into World War II, she has long been recognized as an outstanding exponent of the right of dissent.

Nor is she inclined to be satisfied with

moral victories. She wants results, and, in setting patterns, she tends to get results. The antiwar sentiment in vogue today in Congress is wholly in keeping with many of Miss Rankin's past pronouncements. As for women's rights, these are now reality in many respects, and Miss Rankin can be said to be in large part responsible for that.

It is a great pleasure, on the occasion of her 90th birthday to salute her performance, in the name of political integrity, of which she is the chief apostle in this imperfect world.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to include the following article from today's Washington Post and two telegrams:

JEANNETTE RANKIN: RADICAL AT 90

(By Judith Martin)

If Jeannette Rankin shows any sign of age on her 90th birthday, it is a slight weariness at seeing ideas she has advocated for 70 years being treated as something radically new.

Miss Rankin, whose birthday will be celebrated today at a Montana-sponsored dinner in the Rayburn House Office Building, is a former representative from Montana, first elected in 1917 to become the first woman to serve in Congress.

Her great causes then, and through the years, have been peace and women's rights, and she did not hesitate to fight for them alone. She was one of 56 congressmen to vote against American entry into World War I, and, 24 years later when she was serving her second term in Congress, the only member of Congress to vote against the declaration of war against Japan which brought the United States into World War II.

Two years ago, she led the Jeannette Rankin Brigade, a rally of women marching on Capitol Hill to protest the war in Vietnam. Last fall, she was out at moratorium marches, in Georgia and California. And as always, she writes letters and responds to requests from peace groups.

Her stand has always been against all war, for whatever reason, and for the immediate disarmament of the United States, which she believes would lead to international disarmament.

The Jeannette Rankin Brigade and the Congress which followed it were also a focal point for the early development of the Women's Liberation Movement. Miss Rankin, who joined the women's suffrage movement at the beginning of the century, said she thinks the present movement "is doing splendid work, but I can't get excited about it because I got so excited so long ago."

"Everything they talk about, we talked about before 1914."

But just when you think she's missed the differences, as when she suggests that women ought to be paid to take care of their children because "most women would prefer to stay home with their children," she says things like, "It's superficial to ask for equal pay—what we need is a complete revision of the money system."

Long ago, she worked for abortion and improvement of marriage and divorce laws, but she's impatient with such things. "They won't be necessary once people get the idea that women are human beings." And that will come, she said, "when they behave like human beings and stop submitting to everything and everyone."

She is more enthusiastic about the peace movement. "It's growing very powerful." That the war has meanwhile spread, too, does not discourage her. "You can't say a tree is no good because it's grown so many feet high and not higher yet."

Her chief focus now, however, is work for direct, preferential voting, which she be-

lieves will lead to the election of candidates who will assist her other causes.

In 1917, in a speech in Carnegie Hall, she advocated direct, popular elections, omitting the preferential aspect in which a voter could list several choices in order because she felt that vote-counting systems then could not handle the more complicated procedure.

But basically, she feels that eliminating the Electoral College wouldn't help the problem of a voter's not being able to select the candidates. "We can get a president out of office, but we can't get one in," she said.

Fifty-some years later, people have begun thinking the same thing. "After the 1968 conventions, there was public sentiment for it, and that was the time to start pushing it again," she said.

And so Jeannette Rankin has found herself back with the radicals again.

SALEM, MASS.

JEANNETTE RANKIN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincere regrets that I shall not be with you in person to offer my congratulations for your noble achievements and to wish you many happy returns of the day with greatest admiration.

DOROTHY G. HALL

HELENA, MONT.

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN,
Washington, D.C.:

Let us rejoice that Jeannette Rankin came into the world 90 years ago to say let the women vote, let the door to Congress open to women and let us follow reason and not violence in meeting world troubles. It took energy and it took courage and we are proud to stand with you and celebrate in this great occasion.

BELL NORMAN,
FREDA FELGAMAN.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I salute Jeannette Rankin on her 90th birthday. I salute her also, as the first lady ever to be a Congresswoman. She was first elected a Member of the 65th Congress, 1917-19, and was again a member of the 77th Congress, 1941-43.

This gallant lady was a pioneer for female suffrage and helped to win the vote for women. Today, the issue of social welfare is a national concern; decades ago Jeannette Rankin took her stand for the betterment of her fellowman. As far back as 1915, she visited New Zealand and worked as a seamstress in order to gain personal knowledge of social conditions. We are her beneficiaries.

It was my good fortune to have been her colleague in the 77th Congress. I had then and have ever since a great admiration for her charm of manner, courage, and intellect. More recently, she appeared before the House Judiciary Committee, ably defending her proposal for electoral college reform. When I opened the hearings and stated, as I customarily do, "You may be seated," Miss Rankin replied, "May I stand? I fight better standing." Is this not the summation of her long, active, committed life?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in 1958 John Kennedy named Miss Jeannette Rankin one of his "Three Women of Courage" in an article he wrote for McCall's. I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating this remarkable lady on her 90th birthday. Her lifetime dedication to humanitarian prin-

ciple has inspired Americans throughout the most turbulent and difficult years of this century, and has reminded us again and again that idealism and energy in the cause of justice are not the sole property of youth.

Born into the frontier egalitarianism of the West, Miss Rankin was a pioneer in the suffrage movement. Graduating from the University of Montana at the age of 22 in an age when it was still most unusual for women to go to college, she went on to study at the New York School of Philanthropy, and it was there that she first became interested in woman suffrage. As a social worker in Washington and California she combined the struggle to end the exploitation and misery of women workers, and the fight to get them the vote. As president of the Montana branch of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, she led the successful campaign that gave women in her home State the vote.

Jeannette Rankin was never one to sit back while others did the work, and then take credit for the results. She was prompted in 1915 by her desire for firsthand knowledge of the problems of women workers to go to New Zealand and take a job as a seamstress. This experience added to her conviction of the urgent need for improvements in the lot of women.

Back in Montana, the voters, many of whom were women voting for the first time, elected Miss Rankin in 1916 to the House of Representatives on a peace platform. Just 2 days after she took her seat, she joined 40 of her fellow Members of the House to vote against American involvement in World War I. "I want to stand by my country—but I cannot vote for war," she said, and it is on this rock of principle that she has stood throughout the more than half century since.

In a way, it was unfortunate that Jeannette Rankin's service in the House occurred during wartime. The peace issue and later the requirements of running a war, distracted the attention of Congress from the pioneering humanitarian legislation introduced by her during both her terms—in World War I and in World War II. She was the first to propose a bill authorizing free instruction in hygiene for mothers and infants, and she was the first to introduce an "independent citizenship for women" bill.

I remember very well Miss Rankin's second term of office in the 77th Congress, and her historic solitary vote against lend-lease and U.S. involvement in World War II. We served together from 1941–43, and I was one of her many colleagues who respected and admired her for her courage in taking a position on principle and sticking by it. We did not agree with her on that issue, but we could not help being deeply impressed by her idealism and her dedication to the cause of peace.

In addition to working for peace, Miss Rankin was among the first to advocate reforms which have been taken up by others in recent years. As early as 1917 she called for abolition of the electoral college and direct election of the President. Only last year she returned to testify before the House and Senate Judiciary Committees on this crucial issue. As

the namesake and honorary chairman of the Jeanette Rankin brigade, she led a march by women to Congress to present a resolution demanding that Congress end the war in Vietnam. And throughout her life she has stood up for civil rights and equality before the law, without regard to sex or race. Finally, she has lived to see many of the urgently needed reforms in working conditions and social welfare for women which she proposed and fought so hard for, become accomplished fact.

I salute Miss Rankin for her long and fruitful career in the cause of peace, justice, and humanity. Her courage has indeed been phenomenal, and her dedication an inspiration to Americans of four generations. I think she will be remembered by history as one of America's greatest women and outstanding moral leader, just as she is loved, admired, and respected by those of us who have had the honor and the pleasure of knowing her and working with her. To her, I extend my warmest congratulations and birthday wishes.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in this year when people are finally becoming aware of the very real need for providing women full equality under the laws of our land, it seems so very fitting that Congress pay special tribute to Jeannette Rankin on this, her 90th birthday.

Congress—especially we women in Congress—is privileged to honor our very own pioneer, even as the national conference on "American Women at the Crossroads: Directions for the Future" gets underway.

Her warmth, her strength of character, her dedication to principle, her courage and integrity, have been and will continue to be the subject of innumerable writings and speeches.

Living up to her commitment to peace and voting against entering both of the World Wars of our century could not have been easy. She has been justifiably called the Nehru of our country—ahead of the times.

She was far in the forefront in calling attention to the needs of our first Americans, the Indians, and to the conditions that existed on the Indian reservations. She was actively and constructively interested in the development of public lands and national parks.

Her lifelong concern about the basic problems of humanity—about the long range health of civilization—can only inspire the deepest admiration and respect.

It is, therefore, a very real honor to join with my colleagues in paying the tribute she so well deserves to the First Lady of this Chamber, the Honorable Jeannette Rankin.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join the gentleman in his tribute to the Honorable Jeannette Rankin on the occasion of her 90th birthday. Miss Rankin, who served from Montana in 1917, was not only the first woman Member of Congress, but also served prior to the establishment of the suffrage amendment in 1920.

Miss Rankin joined the suffrage movement at the beginning of the century. She is entitled to be impatient with those who consider today's women's rights movement radical, since she advocated many of these reforms since before

World War I. I can imagine that her position earned her many rebuffs and discouragements and I commend the courage which allowed her to persevere in her efforts over 70 years.

Miss Rankin's entire life has been dedicated to the establishment of women's rights and peace and she pursued her goals alone, if necessary, and in the face of all opposition and adversity. I remember as a boy reading the newsstory of Congresswoman Rankin's vote against American entry into World War I. I recalled those stories again when in World War II she was the lone Member of Congress to oppose the declaration of war against Japan which brought the United States into World War II. Regardless of one's viewpoint, the courage of her stand was apparent to all.

Miss Rankin made it possible for all American women to attain many of their rightful privileges as citizens which once were denied them. Her greatest contribution, in my mind, was to open the door of the Congress to permit the entry of able women. We now have women Members who are among the most distinguished and influential members of either sex ever to serve in Congress. We are proud of them and their contributions, not only to women's causes but to our work over the broad spectrum of legislative responsibility. Many of us here, women and men, have contributed to the cause of women's rights in such important areas as equal pay for women and in the extension of the equal opportunity provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit discrimination based on sex.

The necessity to secure full equality for women in all aspects of American life is no longer an arguable point. The breakthrough has been made. Much has been done; much remains to be done. Miss Rankin has passed the torch to many able women. They and we salute her today. We extend her our thanks for the years of work she has dedicated to improving the quality of life for American women. We wish her many happy returns on this, her 90th birthday.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the first woman to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, Jeannette Rankin, who is celebrating her 90th birthday today.

On March 4, 1917, Jeannette Rankin was sworn in as a Representative from Montana. She served one term; then decided she could further her causes better in the Senate. Defeated in her Senate bid, she returned to social work, woman's suffrage, and working for peace. She was out of Congress for many years and then was elected again for another term in 1941—just before the outbreak of World War II.

Miss Rankin is perhaps best known for her votes against the United States entering the two World Wars, but she was a dedicated person in many other areas and is known as one of our most outstanding legislators. She was one of the first persons who cited the need for attention to Indian reservations and Indian citizens. She was a person who was interested in the development of public lands and the conservation of our nat-

ural resources. She was concerned about western problems and western civilization and she had a deep interest in finding solutions to the problems of less fortunate and disadvantaged persons.

But, in addition to all of this, Jeannette Rankin was a pioneer in behalf of women's rights and, in my judgment, she paved the way for other women to be elected to public office at the national level.

It is good to have this opportunity to join in the tribute to Jeannette Rankin. I wish her a happy birthday today and hope that she will be fighting for her causes for many more years.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of our brave Astronaut Neil Armstrong when I consider Jeannette Rankin. After all, he took that "giant step for mankind" as the first man on the surface of the moon. Miss Rankin took a giant first step for womankind when, on March 4, 1917, as a Representative of the State of Montana, she was sworn in as the first woman Member of Congress.

Both events were great historical milestones. I am delighted to welcome Miss Rankin back to Washington as the Congress marks this unofficial "Jeannette Rankin Day." I wish her a happy 90th birthday.

I am pleased that the first Congresswoman was a Republican. Miss Rankin and I share something else in common. We are both redheads.

Since that memorable day when Jeannette Rankin was elected to Congress, a total of 75 women—32 Republicans and 43 Democrats—have been elected or appointed to Congress. The roll includes 10 women in the Senate and 65 in the House. There is presently one woman in the Senate and there are 10 women in the House. I think that Miss Rankin was courageous in taking that first step. But the way has been shown and, since I believe that the potential of women has been tremendously underutilized in this Nation, I encourage women to become involved in politics and in today's great causes and to run for public office.

Jeannette Rankin fought, in both public and private life, for the causes of her day including social betterment and woman's suffrage. And, like her contemporaries, one of her greatest causes was that of seeking peace.

She was never fazed by any opportunity gap for women. Jeannette Rankin is a remarkable person, as well as a remarkable woman. I believe the Nation should rightfully join in tribute to her achievements.

I join all of my colleagues in welcoming her, and wish her many more happy and fruitful years ahead.

FORWARD TO FREER TRADE, NOT BACKWARD TO PROTECTIONISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to discuss the subject of import quotas and trade expansion. I believe that this may well be the most important

subject with which the Congress deals this year. One approach before the Ways and Means Committee would provide for continued trade expansion and the prosperity, both at home and abroad, which such can bring. The other approach of imposing import quotas on certain products, however, would have a direct adverse effect on every single American who wears clothes and shoes—and who does not? Beyond that, it may potentially mark the opening shot in a trade war which could cause stagnation of the world economy as nations vie with each other to erect trade barriers which would divide and fragment the free world.

Before Americans decide they want to take the enormous risks inherent in quotas, or—better said—before we in Congress decide to impose that risk upon them, it is important that we consider carefully what may result. I do not pose as an expert. My political judgment may also be questioned. After all, yesterday I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to attempt to present a case against restrictive quotas to a committee, 13 of whose members—including the chairman—have sponsored such a bill. A political expert might at least hesitate before taking a lonely position opposed to the 306 Members of this House who have petitioned the President asking him to use his full weight to seek "voluntary" quotas on shoe imports.

Yet, I am here today, because I believe that this issue is so important to the American people, as consumers and as working-class citizens, as well as to long-term standing of our Nation in world affairs that it simply must not be decided upon narrow grounds or for the exclusive benefit of one or two special interest groups.

Should imports of shoes and textiles be restricted, as proposed in H.R. 16920?

The bill would set quotas for 1970 on the average of imports during 1967-68, and beyond this would limit them according to the ups and downs of the U.S. market. For textiles, the overall average would be about 2.9 billion square yards, a rollback from 1969 imports of some 3.6 billion square yards. For shoes, the average would be about 185 million pairs, a reduction from the 1969 volume of 195 million pairs.

Are these quotas in the national interest? Are they in the interests of the American consumer? Or agriculture? Or the working man? Or the businessman?

In each case, the answer must be no.

Our national economic life today is dominated by the problem of inflation. No domestic issue is more important, no issue affects more people adversely, no issue presents a greater challenge to our society. Yet, quotas, and the higher consumer costs they will spawn, will only fuel the fires of inflation and thus harm the national interest. Quotas remove one of the dampening influences upon price increases because foreign competition would no longer tend to hold domestic prices down. For example, it has been estimated by the National Retail Merchants Association that quotas on textiles will cause a 15 to 25 percent rise in some clothing prices. Similar inflationary effects upon prices can be expected

in other industries where restrictive trade practices are imposed.

Nor will quotas serve consumer interests. Protectionism taxes consumers to protect producers and thereby destroys the consumer's purchasing power. Nothing could be more self-defeating, and nothing could hurt the consumer more. At the same time that protectionism taxes the consumer-taxpayer and destroys his purchasing power, it also raises the costs of the protected goods he must purchase. The consumer gets hit the hardest, and from three different directions.

In this particular case, this bill proposes to hit hardest those consumers who can least afford it—the poor and those with middle incomes. Of the three basic essentials of life—food, shelter, and clothing—this bill proposes to raise the price of the shirt or blouse on your back and the shoes on your feet. The poor who have difficulty paying for shoes now will be worse off in the future.

The lower a family's income, the greater the proportion of that income must be spent upon shoes and clothing. Quotas make the pinch even tighter and have a sharp regressive character that hurts poor people worst. This bill is certainly not in the interests of the American consumer, rich or poor.

American agriculture, already in deep trouble in foreign markets, would risk a severe blow from this bill. In the past 3 years, after record crops have produced surpluses here at home, U.S. exports of farm products to Europe's Common Market have fallen by \$300 million, due in large part to European protectionism and rising agricultural production on the Continent. So far, the United States has been able to stave off proposals which would greatly restrict the importation of American soybeans. However, the moment the United States imposes quotas on shoes and other products, we will have opened the door to a flood of retaliatory protectionist measures worldwide, including the Common Market—measures which will affect all American businessmen, all American workingmen, all American consumers, and certainly the American farmer whose foreign markets will be hurt.

And we risk severe harm by placing quotas on textile imports from Japan, the largest importer of U.S. agricultural products, now totaling almost \$1 billion annually. This year Japan has become our first billion-dollar agricultural customer in history.

In fact, one of the great ironies of this quota legislation is that producers of leather and cotton fibers, who are a part of the industries seeking protection, will be directly hurt by the proposed quotas. Last year Japan exported \$285 million worth of textiles to the United States, but purchased fully one-fifth of the raw cotton exported by us, valued at \$52 million. Of the \$84 million worth of shoes Japan sent to us, Japan returned \$54 million through the purchase of hides and skins to make such products. It is a cinch that quotas imposed to keep out Japanese shoes and textiles will be met on their part by drastic reductions in the purchase from the United States of the

raw materials which go into these products. Japan can buy cotton and hides elsewhere.

The workman is first and foremost a consumer, and therefore he will suffer from protectionist policies resulting in higher prices on the goods he buys and higher taxes. Indeed, the interests of people directly involved in the local industry seeking protection are mixed. Let me illustrate from personal experience. Last year, I received several hundred postcards from employees of Brown Shoe Co. in my hometown calling attention to the problem posed to their factory and their jobs by shoe imports from Italy and Japan. Several weeks later I had a chance to visit personally with one of the people who had written to me. That person, a production line employee, volunteered this comment, "I can see two sides of this problem. We have to buy shoes for our family, and frankly, it would hurt if we could not buy lower-priced imports. We simply could not keep everyone in shoes as well as we do now."

The average businessman will also be badly hurt should a wave of protectionism sweep the country. With everyone else, he would suffer the added dangers from inflation and the higher prices he must pay for his purchases and therefore pass on to his customers. In addition, artificially high prices stimulate the search for substitutes for his product. Finally, since quotas do not remedy the basic structural problems in an industry, but only prolong them, they provide no real lasting relief for the businessman. He must live in constant fear that the quotas will be removed, unable to build a sound economic base for his business.

With all of these apparent liabilities to the American consumer, farmer, workman, and businessman, why is Congress today considering inflicting quotas on an unaware and unsuspecting public?

The answer is that for the first time, two industries which have assembled over recent years a powerful constituency on Capitol Hill have joined forces.

One is the shoe industry. This is an industry with a relatively high input of labor. Automation of its manufacturing process is severely limited by the lack of uniformity in the principal raw material, leather. Compared with most industries, labor-saving techniques in the shoe industry have been almost nil in recent years. Inevitably, shoes imported from countries with low-cost labor, like Japan, present severe competition.

This competition has not killed U.S. shoe production; indeed, U.S. production has remained fairly steady. However, U.S. shoe consumption has been rising steadily, with the increased business going almost entirely to imports.

I am more keenly aware of this problem than some Congressmen, perhaps, because shoe manufacturing is the principal industry in the small Illinois town, Pittsfield, which is my home. Over the years the challenge of imports has been repeatedly brought to my attention.

The other industry in this package is the textile producers. For my part, I have come to respect the political power of textile interests. They do not represent the broad interests of American agriculture. They do not represent consumers.

They certainly do not represent the international best interests of our country.

Our most scandalous agricultural program—the one for cotton—is largely the creature of the same textile interests now clamoring for import quotas. This program costs the taxpayers nearly a billion dollars a year, which, unbelievably, equals the market value of the entire U.S. cotton crop.

Over the years, the price of domestic cotton was kept—by the taxpayer—well above the world price. As a consequence, the demands for imported cotton fabrics increased. Fundamentally, this shortsighted anticotton policy helped underwrite the cost of research and induced the successful development and expanded use of cheaper synthetic fibers. This uneconomic cotton policy hastened the day of reckoning for cotton and textile interests alike.

In 1964, cotton mills had a chance to change the course of events, to make their products more competitive in both domestic and foreign markets. Thanks to new legislation, they received a price reduction of 30 percent in raw material cost. Instead of passing even part of this advantage on to the consumers, the price average of basic cotton constructions continued a steady upward trend. Not even the slightest dip occurred to show when the lower price of raw cotton became effective.

Now this industry wants additional Government subsidy—this time in the form of an absolutely protected market. It seems to me that it is time to call a halt.

It will undoubtedly be argued that a limited class of workmen and businessmen—that is, those who might actually lose their jobs or be forced to close their doors—will be benefited, at least in the short run, from protectionist policies. However, the interests of local industry, while important, should not be overriding. In order of importance, here are the factors I feel should be considered in judging a policy question on import quotas:

First. Impact on the Nation's economy. Here the potential loss of U.S. jobs and profit earnings has to be balanced off against the fact that quotas by their very nature are inflationary, and the possibility that one quota measure will be followed with others.

What is the profit situation of the textile industry which is clamoring for quotas with the higher prices they will bring? Fortune magazine's listings showed that total sales for textiles increased 11.3 percent in 1968 and 10.2 percent in 1969, while sales of wearing apparel increased 20.5 percent in 1968 and 20.8 percent in 1969. In 1968, the textile industry led all other industries in the Nation in profit increases—up a phenomenal 32.2 percent. Following this tremendous increase in 1968, profits declined 1.9 percent in 1969 with the subsequent downturn in the economy. For the apparel industry, profits increased 27.1 percent in 1968 and, despite the downturn in the economy, were up 12.8 percent in 1969. If individual plants are experiencing difficulties, the industry as a whole is indeed strong and healthy. The

Wall Street Journal recently summed it up this way:

In these inflationary times, import competition is among the few factors working toward holding prices down.

Price disciplines are eased in direct ratio to quota levels. Quotas may postpone the day of reckoning, but they also make it more severe when it finally comes—and it will come.

Second. Impact on average citizen: Here job loss to a few has to be balanced off against the fact that quotas tend to boost the cost of living to all Americans on the item, which next to food is the most essential in the family budget—clothing. Quotas on textiles and shoes definitely would tend to impose important additional budget pressures on a large number of families of medium and low income, and this at a time when inflation has already pressed many families to the wall.

Third. Impact on our international objectives: Through foreign aid, food for peace, Peace Corps and related activities, our country has sought to encourage economic development of other countries and particularly in areas of national advantage. We oppose the tendency of the Common Market to become highly protective. We have sought the expansion of trade relations with most nations.

Trade restrictions, especially on items produced in areas where wage rates are low, work against these objectives.

As the world's leading trading nation, we risk retaliation and the possibility of escalating trade warfare, by meeting a relatively-limited domestic problem with import quotas.

As the President stated in his trade message to Congress in 1969:

Any reduction in our imports produced by U.S. restrictions not accepted by our trading partners would invite foreign reaction against our own exports—all quite legally. Reduced imports would thus be offset by reduced exports, and both sides would lose. In the longer term, such a policy of trade restriction would add to domestic inflation and jeopardize our competitiveness in world markets at the very time when tougher competition throughout the world requires us to improve our competitive capabilities in every way possible.

It must be remembered that the Smoot-Hawley tariff—a trade protection measure—backfired. Instead of helping to ease U.S. economic depression, it aggravated it. Unable to compete in U.S. markets, other nations raised trade barriers. From 1930 to 1934, the value of U.S. exports dropped 70 percent, and world trade fell by the same.

Not since the Smoot-Hawley days has protectionist fever reached such a peak in the United States as now.

It is my hope that this challenge will be met in an enlightened way by the Congress, first by rejecting the mounting pressures for quotas, and second, by exploring ways to reduce still lower the barriers to international trade.

Certainly, it is true that there are instances where local industries have received substantial damage from import competition. But this does not mean that we should prop them up all the higher, at tremendous cost to the taxpayer, so that

when they finally fall it will be even worse. Every time we have tried such a policy, we have paid dearly for it.

Instead of turning to the tried and tired remedies of the past which have reliably brought us only hardship, instead of turning to protectionism and quotas, instead of turning backward to ideas and policies which have never worked, we must formulate new ideas, we must make every possible adjustment to make foreign trade flourish.

If taxpayers' dollars are to be used to aid local producing units in difficulty, let it be in the form of adjustment assistance which recognizes that nations may have different competitive advantages. Instead of taxing to prop up and sustain inefficient industries, let Government help them find new areas of competitive advantage which will allow them once again to compete in the world market. We have never done this with textile interests, and our failure to do so has cost taxpayers precious billions of dollars badly needed for other purposes. It has also bred an industry totally dependent upon government checks, government handouts and political favors.

Beyond whatever assistance Congress may provide to affected industries, we must also continue to look forward, not backward, in our tariff reduction plans for the future.

Tariff reductions and reduction of other trade restrictions by means of general international agreement were considerable under the recently-concluded Kennedy round negotiations.

However, because all parties must agree to whatever is done, reductions of this sort are far less than many of the parties would be willing to accept. Like wartime ocean convoys, the negotiations can move only as fast as the slowest party.

Another round of negotiations, right on the heels of the other, would produce little if anything.

At the same time, a will to make substantial advance may exist among the principal industrialized nations. This possibility should be explored, to see if the nations of OECD and perhaps others will join together in staged reductions of remaining barriers to trade. This of course is authorized under GATT.

The European Economic Community, which has moved decisively to remove almost all barriers to commerce among its six members, is the best known of the major trade associations.

Less well known is the European Free Trade Association, or the outer seven, as it has sometimes been called. With Britain as the principal partner and Iceland as the recently added eighth member, these nations have been doing business with each other—except in the field of agriculture—on a free trade basis for several years. The project has been a success.

Unlike the Common Market, the EFTA association permits each nation to establish whatever individual trade policies it wishes external to the group of seven nations. External policy on tariff, quota, and other measures vary from one nation to another. But in dealing with each other, commerce is almost as unrestricted as between Indiana and Illinois.

I mention this because a number of people prominent in commerce and politics in Britain have been undertaking an intensive study of the possibility of extending the free-trade area concept to include the United States, Canada, Japan, and perhaps other nations.

It is being explored by some as an alternative to British entry into the Common Market. Instead of moving behind the protected barriers of the Common Market, Britain and these other nations would agree, on a staged basis, to join with the United States and others in removing all barriers to commerce from one to another—whether the barriers be in the form of tariffs, quotas, border taxes, internal taxes or other devices.

It is an idea that thoroughly merits exploration, and frankly, I am strongly attracted to the possibility of a great free trade area encompassing most of the major industrialized nations, letting each compete freely for markets throughout the entire area.

In my view, this is the rational direction to take—forward toward freer trade—rather than backward to protectionism.

I mentioned the severe blow to agriculture which might result if retaliatory trade practices were adopted by countries which import our agricultural products. At the same time, I believe that our tremendous agricultural production potential presents us with our strongest argument against additional quotas and in favor of expanded trade. It presents us with an opportunity we should not hesitate to press in trade negotiations with other countries. Let me explain.

One of the most critical questions facing the United States and Japan is the imbalance of trade wherein we are running a deficit with Japan at the rate of a billion and a half dollars per year. Many have observed, and I am inclined to agree that we cannot permit this gap to continue—it must be narrowed in the best interests of both countries.

I submit, however, that limiting Japan's textile shipments to the United States and running the risk of a trade war, is not the way to do it. Rather, I say the course of action for this Nation to take at this crucial time in U.S. relations with the Pacific and all Asia is to sell more to Japan and to concentrate further on reducing the Japanese restraints on U.S. investments in Japan.

Japan's total textile and apparel sales to the United States for the latest 12-month period on record accounted for only about 8.5 percent of U.S. consumption in volume and only 4.2 percent in dollar value. However, as I mentioned before, U.S. exports of agricultural commodities alone to Japan are now likely to exceed a billion dollars for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Furthermore, Japan's needs for agricultural commodities is increasing at a rapid rate. On December 3, 1969, Buroku Yoshino, Minister of Japan to the United States spoke to the farm magazine editors in Chicago. He referred to a recent report issued by the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry saying:

Rise in import needs by 1977 will include 86% more soybeans, 22% more wheat and

67% more feed grains, as well as sharp increases in other products.

In fiscal year 1969, Japan bought from the United States over \$200 million worth of soybeans, \$112.2 million worth of wheat and flour, \$218.7 million worth of feed grains, and about \$50 million worth of hides and skins, as well as a number of other commodities.

The figures for soybeans and feed grains are of special interest to me because of the vantage point of my constituents and the vast resources of the State of Illinois and the great Midwest. But actually, the figure on soybeans, in particular, should be of great interest to my colleagues in Southern States—the home of cotton and textiles—as well, for soybean production is now firmly established throughout the South and is increasing tremendously.

I have here the statistics for soybean production by States and would like to include them in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. SOYBEAN PRODUCTION BY LEADING STATES

[In millions of bushels]

State	1964	1969
Illinois.....	143.3	220.9
Iowa.....	121.2	174.3
Indiana.....	66.2	104.8
Arkansas.....	61.1	86.6
Missouri.....	58.6	81.9
Minnesota.....	57.0	76.0
Ohio.....	41.8	67.9
Mississippi.....	24.5	50.3
Louisiana.....	8.0	30.5
Tennessee.....	13.4	28.6
Nebraska.....	12.0	26.8
North Carolina.....	16.3	24.2
South Carolina.....	17.1	21.5
Kansas.....	12.0	19.5
Alabama.....	3.7	14.7
Kentucky.....	5.8	13.5
Michigan.....	7.5	11.8
Georgia.....	2.4	11.2
Virginia.....	7.6	9.0
Texas.....	1.7	7.5
Maryland.....	4.1	6.7
South Dakota.....	4.0	6.3
Delaware.....	2.4	4.6
Florida.....	1.6	4.5
Oklahoma.....	2.0	3.4
Wisconsin.....	1.9	3.3
North Dakota.....	2.7	3.0

Source: USDA

And most producers in these States are finding that foreign markets are very important outlets for our soybeans and soybean products. For example, about 40 percent, or about 2 out of every 5 acres of annual soybean production has been exported in recent years. In fiscal year 1969, the total U.S. soybean crop was valued at about \$2.5 billion, and we exported over \$1.1 billion throughout the world. Already this fiscal year through April, USDA estimates that we have exported about \$1.45 billion worth of soybeans, meal, and oil.

The big question which Minister Yoshino did not answer is how much of Japan's future needs will come from the United States. For soybeans, Japan has made a most important move toward liberalization. Japan agreed to advance the effective date for reduction of duty on soybeans by 1 1/4 years. Thus, the reduction from the present 10-percent rate to the new 6 1/2-percent rate will occur sooner. For soybean meal, Japan is making further liberalization by removing the quotas at the end of 1970.

However, there still is a duty on soybeans and our Government's objective

should be, and is, to seek its early and complete removal.

As successful as our negotiations on the importation of our agricultural commodities have been, I believe we must be more forceful and make such negotiations a matter of higher priority. That high priority must be established now. The penalty for not making such decisions now is to risk losing these markets in the long term development of Japan's procurement of her food needs.

The most important natural resource of this Nation is our great capacity for dependable agricultural production year after year with efficiency unmatched anywhere in the world and the plentiful supply of the major commodities upon which the world population depends—soybeans, corn, wheat and other feed grains.

Are we to risk losing these markets because we have launched a trade war at the wrong time on the wrong issue? Will we gain new agricultural markets? I do not believe that this Nation can long remain prosperous without the economic muscle of U.S. agriculture. In today's world the potential loss of markets to the United States which may be triggered by textile and footwear quotas could be too large a handicap for even our great country to carry.

And it need not be.

Sometimes agreement can be reached if new elements are injected into the discussion. I submit that we should inject the element of expanding U.S. agricultural trade into our current textile negotiations with Japan. This would give Japan an opportunity to exercise its tremendous buying power and to use one of its great sources of national strength as a means of developing a sounder, more profitable long-range relationship with the United States. Japan can and should buy more of our agricultural products, and the United States should negotiate from that position of strength rather than seeking to impose quotas.

I am confident there are other significant items of trade between the United States and Japan which could become part of discussions which might be much more meaningful than the narrow, self-defeating concentration on textiles.

We are at a critical juncture. We can turn back the clock on trade, or we can move boldly ahead in the best of American tradition by expanding markets, fostering opportunities, and laying the foundation for the growth of American commerce, prosperity, and foreign opportunities. There can be no question that the latter course should be our choice.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Congressional Quarterly's disdainful regard for accuracy with regard to statistical conclusions, which I have previously pointed out in this House, now appears to apply to its editorial extrapolations.

I refer specifically to the sentence in the May 6 Congressional Quarterly re-

lease regarding House Member's recent financial disclosures, which states:

"More than one-third, 160, of the reports were blank, pointing up loopholes in the disclosure requirements."

The clear inference in this statement is that all Members of the House are inherently in potential conflict-of-interest positions and that 160 of them had been able to avoid that revelation by a deviously contrived reporting rule.

The real loophole is Congressional Quarterly's lack of understanding of the rule's purpose, unless Congressional Quarterly intentionally seeks to indict from premises which responsible journalism would at least demand be stated.

Two theories exist on the function of financial disclosure. One holds that every public officeholder is obligated as a condition of service to have every detail of his personal affairs widely publicized.

The other theory is well explained in the recent book *Congress and the Public Trust*, a report of a study of legislative branch ethics which was financed by the Ford Foundation and conducted by a special Committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York.

The report states on page 73:

Disclosure must be public, but it need not be "complete" in the usual sense.

The report further comments:

It is common for journalists and reformers in this area to call simply for "complete" or "full" financial disclosure, but few go on to say exactly what the terms mean. If such disclosure means Members should bare to the public every economic detail about themselves, their families and their associates, then it is unprecedented and unnecessary. Such requirements now exist nowhere in our law and are not essential to conflict-of-interest regulation.

It may be arguable whether a disclosure rule based on one of these premises would be more in the public interest than one based on the other. Both, however, rely on the proposition that the collective common sense of the American voter is capable of assessing their representative positions, without the pious urgings of the profit-oriented publication of Congressional Quarterly to have an institutionalized inner circle do it for them.

I happen to have personal knowledge that some of the 160 Members which Congressional Quarterly inferentially libels, including myself, reported no holdings simply because they have only nominal net worth or have no holdings in any company doing business with, or regulated by, the Federal Government.

Others made negative reports after electing to divest themselves of their holdings in a very depressed market rather than endure continuing unfounded abuse. Still others rearranged their portfolios for the same reasons. Any of these reasons are totally legitimate toward the objective of financial disclosure and therefore do not exist as a result of loopholes.

It is difficult for me to believe that such elementary analysis of either the rationale of disclosure or the reasons for 160 negative reports could have eluded Congressional Quarterly's editorial judgment. If that is reasonable, it is even more difficult to justify Congressional Quar-

terly's conclusions, with no declaration to Congressional Quarterly's assumptions, as a legitimate exercise of freedom of the press.

REPORT ON ACTIONS OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, every year at my own cost and expense I have sent out to my district a report of the actions of the Congress. Earlier this year I sent out over 180,000 reports, together with a questionnaire, which is presently being tabulated. As we reach the halfway mark of this second session I believe it would be well to reflect on some of the actions we have taken. Some of the highlights of a national and international nature and the actions I have taken thereto, I believe, can be categorized as follows:

INDOCHINA

I have sponsored several resolutions calling upon the President to accelerate the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam and expressing my position against the sending of troops to Cambodia, Thailand, Laos or North Vietnam without a declaration of war or a Joint Resolution of Congress. Our Nation has already met its original commitment to South Vietnam and now we must bring our forces home safely and speedily. Only in this way can we concentrate on reunifying a Nation badly divided at home.

MIDDLE EAST

I have made several statements on the crisis in the Middle East in order to urge a clarification of U.S. policy in that troubled area. I have repeatedly called upon the President to act favorably on Israel's request to purchase Phantom and Skyhawk jet aircraft. In addition to my support for military assistance to Israel, I have called for a more forceful U.S. policy within the United Nations against Arab terrorism, against the presence of Soviet personnel in Egypt and in support of the sovereignty of the State of Israel.

ENVIRONMENT

The threatened destruction of Jamaica Bay continued and efforts to extend runways at Kennedy Airport into the bay have increased. For these reasons I have taken a strong stand against any further construction at Kennedy Airport. I recently testified before a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences urging that the bay area and its residents be protected against increased air and water pollution, aircraft noise, and air traffic congestion which threatens to make this area uninhabitable for future generations.

SOCIAL SECURITY

I have sponsored broad legislation to increase benefits and improve health insurance programs under social security. Congress did pass a 15-percent social security increase at the close of last year and the House recently approved another 5-percent increase with an automatic adjustment for future increases in the cost of living. These measures were part of

the bill I sponsored and I am hopeful that other improvements in these programs will be made shortly.

THE ECONOMY

Runaway inflation and tight money policies have disrupted the Nation's economy. I am particularly concerned about increasing unemployment statistics and the impact of high interest rates on the housing industry. I have sponsored legislation designed to bring about lower interest rates and provide incentives for the construction of needed middle- and low-income housing units in our city and in the Nation.

CRIME AND NARCOTICS

The entire system of law enforcement, the judiciary and citizen education have gone without our attention for too long. I have supported programs to educate our young people about the dangers of narcotics and drug abuse and to create additional treatment centers and after care programs for addicts. In addition I have voted for or sponsored legislation to appropriate additional funds for local law enforcement agencies and research in crime control.

TRANSPORTATION

I have sponsored bills to provide additional funds for public transportation in order to improve our city's subway and commuter system. I have also been in the forefront of the battle to find a site for a fourth jetport to serve the New York area and relieve Kennedy of the dangerous and disruptive air traffic congestion and related problems.

COMMITTEES

I continue to serve on the important House Appropriations Committee and Select Committee on Small Business. These assignments afford me a unique opportunity to participate in the major decisions which affect the Nation's priorities at home and abroad and to speak for you in the debate about these priorities.

This is a time of crisis in America—a time when the rule of reason is being tested by dissenters at opposite ends of the political system. It is my hope that our system will rise to the occasion by meeting these challenges with imagination and just solutions to real problems. I am always available to discuss these issues with you and to hear your views and suggestions.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL FACTFINDING COMMITTEE FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of President Nixon, four Members of the Senate, four Members of the House of Representatives, and the Governors of three States last week completed a factfinding mission to South Vietnam and Cambodia. Upon return the group submitted a report to President Nixon at a meeting in the White House yesterday.

Members of the House delegation on the panel were, besides myself, Mr.

FISHER, of Texas, Mr. BRAY, of Indiana, and Mr. WHITEHURST, of Virginia.

I submit herewith to my colleagues the report which the committee made to the President:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FACTFINDING COMMISSION ON SOUTH VIETNAM, JUNE 10, 1970

At the request of the President, our group undertook a whirlwind journey to Southeast Asia, leaving Washington, D.C. on June 3, 1970.

From June 5 through June 8, we met in South Vietnam and Cambodia with senior U.S. and South Vietnamese civilian and military leaders and with American and ARVN soldiers in the field. We visited villages and hamlets. We met with enemy defectors. We ranged into active battle areas. We visited with Cambodian soldiers. We were at liberty to see and talk with anyone we wished in regard to any aspect of the war.

Some of the group concentrated on the pacification program while others went into battle areas. Others visited Cambodia's capital. Some consulted veteran reporters in the area. While the visit was much too brief to be conclusive, most of us are agreed on the following broad points.

1. The Cambodian operations are militarily successful, certainly for the short term. Huge quantities of enemy arms, equipment, ammunition and foodstuffs have been captured. More than 10,000 of the enemy forces in Cambodia—an estimated one-fourth of the total—have been destroyed. Enemy command and logistical systems have been disrupted. Especially in the III and IV Corps Tactical Zones, the enemy's capability to conduct large-scale operations within South Vietnam has been substantially reduced for at least six to eight months. The confidence and morale of South Vietnamese forces have been undergirded by their proven mettle in battle and—as one top U.S. leader reported to us—as they have demonstrated a capability for combined force operations not deemed obtainable for at least two more years. The American servicemen we encountered also responded enthusiastically to this combat initiative.

We are agreed that the attack on the sanctuaries has produced important immediate dividends for the U.S. and South Vietnam.

2. We are most favorably impressed with the leadership of our own and ARVN military forces, and with the competence and dedication of State Department personnel in Saigon. Ambassador Bunker and General Abrams are extraordinarily able and effective leaders for our country. Our troops in the field are magnificent.

3. Military planning in Saigon, as in Washington, is firmly set on the removal of American forces from Cambodia by the June 30 deadline set by the President. All leaders we met with agreed that, due at least in some measure to the Cambodian operation, the scheduled U.S. troop withdrawals can safely and surely proceed. We conceive and hope that in coming months an acceleration of withdrawals may even become possible. Some ARVN forces will likely remain in Cambodia for an additional time to complete the very arduous task of locating enemy caches and removing or destroying the captured materiel. South Vietnamese leaders, both military and civilian, disavow any intention to position ARVN troops permanently in Cambodia or to allow any of their Cambodian activities to impair the Vietnamization and pacification programs within South Vietnam. They firmly state, however, that an enemy attempt to reconstitute the sanctuaries will provoke an ARVN re-entry.

4. U.S. embolment in a wider war in Cambodia is not contemplated or expected by any of the top American or Vietnamese leaders we consulted on this trip. To the

contrary, all of these leaders freely acknowledged the fact that June 30 is the deadline for the removal of all U.S. ground forces, including advisers, from Cambodia. ARVN forces will not be employed in Cambodia, according to our authorities, without the consent of the Lon Nol government. We are assured that U.S. support for ARVN forces will not be allowed to underwrite adventurist efforts in Cambodia by the ARVN at the expense of our objectives for South Vietnam.

5. There is noteworthy progress in the military and civilian aspects of Vietnamization, auguring well for U.S. disengagement and the long-term viability of South Vietnam.

On the military side, 115,000 Americans have left, and 150,000 more are to come home by next May. The Vietnamese are pridefully taking their place. We were greatly pleased by the confidence—indeed, eagerness—of Vietnamese military leaders to assume their expanding role, despite the consequent marked reduction in U.S. casualties and the sharp increase in theirs. The Delta area—"the backbone of the nation," as a top American leader described it to us—is now wholly under Vietnamese military direction, our 9th Division having been withdrawn. Other important military areas have been moved under Vietnamese direction, including the defense of the Saigon area. Vietnamese military training has been increased by 30 percent and their military trainees in the U.S. tripled, including especially Air Force pilots—a skill at which the Vietnamese excel, according to reports volunteered by a number of our own military leaders.

On the civilian side of Vietnamization—the pacification program—progress is also encouraging. Our meetings with province and hamlet chiefs and our visits to representative villages were particularly rewarding in revealing the crucial role of local courage and leadership in regaining control in this nation so long undermined by subversion, terrorism, and war. The Vietnamese Popular Force units, roughly comparable to our civilian components, are sharply on the increase. Some 350,000 of the People's Self-Defense Force are now armed, forcing the Viet Cong to wage war on the people as well as on regular military units. Territorial Security Forces, now more than 500,000 men, are attaining a 3-1 weapons capture ratio today as contrasted to a 1-3 ratio only two years ago. The roads, the waterways, the railroads are improved and are increasingly secure in ever wider areas. Enemy recruitment in South Vietnam is sharply down, so that almost three-fourths of enemy combat strength in this region now consists of North Vietnamese—a proportion almost exactly reversed from what it was in earlier phases of the war. Enemy defections were almost 40,000 last year, and our leaders anticipate tens of thousands more this year. Elections have been held in over 90 percent of the villages and hamlets and other important elections are near at hand—a presidential election next year, half of the Senate this fall, and 44 provincial councils this month. President Thieu is pressing for more election improvements, including a run-off requirement for the presidential election in 1971, and is attempting to develop coalition groups to reduce the political party proliferation in South Vietnam.

Noteworthy, indeed, we believe, is the continuing enthusiasm of village and hamlet chiefs to stand for election despite the obvious perils of these leadership positions targeted by the Viet Cong. In IV Corps we learned that despite an assassination rate of 8-12 a month, 82 percent of these 16,000 elective officials chose to run again, and 50 percent of them were reelected. Significant also is the fact that the newer leaders are younger and better trained.

In sum, we have both seen and felt an increasing vitality and confidence in this

hard-pressed country. We share the conviction of our leaders in Vietnam that the present prospects are more promising than at any previous time during our long involvement in this war.

6. We were pleased especially by reports given us by our own leaders and President Thieu on the "Land to the Tiller" program, which promises to have a revolutionary social and economic impact throughout this country. This program, signed into law by President Thieu on March 26, is devised to end land tenancy and ultimately will distribute 2.5 million acres—60 percent of the cultivated riceland in Vietnam—to more than 800,000 rural families. Next month a series of two-week training programs will begin for 4,000 village officials who must administer this program. President Thieu expressed great enthusiasm for this far-reaching effort both for its intrinsic merit and for its countervailing influence against Communist land-redistribution propaganda. Our group commends his initiative and shares his enthusiasm.

7. Despite the heartening advance of Vietnamization, the improved operational capabilities of the RVNAF, the potential of land reform, the severe logistical embarrassments of enemy forces, the immediate tactical success of the Cambodian operations and the gathering strength of the Vietnamese political structure, we must not exclude the possibility of significant setbacks in the progress we have noted in Vietnam. Historically, there have been heartbreaks there, and this young republic will doubtless suffer more of them as an implacable enemy persists for an indeterminate time. An important indicator in coming months will be the manner in which the Republic of Vietnam measures up to these adversities. From the indications available to us, we deduce that the South Vietnamese have the tenacity and courage, and now hopefully have the time, to win their long struggle for survival.

8. Particularly for those among us who have been previously in Vietnam, the evidence of progress, military, economic, and political, is plainly evident. The clear impression we carry away with us from this brief but intensive survey is that at last in South Vietnam one can discern a genuine prospect for self-defense, a strengthening promise of political viability, and a growing spirit of confident nationhood. We prayerfully hope, and most of us believe, that all of this will be enhanced by the bold move into enemy havens in Cambodia.

9. On leaving this tormented region, we conclude that the objective of our country must continue to be neither military victory nor an indefinite continuance of our participation, and assuredly not an enlargement or broadening of our military role in Southeast Asia, but rather an orderly withdrawal of American personnel in phase with the mounting capability of the South Vietnamese to assure their own security and lead their own lives in their own way.

Approved by: Governor John Love, Governor Raymond Shafer, Senator Howard Cannon, Senator George Murphy, Representative William Bray, Representative O. C. Fisher, Representative Melvin Price, Representative William Whitehurst.

NATIONAL SOJOURNERS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the House the fact that the National Sojourners will, during this month, celebrate that organization's golden anni-

versary convention. The occasion will be observed on June 24–27 at Columbus, Ohio.

The National Sojourners, Inc., is an outstanding organization whose membership is made up of commissioned officers and warrant officers, both active and retired, of the Armed Forces who are Master Masons. As would be anticipated, their principal purposes are to cultivate Masonic ideals, to support patriotic aims and activities, to develop true patriotism and Americanism, to bring together members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States in efforts to further national defense, and to oppose influences calculated to weaken the national security.

National Sojourners believe in God as the Supreme Architect of the Universe. They hold that political, economic, and social problems are subsidiary to and ever separate from that steadfast belief in God.

They maintain that God must motivate man if present-day problems are to be solved, and urge active participation in maintaining that Government for which our forefathers fought.

National Sojourners remember that George Washington once said:

When we assumed the soldier we did not lay aside the citizen.

Gov. James A. Rhodes of the State of Ohio has proclaimed June 24–27, 1970 as National Sojourners Week in Ohio. He has urged the people of the State of Ohio to honor the National Sojourners, welcome the delegates in the true Ohio spirit, and requested the flags of the Nation and Ohio be flown those days as a special tribute to the patriotism and fidelity of National Sojourners.

National Sojourners have met and worked on land, on sea, in the air, under the sea, and in outer space. A number of Presidents have been members, including Warren G. Harding, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. Also included in its membership are such outstanding military leaders as Douglas MacArthur, Lyman Lemnitzer, and Arleigh Burke, to mention only a few, and Astronauts Aldrin, Eisele, and Schirra.

The majority of the Grand Masters of the Masons in the United States are either active or honorary members of the organization.

They have active chapters in Vietnam, other overseas areas, and throughout the United States.

I urge a salute to National Sojourners on their Golden Convention.

THE HONORABLE JOHN J. WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there is no other Member in either House of Congress of the United States to which the term "honorable" more aptly fits than the extra-distinguished gentleman who represents the State of Delaware in the U.S. Senate, JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

In January 1971, irrespective of the

outcome of elections throughout the country, and irrespective of which party will organize the other body, the Halls of Congress will no longer be able to boast that Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS is on the job. Senator WILLIAMS is retiring.

The message of the man as compared to his colleagues is immeasurable. This typical WILLIAMS quote, from an article in this morning's Wall Street Journal, is symbolic of what the Senate and the Nation is losing with the Senator's retirement:

If the Republicans won control of the Senate, I would be Chairman of the Finance Committee, and I would have liked that very much . . . But above all, I would have liked to be Chairman at an age when I could handle the job without question. It was tempting, but you just can't make exceptions to your principles.

The Senator feels, as I do, that public officials should retire gracefully from the scene when age begins to inhibit one's capacities to give the full measure of devotion to his constituents and the Nation. The Senator does not need a Federal law passed to require this sensible policy. No, the "conscience of the Senate" simply retires.

For others, a Federal law might be necessary and knowing this, I introduced H.R. 2121 which would require that "each officer and employee in or under the Government of the United States shall be separated from the service of the United States at the age of 70 years."

So far, my bill has gotten exactly nowhere in the Congress; perhaps the example of the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware will assist my efforts. But irrespective of the fate of this one piece of legislation, the important, the magnificent, and the historic point that we should remember today is that because of principle a man is leaving his past with the Government. And, gentlemen, the most incredible thing about this retirement is this—JOHN J. WILLIAMS retires in order to better serve his constituency.

An article by Alan L. Otten in the Wall Street Journal tells something of the unique impact of Senator WILLIAMS on the institutions of the Congress of the United States and I highly recommend it to all Members. The article follows:

DEPARTING CONSCIENCE (By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—When a new Senate meets in January, several present members will be missing—a few having quit, a few retired by the voters. None will leave a hole more uniquely difficult to fill than Republican John Williams of Delaware, who for almost 24 years has battled, often alone, for honesty and high ethical standards in Congress and the rest of Government.

Mr. Williams is leaving voluntarily—and in a way that demonstrates anew his claim to the title of "the conscience of the Senate." He is retiring at the end of this session not because of ill health or imminent defeat but as a matter of principle. Just turned 66, he would be 72 by the end of another term, and simply does not believe that he—or any Senator, judge, or other public official—should hold public office at that age.

"After 70, you just don't carry your share of the load," he argues earnestly. "You have to rely more and more on staff aides, and they become the ones who make the deci-

sions, and there's a situation where the person making the decisions is not accountable to the people."

Retirement wasn't an easy choice. Though Mr. Williams avoids cocktail parties and other social functions, he loves the Senate, where he is now the third-ranking Republican behind George Aiken of Vermont and Milton Young of North Dakota. "If the Republicans won control of the Senate, I would be chairman of the Finance Committee, and I would have liked that very much," he concedes. "But above all, I would have liked to be chairman at an age when I could handle the job without question. It was tempting, but you just can't make exceptions to your principles."

Mr. Williams has always been a Senate anomaly. In a body of lettered men, he's a mere high-school graduate. Other Senators are handsome, articulate, extroverted; he is shy and gangling, the perfect country rube, a dreadful speaker whose almost-inaudible nasal sing-song has earned him another nickname, "Whispering Willie."

Most Senators held a series of lower offices; Mr. Williams, a small-town (but very successful, self-made) feed merchant and chicken farmer, was only briefly a member of the Millsboro town council before running for the Senate in 1946. (No other Republican wanted to take on the top popular Democratic incumbent; then, to everyone's surprise, the national tide against post-war controls carried Mr. Williams to victory.)

And where most Senators pursue from the start some favorite field such as foreign affairs or urban problems, the Senator from Delaware slipped by accident into his career as the nemesis of evil-doers. Constituents began complaining about undesired delinquency notices from the Federal tax office in Wilmington; following up, he found his own name on the delinquent lists, and had canceled checks to prove that was an error. Closer investigation revealed the cashier had been systematically embezzling for almost seven years—and what really violated the Senator's strict Methodist morality was the way top officials seemed unconcerned and reluctant to act. "It planted in my mind the idea that things could be wrong, with little being done to correct them," he says, his thin lips drawing even tighter in disapproval.

This success started other leads coming his way, and he gradually built voluminous files and a network of tipsters. He exposed a mammoth tax-fixing ring in the Internal Revenue Service, excessive grain storage payments by the Commodity Credit Corp., shoddy practices in defense contracting. It was his disclosures that helped indict Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker. He battled—sometimes successfully, sometimes not—to reduce tax depletion allowances on oil, cut merchant marine subsidies, limit soil bank and other farm payments.

He managed it all, too, without the large staff, wide-open subpoenas and dramatic TV hearings that characterize most Congressional investigations. A confirmed loner, he checked out his leads himself or with the aid of his long-time secretary, and then, when he was sure he had the facts, he laid it all out in a thoroughly documented speech on the Senate floor.

Practicing what he preached, he refused all Government subsidies on his Delaware farms, and once embarrassed Senate colleagues by turning back unspent stationery funds. Repeatedly he has blocked proposals for Congressional pensions he considered extravagant.

A loyal Republican and consistent conservative on most domestic matters, he hasn't hesitated to hit GOP wrong-doing as hard as Democratic. He early called for Sherman Adams to quit as assistant to President Eisenhower, and last year opposed Clement Haynsworth for the Supreme Court as a man "insensitive to the expected requirements of ju-

dicial ethics." (He did, however, support the Carswell nomination.) When the Nixon Administration budget followed the previous practice of including trust fund income with other Government tax receipts, he blasted "sleight-of-hand bookkeeping."

This fall he will take his files back home to Millsboro, and spend a good amount of time weeding out references that might compromise any of his sources—men and women he has always scrupulously shielded. Then he hopes to make the files available for public inspection.

Beyond that, he won't discuss his post-Senate plans except to promise he will not take any other public post, elective or appointive. "If I were going to be in public service at that age, I'd rather stay here." He sold out his feed business some years back, but another business venture is certainly possible; "I come from a family," the Senator notes, "that believes there are a lot of ways to live without being on the public payroll." He will not, however, write a book; "I can't sit still that long."

He thinks well of his Senate colleagues—"human beings with the same frustrations and frailties as men in private life," but also "dedicated men, trying to do the best possible job." Perhaps most surprisingly, after 24 years of exposing misdeeds, "I am leaving with greater confidence in the overall integrity of mankind, and particularly the integrity of Government workers, than when I came in. I have seen so many men willing to gamble their own security, their family's security, with no possible gain, no possible recognition, just to correct a situation they considered wrong. It's been a tremendously reassuring experience."

DON'T DICKER WITH DICKEY-LINCOLN

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, is there no way Members of the House of Representatives can say "No" to a proposal to destroy vast portions of our natural beauty by the unnecessary construction of a hydroelectric project and make it stick? This body has forcefully rejected the Dickey-Lincoln project by five record votes in the past 5 years, but still funds are requested for the project by the Corps of Engineers this fiscal year. It is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee may consider the public works appropriations bill next week. I sincerely urge the members of that committee, "Don't Dicker with Dickey-Lincoln."

Mr. Speaker, to repeat, Dickey-Lincoln has been rejected by this body by five record votes in the past 5 years. Its authorization was rejected by a recorded vote in 1965. We have cast four record votes against any appropriation for its construction planning. Our last record vote against it was 265 to 132. How many more times must the conservationist across America fight this project?

This administration has announced some giant and long overdue steps designed to follow through in preserving our environment and just last week I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the commitment as expressed by President Nixon to improving this land of ours. I also stated at that time that the public did not question the President's commitment to improving the environment

but the unfortunate part is that translating the President's desires into action throughout the Federal bureaucracy is a problem of herculean proportions. The continued activities of the Corps of Engineers to construct Dickey-Lincoln is the prime example of this problem.

It is obvious that the President's message and the will of the American public—as done in the past—will continue to be ignored by the Corps of Engineers.

Dickey-Lincoln is perhaps one of the most destructive projects ever proposed by the Army Engineers. It is vigorously opposed by numerous outstanding national and regional conservation organizations, including: Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Audubon Society, Maine Fish and Game Clubs, Massachusetts Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Council of Maine, New England Advisory Board on Fish and Game Problems, Sierra Club, State Biologists Association of Maine, and the Wilderness Society.

Dickey-Lincoln would consist of an elevated artificial reservoir of dead-surface water spread over 140 square miles of the upper St. John Basin, plus six dams around its perimeter to keep it from spilling over, plus various power plants, switchyards, transmission lines, project buildings, and spoil areas. It would have a reservoir fluctuation of 40 vertical feet, and a shoreline exposure at low pool exceeding 42 square miles. It would take the despoilers only 7 years to destroy what has taken nature an eternity to create for the benefit of mankind.

A Federal Inter-Agency Committee report on New England water resources a few years ago called the upper St. John Basin where Dickey-Lincoln would be built "the largest remaining wilderness in Eastern United States" and said it should be preserved in its unique wilderness condition—resources of the New England-New York Region, Part II, Volume III, page 6, 1955. For generations, the Great Maine Woods have provided a caliber of outdoor adventure and inspiration that cannot be experienced elsewhere in the northeast. Dickey-Lincoln would destroy much of this area.

In addition to the upper Basin's pervasive forest primeval character, the Inter-Agency Committee found that its famed scenic qualities include the entire portion of the river and valley above the mouth of the Allagash, which enters the St. John between the proposed Dickey and Lincoln damsites—the most vibrant two-thirds of the upper St. John above the mouth of the Allagash would disappear beneath Dickey Reservoir—the "Fish River Chain of Lakes"—which would be traversed by extra high voltage transmission lines—and strikingly beautiful mountain setting. Deboullie Mountain, about 4 air-miles from Dickey dam-site, would be excavated to obtain gravel and stone for Dickey dam.

The Inter-Agency Committee recommended that—because of its "unique upland wilderness character, its outstanding scenic and geological features, mountain peaks, lakes, forest and marshlands"—the reach of the Upper St. John River Basin beginning near Deboullie Mountain should be set aside or "reserved" to preserve the unspoiled wil-

derness character of these Great Maine Woods.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a substantial revision in our thinking on priorities as they relate to our environment. We, the people of the United States, have come a long way toward recognizing that there is more to life than merely living. We are now concerned with those things which may contribute to the betterment of life. Leisure time has been increasing which we can use to renew the needs of what some have called the inner-man. It was Henry David Thoreau who said, "In wilderness is the preservation of the world." In his book, *Walden*, he also said:

We need the tonic of wildness, to wade sometimes in the marshes where the bitter and the meadow-hen lurk, and hear the booming of the snipe . . .

We must be refreshed by the sight of inexhaustible vigor, vast and titanic features, the sea-coast with its wrecks, and the wilderness with its living and its decaying trees.

From men such as Thoreau and John Muir, in the middle of the past century, to the leaders of today, there has been a continuing tradition of love for the great outdoors and unending efforts to conserve its limitless values. John Muir spoke for the mountains and the wilderness with such a missionary zeal that he moved many people to constructive action. Theodore Roosevelt may have been an advocate of the soft voice in international relations, but he spoke in thunderous terms about the disappearance and abuse of natural resources. Carl Schurz, the German-American Civil War general and Interior Secretary, began efforts to halt the uncontrolled exploitation of federally owned forests and paved a way for Gifford Pinchot to carve out the national forest system.

Throughout the years there has been a long list of other outstanding conservation leaders who have kept alive the warning that the American people cannot wander too far from nature and the great outdoors, without losing character, strength, roots, and orientation. Some of these areas of the great outdoors must be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unaware that there are also some other priorities on use of our natural resources which must be met. But, I assure my friends here today Dickey-Lincoln is not a case requiring further sacrifice of the Nation's diminishing areas of unique natural beauty for a vitally needed water resource project. Dickey-Lincoln's only water resource purpose other than power is not significant according to the testimony of a former Assistant Secretary of the Interior. It would be built solely for power purposes and equivalent power can be produced more cheaply by less destructive means elsewhere in New England. Interior officials have admitted that Government power can be generated by alternate methods cheaper than the Dickey-Lincoln project, but they contend the Dickey-Lincoln project is essential for the comprehensive—power—development of the St. John River. In my opinion, the unique values of the Upper St. John and its Great Maine Woods are far

too precious to be sacrificed for power development.

Construction of Dickey-Lincoln in the middle of these Great Maine Woods would result in a level of intrusion and ecological disturbance throughout the entire region that would forever destroy its unspoiled, cathedral-like wilderness quality. The Inter-Agency Committee reported that the benefits of these Great Maine Woods can be enhanced by improved access roads to their perimeter; they will be destroyed by penetration.

Mr. Speaker, the Great Maine Woods and Upper St. John River are an American heritage to be preserved—not to be destroyed. I most earnestly urge that if this matter again comes before the House we reject any appropriation for construction planning of the Dickey-Lincoln power project. Don't Dicker with Dickey-Lincoln. Let us say "No" this time with such overwhelming emphasis that it can be put to rest for all time.

FLAG DAY

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, June 14, is Flag Day. It will mark the 193d anniversary of the approval of the resolution by Congress establishing the stars and stripes. Since that summer day "old glory" has flown proudly over the Capitol of this Nation in times of crisis and tranquillity. It has weathered the storm of challenges both internal and foreign. Today it is a symbol of our great heritage and an inspiration to all freedom loving people.

In observing Flag Day, I would call our attention to the famous flag tribute written by Marine M. Sgt. Percy Webb—the text of which follows:

I am Old Glory; For more than nine score years I have been the banner of hope and freedom for generation after generation of Americans. Born amid the first flames of America's fight for freedom, I am the symbol of a country that has grown from a little group of thirteen colonies to a united nation of fifty sovereign states. Planted firmly on the high pinnacle of American Faith my gently fluttering folds have proved an inspiration to untold millions. Men have followed me into battle with unwavering courage. They have looked upon me as a symbol of national unity. They have prayed that they and their fellow citizens might continue to enjoy the life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, which have been granted to every American as the heritage of free men. So long as men love liberty more than life itself; so long as they treasure the priceless privileges bought with blood of our forefathers; so long as the principles of truth, justice and charity for all remain deeply rooted in human hearts, I shall continue to be the enduring banner of the United States of America.

Today when America is under verbal attack from various quarters and patriotism is sometimes ridiculed and scorned, I believe we, as Representatives of this Nation, should encourage the observance of Flag Day. Although we have differences of opinion and have experienced awesome problems, we are assured in the knowledge that the Unit-

ed States of America still remains the world's best hope for freedom and justice.

We here in the House can do our part in helping to promote the observance of Flag Week by displaying our Nation's flag throughout the Halls of Congress. Toward this end I urge my colleagues to join with me in displaying their office flag in the hallway outside their office.

THE NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY IN THE NATION'S TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, testified before the House Public Works Committee on the subject of Federal highway legislation.

The Secretary's testimony was a great disappointment to me because its orientation was so narrowly directed to highways. It failed to give any quarter to the country's other transportation needs. Furthermore, he ridiculed the concern expressed by many over the want of a balanced transportation system by pointing to the use that has been made of the highways and by saying that the cause of the imbalance is due, not to how much has been spent on highways in the past, but to how little has been spent on mass transportation. This may be one answer, but I would suggest that if less had been spent on highways in the past, the alternative modes of transportation would have had a larger market and consequently more financial support. As it is, over the years we have spent more than \$50 billion in Federal funds on highways and barely a billion on mass transit. This great disparity in funding has caused a highway reflex in the communities because of the abundance of free highway money and the alternative lack of mass transportation money. And since the mid-fifties, with the establishment of the multibillion-dollar Highway Trust Fund, we have seen a dramatic drop in the use of trains and buses. With this decline in use by the public, a vicious circle has evolved with equipment and service deteriorating, in turn causing an even further fall-off in riders and losses of revenue.

We must redress the imbalance of past expenditures. Despite the claims by the administration, there is not much improvement in this year's budget. The President has recommended that in fiscal year 1971 we spend approximately \$4.5 billion, but just 6 percent of this, \$285 million on mass transit. Furthermore while Secretary Volpe, in his testimony yesterday, projected an expenditure of slightly over \$9 billion on highways in the next 6 years, the administration has submitted a mass transportation bill in which only \$3.1 billion would be available for commitment over the next 5 years with actual appropriations amounting to only \$1.86 billion.

In his statement, Secretary Volpe said, "For the future there should be a better

balance of effort." How is this a better balance of our effort, particularly when there is such a backlog of mass transit needs and growing urban concentrations demanding more public transportation at a rate greater than highways?

The Department of Transportation has submitted to Congress a highway needs study for the next 15 years totaling \$320 billion. This is a gargantuan figure which will far exceed whatever is left for other modes of transportation. But, perhaps more important than the simple economics of this estimate, is the mistaken premise on which it is based and on which the Department of Transportation seems to be relying. The estimate appears to be calculated on the expectation of a continued rise in highway use equal to the growth in population. But, the fact is that highway use may not—and indeed should not—grow in the same proportion as the population. Indeed, as our population concentrations go up, the use of highways should proportionately go down.

Very simply, when we come to the point that our superhighways are bogged down in commuter traffic each morning and night, or that projected traffic patterns demand six to 10 lanes of highway to handle the traffic, then it is time to move on to some form of public transportation. Financially it is cheaper to build one pair of tracks than the 12 lanes of highway needed to carry the same passenger load, to say nothing of the land and housing that is saved, the real estate taxes preserved, and the pollution avoided. Just because people use highways to the point that they are overloaded, is not a justification to go on building highways. In most instances people have had no choice and simply have had to resort to car travel.

On a number of occasions the Secretary has talked about the desirability of a single Transportation Trust Fund, and I am in accord with him on this. But, yesterday, the Secretary forgot about this idea and spoke only of the extension of the Highway Trust Fund until 1977. While recommending that there be some diversification of this trust fund to finance a number of highway related programs, such as beautification and safety, he failed to recommend that any allowance be made for any form of mass transportation.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with the Highway Trust Fund scheduled to expire in 1974, we have a golden opportunity to make the change needed to update our total transportation program and indeed to give "balance" to our transportation system. Instead of extending the Highway Trust Fund, we should replace it with the establishment of a single Transportation Trust Fund in 1972, the year that the Highway Trust Fund's revenue authority expires. In this way there would not be a break in the continuity of the highway program. The Highway Administration could continue to expend funds collected prior to October 1972 from the trust fund through 1974. This would give the Department of Transportation time to set up the administration of its new funding program so as to continue the funding of the In-

terstate System after 1974, as well as other modes of transportation. Some highway advocates have expressed the concern that a change to a single Transportation Fund would slow down the interstate program. In terms of the operation of the program, there is no reason why it should. What the opponents of the Transportation Trust Fund are really worried about is the competition highways would get from other modes of transportation. But why should highways be given special protection or special preference over other modes of transportation? If mass transit is established to be a better means of transportation in some areas to serve the public, why should Federal funds not go to that mode that can most efficiently and economically serve the public.

There are a number of Governors and mayors who have requested greater flexibility in the expenditure of Federal transportation funds. Some have not been able to use their share of highway funds, while desperately needing mass transit money. Legislation has already been introduced in several States to allow diversion of State Highway Trust Fund dollars to public transportation programs. Among these is Virginia. And in Maryland a transportation trust fund has already been established. Is it right that this Congress rigidly continue to embrace the Highway Trust Fund, while other forms of transportation get so little support and while the States are moving ahead in the development of overall transportation programs and funding mechanisms? Are we here in Congress to stand in the way of progress and change desired by the localities we serve? With the widening of the Highway Trust Fund to a single Transportation Trust Fund, the Congress would give the Department of Transportation and the States maximum flexibility for determining how expenditures should be made and also secure a long-term funding mechanism for all modes of transportation. Certainly such flexibility would be in accord with Secretary Volpe's interest in making President Nixon's purported "New Federalism" work.

Mr. Speaker, we need to move forward to meet the changing transportation needs of our times. Let us not be so captured by the past success of the highway program that we cannot respond to the demands of a new era requiring that attention be paid to, and funds provided for, the mass transit needs of our urban and great metropolitan centers.

THE TEACHER CORPS

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak of one of the most innovative and successful education programs which Congress has initiated, the Teacher Corps.

Congress created the Teacher Corps in 1965 under title V of the Higher Education Act. It was a time of increasing awareness that the educational needs of

our Nation's poor children were not being met.

Many of us in Congress and in the education professions knew that too often our schools were not reaching many students, and particularly the children of poverty. Many of our schools were not able to prepare the disadvantaged so that they would have real choices about the course of their lives.

As some educational reformers have put it, students were being "turned off and turned out" to lives which were limited both personally and professionally—a waste in human resources that the Nation could ill afford.

Like other sponsors of the Teacher Corps legislation, I believed the Teacher Corps program could be a means of helping schools and universities to find new ways of reaching these children such as through teachers acquiring new attitudes and skills, the introduction of new curriculums in schools and universities, and through more effective use of school personnel.

All of these educational reforms could require changes in the ways that schools and universities had traditionally operated, and as we all know, to change our habits is sometimes very difficult. However, many schools and universities had indicated that they wanted to attempt change but lacked the necessary money and personnel.

In preparing the Teacher Corps legislation, we attempted to devise a program that would not only attract and prepare large numbers of committed young people for careers in poverty-area schools but would also facilitate the adoption of reforms in teacher preparation and classroom teaching.

PURPOSES OF THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. Speaker, the Higher Education Act of 1965 set forth these purposes for the Teacher Corps:

- (1) To strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and
- (2) To encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation.

The law provides that these purposes are to be accomplished "by attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas," and by "attracting and training inexperienced teacher interns who will be made available for teaching and inservice training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher."

Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of the Teacher Corps program, I am pleased to report today that the Teacher Corps has been remarkably successful in meeting the purposes that Congress has assigned it. Moreover, the Teacher Corps has appealed to many thousands of young people who want to work constructively to bring about improvements in our society.

ACCELERATING EDUCATIONAL REFORM

I believe it is important that we understand the scope of the Teacher Corps accomplishments. I would mention four

major areas in which I believe the Teacher Corps has demonstrated its effectiveness.

First. It has accelerated the adoption of educational reforms both in universities and in schools.

The Teacher Corps has helped universities, schools, their communities and State departments of education to work together in pursuing such reforms.

The Teacher Corps has, for example, enabled school districts to participate in the design of teacher education; has given universities the opportunity to become familiar with the actual conditions in the schools for which they are preparing teachers; has involved parents in planning the education of their children; and has insured that a Teacher Corps program supports the State's own plans for educational reform.

NEW APPROACH TO FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Second. The Teacher Corps has demonstrated a sound new approach to Federal assistance.

It has required that participating institutions determine what they want to accomplish and spell out their objectives for institutional change, and then has used its resources to sustain a program until it can be supported with local resources.

For example, the Louisville schools' Project Focus is the school system's long-term plan to introduce differentiated staffing—which involves the use of teams of master teachers, regular teachers, teaching interns and aides—to meet more effectively the needs of individual children. The first steps of Project Focus have used a Teacher Corps program to reorganize the staffs and instructional programs in five Louisville elementary schools.

DISSEMINATING NEW IDEAS

Third. Too often, what we have learned from expensive educational research is not put to use in schools. But the Teacher Corps has taken the initiative in disseminating the educational materials and techniques which have been developed by the Office of Education and its regional laboratories and by others.

For instance, the Teacher Corps has generated an awareness and understanding of the so-called 10 models of competency-based teacher education which were developed under grants from the Office of Education.

This fundamentally new approach to teacher preparation demands that prospective teachers learn techniques that have already been proved effective in teaching children. And it further requires that would-be teachers actually demonstrate these skills before being awarded either a degree or certification.

As of now, seven universities are attempting the difficult transition to this new approach through their Teacher Corps programs. Moreover, all colleges and universities which apply for Teacher Corps programs in fiscal 1971 will be asked to use some degree of competency-based teacher training in their programs.

THE APPEAL TO COMMITMENT

Fourth. Mr. Speaker, the Teacher Corps has attracted thousands of young Americans who want to volunteer their

energies and talents to serve in educating disadvantaged children. In fact, for every Teacher Corps applicant who can be accepted, 10 must be turned away each year because the program does not have enough money to utilize them.

Teacher Corps interns volunteer for 2 tough years of service and average about 60 hours of work each week. Approximately 80 percent of their time is spent in school classrooms and in neighborhood education projects, and the remainder is devoted to study leading to a bachelor's or master's degree in education from a nearby participating university and to teaching certification.

For these activities, interns now receive a stipend of \$75 a week, and because this stipend is taxable, an intern's take-home pay is sometimes as low as \$54 a week.

At present, about 2,600 corpsmen—interns and their team leaders—are serving in 135 school districts and three prisons while studying in 77 universities. Teacher Corps programs are located in 40 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, and the school districts involved are about equally divided between major cities and small towns or rural areas.

In addition, I would point out that all members of Teacher Corps teams are employees of the local school district, fully subject to that district's customs and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, let me stress that a volunteer's service to deprived communities does not terminate when he completes his training program. As of October 1969, 72 percent of the Teacher Corps volunteers who completed the program in 1968 were still teaching in poverty-area schools. Of the 1,300 former interns, an impressive 86 percent have remained in education or a related social service.

As the Federal Times noted in its recent appraisal of the Teacher Corps:

In comparison, a sample of 1967 college teacher graduates by Grade Teachers magazine found that only 19 percent would accept teaching positions in disadvantaged areas.

QUESTION OF TEACHER CORPS APPROPRIATION PROMPTS SURVEY

Mr. Speaker, because the Office of Education appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, which contains funds for the Teacher Corps, is presently under consideration in Congress, it is important that we be aware of the effectiveness of the development.

As a sponsor in the House of the original Teacher Corps legislation, I have followed with keen interest the progress of the program. For this reason, I felt that an examination of its effectiveness from the vantage point of those involved at the grassroots level was appropriate.

In an effort to make a thorough survey, I wrote in April 1970, to 92 university deans and presidents; State, county, and local superintendents, school board officials and local school principals. I asked these university and school administrators to address themselves to the following questions about the Teacher Corps, which I feel are of major concern—and to make any additional comments they wished:

First. Is there effective local control?

Second. Have the university and the

school systems been enabled to bring about desired changes?

Third. Has the Teacher Corps provided needed services to the schools?

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS OF THE SURVEY

From the 65 responses I received, several general conclusions about the Teacher Corps program can be drawn.

First. Administrators feel that there is a serious need for improving the quality of elementary and secondary education, particularly in poverty-area schools, and they view the Teacher Corps as an important means of achieving this goal. In this regard, new teaching methods, more materials, and curricula have been introduced by Teacher Corps programs in local schools.

Second. Regular school teachers have been stimulated to carry on these innovations on their own.

Third. Improved teacher education has been brought about through Teacher Corps programs.

Fourth. The inadequate funding has limited the impact of the Teacher Corps.

Fifth. Local control is adequate and is maintained by the Teacher Corps guidelines, which insist on cooperation among universities, State departments, schools and school communities.

Sixth. The Teacher Corps has prompted States to reexamine and modify their teacher certification policies and standards.

Seventh. The Teacher Corps has made possible additional services to poor children in their schools, and communities have been provided, such as in-school and after-school tutoring programs, classes in cultural enrichment, and store-front schools.

Mr. Speaker, with these general conclusions in mind, I would like to discuss in greater detail the answers these college and school administrators made to my questions.

I. IS THERE EFFECTIVE LOCAL CONTROL?

The overwhelming majority of the public school and university administrators to whom I wrote said "Yes."

Generally, they felt that the Teacher Corps guidelines which establish the terms and conditions of the Federal grant are flexible. In some instances, they looked upon these guidelines as vital means for maintaining local control. As Dean Elmer J. Clark of Southern Illinois University pointed out:

Teacher Corps has helped to establish and make operational the concept of community-based education through encouraging local control and planning.

Numerous university and local school officials stressed that local autonomy is assured by the selection procedures for Corpsmen and by the contractual arrangements under which Corpsmen operate. In this regard, the selection of trainees is made jointly by the local school districts, the school community and the cooperating university. Moreover, interns, once in training, are under the direct supervision of the local school district.

In my survey, I found 40 responses specifically referring to my first question.

In general, the comments reflected the feeling that "certain nationally applied

rules and regulations are necessary for efficient fulfillment of Corps purposes."

Several school administrators echoed Gordon McAndrew, superintendent of the school for the city of Gary, Ind., who attributed much of Teacher Corps' success to its reliance on local control. He said:

Much of the progress may be attributed to the fact that primary responsibility for the program's operation rests with the local school system which is strategically situated to recognize areas of specific educational needs.

II. HAVE THE UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS BEEN ENABLED TO BRING ABOUT DESIRED CHANGES?

Without exception, every university and school district administrator who wrote me recognized actual or potential changes resulting from a Teacher Corps program. These changes were primarily in two areas.

A. CHANGES IN TEACHER TRAINING

First, many administrators noted observable changes within universities, school districts and in communities and human relations.

For example, on the university level, the Teacher Corps has had its largest impact on teacher training programs. This was reflected in a statement by Superintendent Modéal Walsh of Graham County, N.C.

Our colleges and universities are just beginning to re-evaluate their teacher training programs in terms of a more relevant approach. It would be a mistake to discontinue Teacher Corps at this stage.

Because the Teacher Corps emphasizes on-site training in local schools, it is a means of teacher preparation which is responsive to the needs of the communities it serves.

Moreover, as Dr. Richard Moe, dean of the School of Education at Pacific Lutheran University, pointed out, this approach to training has the added advantage of a greater appeal to today's college students.

It is daily becoming more evident that traditional programs of teacher education may not be acceptable to the upcoming generation of college students who prefer a closer tie between theory and practice.

The letter from Dean J. A. Williams of the University of Georgia at Athens provided a specific example of change in teacher training:

The Teacher Corps programs we have operated have served as very effective means for laboratory basing a graduate teacher education program for the education of teachers of Early Childhood Education with emphasis on the disadvantaged population.

Generally, then, as L. Harlan Ford of the Texas Education Agency observed:

The Teacher Corps idea for teacher preparation is a very functional one and has been replicated in varying degrees by institutions involved in the programs.

B. TEACHER CERTIFICATION POLICIES REVAMPED

Modifications in teacher certification policies have also been stimulated by the Teacher Corps. Dean George Denmark of the University of Kentucky among others made this point:

Because of the presence of Teacher Corps on our campus, we have also been more aware of the need to modify requirements for cer-

tification for liberal arts graduates who decide to go into teaching. This has resulted in a new certification program for this type of person.

As a result of more liberal certification policies, teaching as a career is available to a greater number of students. Moreover, the presence of a Teacher Corps program has stimulated an interest among students not majoring in education for teaching disadvantaged children.

Joseph Manch's comment on behalf of the board of education of Buffalo, N.Y., clearly indicated this to me. He said:

There has, indeed, been a noteworthy growth among the faculty of the State University College at Buffalo in becoming actively involved in the education of inner-city children, and in turn creating an early awareness in their college students of the needs of these children.

In this regard, Dean Robert Simpson from the State University College at Buffalo said:

We have statistical data to indicate that an increased number of our student teachers, that is, those who are in regular undergraduate teacher education programs and nearing the end of their programs, are requesting assignments for student-teaching in inner city settings.

COMMUNITY—INSTITUTION RELATIONS STRENGTHENED

In addition to effecting changes in teacher training and teacher certification policies, the Teacher Corps has created a greater awareness of the needs of disadvantaged children and has brought poverty communities into closer contact with both universities and schools.

First, because the volunteer teacher-interns spend most of their time in schools and local communities, they have become more aware of the needs of the disadvantaged child.

Second, the Teacher Corps has emphasized the importance of tapping community resources for educational planning. It has strived to bring school systems and universities into closer communication with each other and with the communities they serve. This has encouraged the evolution of an educational system more responsive to the needs of the community.

Superintendent Walsh of the Graham County schools in North Carolina related the Teacher Corps' impact in the area of community relations as well:

For this school district, Teacher Corps has been a major catalyst for improvement not only in our approaches to teaching inner-city children and youth but improvement also in our way of working with inner-city parents and community in general.

The Corpsmen, who live in the community and spend 20 percent of their working time there, have helped to establish links between the university and school district and the community.

The result of these new relationships has been, in a number of instances, the university's first steps away from an "ivory tower" approach to teacher training. For example, in many cities, university faculty are now offering their courses in the schools or in special centers in the inner-city.

And Dean Roland Goddu of Catholic University credits the Teacher Corps

with indicating to educators "the real point of focus for change in American education: the classroom with children who are not being taught."

INADEQUATE FUNDING

Despite the successes which I have mentioned, not every administrator reported to me appreciable changes resulting from participation in Teacher Corps programs. Yet even in these instances, they saw the Teacher Corps as creating potential for change.

In this regard, Robert E. Jenkins, superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District, wrote:

Frankly, the change in training at the local level has been negligible. This does not mean that the potential for change is not there.

George E. Dick of the University of Toledo's School of Education made a similar reference in his letter:

Naturally, one will not find educational change uniformly occurring in our Teacher Corps schools or programs, but the opportunity for educational change is available through the Teacher Corps . . . You realize that professional educators are not prone to make educational changes and usually need some pushing.

Mr. Speaker, inadequate funding was repeatedly cited as a major factor impeding the realization of the goals of the Teacher Corps.

The level of funding has directly affected the number of programs which can be supported and the number of interns who can be included in any school.

Very candidly, Superintendent Dale Parnell of the Oregon State Board of Education said:

The number of corpsmen in Oregon has never been large, and it will therefore have to be my opinion that they have not materially changed the educational opportunities of children in low-income areas of this state.

The level of funding was also mentioned by John W. Porter from the State of Michigan Department of Education:

You asked whether Teacher Corps has enabled Michigan to bring about changes that we wanted. The response is "No"; but that response grows out of the level of funding for Teacher Corps programs . . . It is obvious that the impact on total teacher preparation product is relatively low and could be substantially increased if the funding level were increased to a point where the number of Teacher Corps graduates were large enough to make a bigger difference in the total number of teachers.

III. HAS THE TEACHER CORPS PROVIDED NEEDED SERVICES TO THE SCHOOLS?

Mr. Speaker, as I examined the Teacher Corps' role in effecting educational change, I also explored what Teacher Corps programs mean in terms of actual service to schools and children. It was this question which elicited the most agreement.

Although Dean Hubert Everly from the University of Hawaii stated that "more services had been rendered to volunteers than received," he did feel that:

On the balance, I would judge that long-range benefits to schools will result.

The administrators I wrote in Oregon and Puerto Rico were less than complete-

ly satisfied with the results in their areas. They felt that total impact of Teacher Corps was limited by the size of the program; yet they did point out that their schools were afforded richer and more extensive services.

The services of the Teacher Corps can be placed in several general categories.

A. SUPPLEMENTARY SERVICES

University of Oklahoma President J. Herbert Hollomon's comment was representative of a number of other administrators:

From all reports, the program has had a very successful first year. It is perceived as one of the better Federal programs in which the Oklahoma City schools participate. The Corpsmen are beginning to provide real services to the schools.

Dean Robert Marrow of the State College of Arkansas noted:

There have been problems, but the Corpsmen's presence is affecting the educational effort of these schools.

The creativity, flexibility, and dedication of the corpsmen were repeatedly lauded and held to be largely responsible for the supplementary services they rendered to both the school and community.

Mr. Speaker, these services included: Public kindergartens that have been instituted in six Arkansas elementary schools; breakfast programs that have been organized and carried out by corpsmen in several States, and counseling and guidance programs that have been initiated in many schools with Teacher Corps teams.

Superintendent Norman Drachler cited other examples in the Detroit public schools. He said that:

Most often a Teacher Corps team assigned to a local school does provide children in that school with a wider range of opportunities. The effect of our Teacher Corps teams have included efforts in tutorial assistance, career guidance, drop-out prevention, Afro-American culture and life, and planning for urban renewal.

Dean J. Marc Jantzen reported:

Teacher Corpsmen at the University of Pacific are conducting after-school and/or week-end programs that open the school library, conduct charm classes, English instruction for parents and students, Spanish instruction for classroom teachers, medical aid programs, recreational programs that organize inter-mural teams.

B. VALUABLE ADDITIONS TO SCHOOL STAFF

In addition to these supplementary services, the Corpsmen are valuable additions to school staff.

In many letters, I found mention of the assistance the corpsmen provide to the regular school staff, such as by increasing possibilities for instruction to small groups and individual students.

Manpower is not the only factor, though. More important, the Teacher Corps has provided the innovativeness, flexibility, and commitment I have already mentioned. As Dean Roland Goddu of the Catholic University of America put it:

The dedication of Teacher Corps trainees has overcome gross deficiencies in materials and services for children in many schools of the District of Columbia in particular. Without these additional persons providing primarily services in teaching language arts and conceptual development, even more children

in big-city schools would not have the opportunity to learn to read.

INNOVATIONS CARRIED ON BY SCHOOLS

Mr. Speaker, it is highly important to note that the changes and services provided by Teacher Corps have left an impact after they complete their internship in the schools.

By introducing and demonstrating methods and materials and by acting as resource people, the corpsmen leave behind them enthusiasm and tools for the regular staff to continue better serving their students. Dean Keith Goldhammer of Oregon State University spoke to this point:

Teacher Corps trainees have provided essential services in their schools, have augmented the staff beyond the limitations possible within the school district and have helped to stimulate some creative approaches to the proper education of children in these districts.

CONGRESS RECOGNIZES SUCCESS OF TEACHER CORPS

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will find these results of my survey useful. Indeed, the House has already recognized the accomplishments of the Teacher Corps by voting last month to appropriate \$30.8 million for the program for fiscal year 1971. This was the full amount requested by the administration, which, like the previous administration, has supported the Teacher Corps.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has also recommended \$30.8 million.

Although this amount is an increase of approximately \$9 million over the funds available in fiscal 1970, these moneys have been earmarked for retraining teachers with degrees who are not yet qualified to teach.

Presently, there is a strong bipartisan move in the Senate to increase the Teacher Corps appropriation by \$10 million over the amount the House approved and the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended.

I strongly support this effort, and hope that when the Senate appropriations bill is returned to the House for final approval, it will be in the amount of \$40.8 million for the Teacher Corps.

For without the additional \$10 million being proposed in the Senate, the Teacher Corps will be unable to undertake, on a large scale, the programs contained in the Student Teacher Corps legislation which I was pleased to sponsor earlier this year.

This legislation authorized a trained and supervised corps of volunteer tutors and instructional assistants, and the mounting of additional programs in correctional institutions and on Indian reservations.

In 4 short years, we have watched the Teacher Corps become one of the most exciting and effective programs within the Office of Education. And we have seen it provide the means to serve for thousands of our young people who want to take part in local programs of constructive change.

RECOMMENDATION ABOUT TEACHER CORPS ADMINISTRATION

Thinking back to the congressional intent in Teacher Corps legislation, I now, however, have one serious concern.

I—and the other sponsors of the Teacher Corps legislation—knew that a program such as this would need flexibility of action, and one expression of this conviction was in specifying that the directorship be accorded the status and authority to report directly to the Commissioner of the Office of Education.

We believed that a unique agency like the Teacher Corps—which is viewed by young people as a means of putting their idealism to work and which depends heavily on youth in achieving its goals—could not be handled as just another Federal aid program.

Presently, because it is administered as part of a bureau, the Teacher Corps director does not report directly to the Commissioner. This is particularly unfortunate not only because it places unnecessary bureaucratic handicaps on the Teacher Corps, but because it reduces the opportunity of the Commissioner to utilize the Teacher Corps to accelerate the adoption of educational reforms.

Now, with new authorities—such as the Student Teacher Corps and expanded opportunities in correctional education—the Teacher Corps will be appealing to even larger numbers of youth—not only of college age but younger.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend that the Secretary-designate of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the new Commissioner of Education, as part of their examination of the organization of the Office of Education, review congressional intent concerning the Teacher Corps.

I believe they would find it to be in the best interest of the Office of Education—and of all those who look to the Office for leadership—to have the Teacher Corps report directly to the Commissioner, and thereby help facilitate the achievement of the intent of Congress in the Teacher Corps—namely, to help colleges and universities and school districts to make major institutional reforms.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I fear the bright promise and demonstrated success of the Teacher Corps is in danger of being drained away.

TEXT OF LETTERS

Mr. Speaker, because several of the letters I received in response to my questions were particularly helpful, I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point. They are illustrative of the supportive attitudes of school and university officials across the country toward Teacher Corps.

The letters follow:

SCHOOL CITY OF GARY,
Gary, Ind., April 15, 1970.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: The Gary Teacher Corps Programs, which involves a partnership between the School City of Gary and Indiana University Northwest, is making a significant contribution to the Gary Public Schools.

The twenty-six Teacher Corps trainees, all locally recruited, have shown a great spirit of pride and dedication in their progressive achievement of skills and competencies related to a new focus on teacher preparation. Their efforts demonstrate their personal and

growing feelings of responsibility to alleviate conditions of poverty which so frequently characterize the life of the disadvantaged. Course work at the University, intense involvement in teacher-related activities in the school and their participation in community activities, attest to this fact.

The four Team Leaders who are masterful teachers are each assigned groups of 6 to 7 interns, whose real-life teaching experiences they supervise and direct in coordination with the responsibilities of regular teachers in the poverty school area. Because of their common concern for removing barriers to learning for the disadvantaged child, a strong and cohesive atmosphere of comradeship characterizes the operation of the teaching teams in each of the four schools.

The spirit of this critical concern is not limited to the child's school life but extends into his waking hours at home with parents, siblings and other elements which influence his life. Parents are also being included in the child's teaching-learning activities at school. This action has engendered much community support and cooperation for the programs of the local schools. Local community people have helped to formulate new courses and to modify the content of university courses to provide greater relevancy to the needs of low-income and disadvantaged families and to formulate Teacher Corps policy and guidelines at the local, regional and national levels.

The impact of these influences on the educative process in the Gary Schools is twofold. (1) There is first and foremost a decided impact on quality of learning and individualized instruction for the pupils. (2) There is an improved quality of teacher preparation—academically and practically—for those who plan to teach disadvantaged children in our schools. This has resulted from conjoint efforts on the part of the School City and the University.

The movement toward individualization of instruction in our program has been accelerated with emphasis on the personalization of teaching for each child. This concern has caused regular teachers to take a more diagnostic view of each child in order to identify those who need special help and consideration and to direct and co-manage the interns' micro and other teaching activities.

In other words, getting to know, to understand, and to emphasize with the child his interests, his affections, and capabilities, as would be factors inherent in this process, are crucial to teaching him effectively. Through various organizational set-ups, individual tutoring, group tutoring, tutoring in groups, full-class teaching, etc.—using this similar process the interns and the Team Leaders are providing better opportunities for our boys and girls to acquire the learning skills, concepts, and other competencies necessary for a good education. The impact is most favorable and perceptible as pupils respond with improved self-perceptions from their newly established identities with interns and Team Leaders.

It is heartening to note, also, that the University is responsive to the need for greater relevancy between the ivory curriculum towers of university thoughts and the circumstances of teaching living and learning in disadvantaged areas. The University has demonstrated flexibility by allowing for changes and modifications in teacher training procedures with emphasis upon immediate happenings in the community and in some instances within a historical perspective.

This has all been cast within a framework of realistic issues as to what teaching-learning and studying mean to today's generation of children. This augurs well for the public elementary school in a disadvantaged community. For universities seldom take

such postures with serious and pervasive intent. Thus, the 26 trainees receiving teacher training in this federally funded program will be better prepared than trainees in a traditional teacher training program to minister to the crucial needs of children from low-income families.

The impact of these aforementioned influences in the Gary Teacher Corps Program is steadily and progressively improving. Much of the progress may be attributed to the fact that primary responsibility for the program's operation rests with the local school system which is strategically situated to recognize areas of specific educational needs and to direct and re-direct our human resources toward needed institutional change.

The proximity of the directorship and the place where real teaching and learning is sought constitutes not only a strategic vantage point for us to regulate the most vital aspect of the program but, also, provides us with the security of knowing directly that the most vital of the program's objectives are being achieved. Everyone connected with this program, including those connected with our prior cycles, indicates that this program is far better organized than previous cycles, and is producing greater impact, and is operating to the satisfaction of all concerned. The realism and value of this program, then, can be viewed in terms of its emphasis on increased teacher competency for improvement in the quality of learning for our boys and girls. Translation of this realization is reflected in:

(1) the active and direct interest which parents and other community people are displaying in the educational aims of our program;

(2) the personalization of instruction with interns and Team Leaders addressing themselves to the real learning problems of disadvantaged children;

(3) the new instructional techniques and approaches being introduced by Corps members;

(4) the unusual teacher training—competency oriented mainly from the LEA's viewpoint, that our interns are receiving. As a result of this, we have little or no doubt that at the end of this two-year program we will have beginning teachers with valuable experience and a vast repertoire of realistic and effective teaching strategies oriented to teaching in our schools. This conclusion will be drawn from our own observations and efforts;

(5) the growth interest of local persons who have learned and inquired about the operational framework of the program and who wish to be considered for the sixth cycle. Such interest has been expressed by teacher aides, secretaries, students in academic areas other than education, and individuals whose college careers were interrupted because of more pressing obligations;

(6) the strong and direct interest which the Superintendent has taken in the program because of its relevancy to our needs. As a result of this posture, this undergraduate program is becoming a core of focus to the administrative staff. Supervisors, Directors, Principals, and some teachers are turning to the availability of this program as a resource media, especially in connection with teacher workshop and video-tape activities;

(7) Teacher Corps' representation as a model program in the Gary Schools, disseminating and or reflecting administrative and supervisory skills and strategies on how a program may function effectively for the welfare not only of Teacher Corps but for other elements of the total school structure. Because of the apparent success of the administration of this program other program coordinators have called upon Teacher Corps for advice and suggestions; and

(8) Indiana University Northwest's at-

tempt to work effectively more than ever before with the public schools and to develop and provide a program needed to promote a better quality of education for the boys and girls of the inner city.

In view of these revelations, I urge you to support all legislation relative to the funding of the Teacher Corps Program.

Sincerely,

GORDON McANDREW,
Superintendent.

ENTERPRISE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Compton, Calif., April 13, 1970.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am most pleased to reply to your request for information with regards to the Teacher Corps Project. Although a "Californian", I am well aware of your outstanding legislative contribution to education, but more importantly, to our society in general.

As an educator I have served my entire career (18 years) in what is considered a "ghetto impoverished area". I have witnessed, first-hand, the continuing plague of failure on the part of our educational system, in attempting, to meet the needs of children. I have served through the "ranks", from teacher to assistant superintendent, thus, statements that I will say are based upon the experiences of, unfortunately, more failures than successes.

Since 1963, my primary responsibilities in the district has been the development and implementation of programs for disadvantaged youth. I have helped to develop programs ranging from the prevention of juvenile delinquency program, to what I consider our most successful program, "Teacher Corps". The Teacher Corps has been the only compensatory program that has emphasized, simultaneously, three important elements that have been long neglected by most other programs: (1) serving children; (2) serving the community; and (3) most importantly, the specialized training of teachers who will serve disadvantaged children. Since the inception of the Corps program in our district, we have developed what I consider an outstanding working relationship between ourselves, the University of Southern California, and Teacher Corps in Washington, D.C.

Our district has had full control in the selection of Corpsmen, both interns and team leaders. Our staff has been used by the University for screening on numerous occasions. The district, has from the beginning, maintained complete control in the development of the proposal and establishing objectives for the program. We have had the encouragement and support, both, from Washington and the University to initiate various innovative instructional programs.

As a result of the Teacher Corps program, Corpsmen planned and established a math and science lab center, which by the way is under the supervision of a former Corpsman. The "learning center," which specializes upon the analysis of critical social issues ranging from race relations to narcotic information, is also operated by Corpsmen. These centers continue to be maintained by both Corpsmen and parent aides from within our target communities. Another innovative practice was the establishment of eight non-graded individualized classes. This program was a forerunner of our Team Teaching complex at one of our target schools. I could go on endlessly as to the Corpsmen's impact upon our district.

It has not all been successes, but the commitment and the ability to try, has become a by-word of our Corpsmen. However, most importantly, are the direct services that have been offered to our children. Since 1966, we have had not one complaint lodged against

Corpsmen from either children or parents. This speaks for itself!

Although I have written about the Corps program in our district, I have just recently completed (March 17, 1970) my doctoral dissertation which included a study of 123 Corpsmen and school administrators. This study was limited to Teacher Corps programs in Southern California, and more specifically whether the Corps' training program was considered effective in preparing them as teachers of the disadvantaged. The study has shown, conclusively, that this training program was a most effective vehicle in preparing teachers to serve in "ghetto" or poverty stricken schools.

I am firmly convinced that the Teacher Corps can and does serve a most vital function by preparing teachers, and also serving children who have the most needs. I hope the information that I have related to you will be meaningful and helpful.

If I can be of further service please call upon me.

Sincerely,

DON HODES,
Assistant Superintendent.

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY,

Huntington, W. Va., April 7, 1970.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAM,
Member, Congress of the United States,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAM: Marshall University has been involved with the National Teacher Corps since its beginning. We have had two units preparing for teaching at the elementary school level.

The National Teacher Corps has provided increased and improved educational opportunities for children from lower income families. I have been very closely involved with the members of the Corps at Marshall University, particularly during the past several weeks. The young men and women in this program are very much concerned about the boys and girls with whom they work and they are providing many educational opportunities which would not be available if the National Teacher Corps were removed.

I had an opportunity just last Saturday to talk with one of the school superintendents associated with the Marshall University Teacher Corps unit and he stated that the young people working in the Corps in his county had had a most favorable influence on the community in which they are working. As we have learned more about how to utilize the corpsmen as aides to the regular teachers we have enhanced the learning opportunities for the boys and girls. Where there have been failures of the Corps to provide better education for children from low income families the colleges and public schools must assume much of the blame. We are only now learning how to utilize these young men and women in an effective way. The future promises much more success.

It is still too early to know whether the National Teacher Corps is helping us to improve education programs. This we can state for the Marshall University program: we are striving through the use of the Corps to build more flexible and effective programs. Again our success has not been dramatic but it takes time to build the climate for change. Your letter came on the day when we were announcing major changes in the Marshall University Teacher Corps organization. We have not been satisfied with our approach and we decided to alter the staff and program in the middle of a two-year program. We will revise the program for this summer with the plan to provide dramatic changes for the beginning of school in the fall of 1970.

We could do this with the Corps because the personnel and the program are flexible. This same type of experimentation would have taken two to four years in the regular

teacher education programs. It is our expectation that the Corps will experiment with those experiences which we believe should be a part of teacher education. We appreciate the opportunity to use the Corps for program experimentation and development.

I do not see how we could have any more local control of the program. The Marshall University program is supervised by local people and the total effort is integrated into the local school organization. Whenever any part of the program is to be altered we confer with local school officials.

I was not a strong advocate of the National Teacher Corps in its earliest days. However, I now believe it to be one of our few and maybe the most effective means we have to experiment to bring change in teacher education and at the same time to provide improved services for boys and girls in need of special assistance. Probably no facet of our educational structure has needed more change and is more resistant than teacher education. We are just now beginning to see the type of ferment develop which should be the forerunner of some rather dramatic changes. We at Marshall University expect the National Teacher Corps to play a vital role in this change.

Our problems with the Corps are due to lateness of appropriation of funds, the limited size of the unit and the lack of stability in Federal funding. It is difficult to successfully launch programs which must be delayed until the last moment because Congress has delayed its action and it is a handicap to have funds so limited in size that one cannot adequately staff for the effort. We must have more funds and have them early enough for adequate planning if we are to be successful. The question of stability is always associated with Federal programs. We need a five year commitment to the programs. Educational enterprises cannot be most effective if we do not know from one year to the next whether they are to be continued. Qualified staff members cannot be attracted or assigned to programs that may not be funded more than one year. There are other problems but they are rather minor compared to the delay in appropriations, size of funding and the lack of stability in funding.

It is a pleasure to express to you my impressions of the National Teacher Corps and to relate problems related to our association with Federally funded programs. I shall be glad to discuss these statements with you any time I may be of assistance to you.

We appreciate the assistance we have received and you can be assured that we are seeking to use the funds provided to improve educational opportunities for our people.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. HAYES,
Dean of Teachers College.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1970.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAM,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAM: I am pleased to respond to your request for my frank opinion of the Teacher Corps Legislation.

The Teacher Corps has effectively served as the "experimental school" for programs in teacher education particularly children from low income areas. Since my experience with the program has been totally urban, in this context the program has developed a high level of local control by school districts and in some cases even by individual school officers.

The dedication of Teacher Corps trainers has overcome gross deficiencies in materials and services for children in many schools in the District of Columbia in particular. Without these additional persons providing primarily services in teaching language arts and

conceptual development even more children in big city schools would not even have the opportunity to learn to read.

While the Teacher Corps legislation has stimulated and encouraged an increased pace of change in teacher preparation programs materials development, differentiated teacher roles, and child learning, real leverage for assuring the continuation of a new level of teaching service seems improbable even in those situations where significant amounts of local dollars have been added to available Teacher Corps funds.

Year by year funding, the yearly modification of level of operation, while forcing inventiveness, ingenuity and flexibility, have not encouraged local agencies to look upon the acceptance or adoption of program changes initiated through Teacher Corps as permanent impact. This perception may in effect allow the Teacher Corps trainees to be more readily accepted by the establishment in the schools, it also provides a rather easy "cop-out."

The cop-out is more readily available in teacher training programs at Universities where just now a beginning flow of Teacher Corps type trainers of teachers are maturing and beginning to seek further training.

Many university cynics expect that this pipeline will also be dried up right at the point where research, evaluation and higher level trainer training could develop a pipeline of new breed trainers. The Teacher Corps is just on the verge of having involved or developed a small core of trainers who can generate a spin-off in advanced students and research.

The Teacher Corps by being action and classroom oriented has turned around for some the process of teacher training and research in teaching. Even if the Teacher Corps has (in my opinion) sometimes jumped too quickly on some new bandwagons in teacher education, it has provided a ripe and relevant situation for testing, analysing, and developing new teacher training procedures and theories.

The Teacher Corps has been a change agent at a very minimal level within the tolerances of the local political situation, available trainer resources and single year funding. The Teacher Corps has not caused a revolution, it has only indicated the real point of focus for change in American education: the classroom with children who are not being taught.

The Teacher Corps legislation should be renewed. Multi-year funding must be required, Research and Training of Trainers should be authorized from this special perspective. The Teacher Corps could well become the "experimental school" type legislation for teacher preparation programs.

I hope these judgments based on my continued experience from the first day of its authorization and the fortune of some distance in my present role are helpful for you and your committee.

Sincerely,

Dr. ROLAND GODDU, Dean.

STRATEGIC STOCKPILE OF GOLD

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and our distinguished colleague from southern California, BOB WILSON, I introduce a bill to establish a strategic stockpile of gold for space and defense needs.

In recent years, the consumption of gold for nonmonetary uses in the United States has been rising rapidly. In view of certain peculiar attributes, this has been particularly true of our gold re-

quirements in the space and defense industries.

In our space craft, gold is used for the thermal control surfaces and for meteorite detection. It has proven invaluable in meeting light reflection needs. Gold is essential for the manufacture of all types of circuits for our electronics and communications industries, and especially for use in microminiature circuits used in computers. Where there is a demand for functional reliability in these sophisticated and technical industries, there is no substitute for gold.

Approximately 7 million ounces of gold was consumed in the United States during 1969 for jewelry, dental needs, industrial applications, and finally defense and space requirements. Of this total, approximately 2.7 million ounces—or nearly 40 percent of the total domestic consumption—went to space and defense programs.

Gold production in the United States during the same period was 1.6 million ounces. Thus the Nation did not come anywhere near meeting its own strategic gold requirements, much less its normal domestic industrial and consumer requirements of its people.

This means that the balance of our gold must be imported. And who are the leading producers of gold in the world—the Republic of South Africa and the Soviet Union. The way the world is turning topsy-turvy these days, can anyone say how dependable these sources would be for supplying our own strategic defense needs for this mineral?

Today in this Nation we have only two major gold producers—Homestake Mines in Colorado which is mining approximately 37 percent of our domestically produced gold and the Carlin Mines in Nevada which is yielding about 20 percent of our domestic production. All the rest of our gold is produced as a byproduct from copper mining operations.

The fact that there are few other producers of gold remaining in this country is not because there is no more gold to be mined. In 1967, the Bureau of Mines reported then that there are some 400 million ounces of known gold ore reserves, but virtually none of it can be mined profitably at the present price of gold on the open market.

True, these are reserves, but they are not like money in the bank as some would believe. Tooling up a gold mining operation is an extremely costly operation, both in dollars and in time and energy. It cannot be undertaken overnight.

If we are to avail ourselves of this source of desperately needed gold, we must begin to tool up now, not tomorrow, when those domestic sources of supply which exist today have disappeared altogether.

In introducing this legislation, we believe that a viable and expanding domestic gold-mining industry is decidedly in the national interest. But as you can see in this Nation of ours, this industry, for all practical purposes, is on the verge of disappearing. Certainly if our domestic mines are producing less than a fourth of the mineral required by our own citizens, and as demand increases production decreases I do not think we can say we have a healthy, viable industry.

Basically, we believe that the establishment of a national stockpile of gold, acquired and maintained by the Office of Emergency Preparedness, would have dual benefits.

First, it would be a "hedge" against the day when our space and defense requirements may exceed not only our own domestic production capacity as it does now, but also exceed our import capacity.

Secondly, it is our hope that the requirement that the Office of Emergency Preparedness acquire what amounts to an estimated 11 million ounces of gold in the next 2 years would stimulate the market to the point where gold mining will be profitable and people will be able to tool up those long dead operations and the industry is revitalized.

Therefore, we introduce today a bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of national defense.

Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for from 3 p.m. today, on account of official business.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. NEDZI, for June 15 through June 19, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for from 1:30 p.m. today until return, on account of official business as a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations meeting in California.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, for June 17 through June 29, on account of attendance at International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ADDABBO, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DULSKI, for 30 minutes, on June 17.

Mr. DULSKI, for 30 minutes, on June 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. LOWENSTEIN to extend his remarks following the remarks of Mr. GIAMMO in debate today.

Mr. SIKES to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 17970 and include extraneous matter and tabulations.

Mr. GROSS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PEPPER to extend his remarks following those of Mr. OLSEN, on his special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. DENNEY in six instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. BURKE in three instances.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. COUGHLIN in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. DOWNING in two instances.

Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.

Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

Mr. FALLON in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4204. An act to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include pris-

oners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11102. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise, extend, and improve the program established by title VI of such act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 15, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2124. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Vyacheslav Pavlovich Artemiev and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2125. A letter from the American Symphony Orchestra League, Inc., transmitting the league's audit report for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-817; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Federal and State Student Aid Programs" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 91-1175). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 66. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on space program benefits. (Rept. No. 91-1176). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the compilation and printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress (1774-1970) with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1177). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1041. Resolution: 1970 United States Census of Population with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1178). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1072. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a representative sampling of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower (Rept. No. 91-1179). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 16408. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended, with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3274. An act to implement the convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Recital Awards, with

an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CORMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 17068. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a partial exemption from duty for certain transportation vehicles manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of foreign components imported under a temporary importation bond with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Improved Manpower Management in the Federal Government (Rept. No. 91-1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1077. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 17070, a bill to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1078. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 16968, a bill to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1185). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1031. Resolution amending clause 19 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect of lobbying practices and political campaign contributions affecting the House of Representatives, and for other purposes with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1186). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1062. Resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 91-1187). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 18035. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CULVER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HICKS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 18036. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to establish a commission to oversee and improve the capability of the National Guard to control civil disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 18037. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to establish a commission to oversee and improve the capability of the National Guard to control civil disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 18038. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the mailing of mail matter by relatives to members of the Armed Forces overseas at no cost to such relatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 18039. A bill to facilitate the transportation of cargo by barges specifically designed for carriage aboard a vessel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 18040. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act to provide corporations formed under that act with the same powers with respect to borrowing money as are provided corporations formed under the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 18041. A bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 18042. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 18043. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by requiring the designation of certain water and submerged lands areas where the depositing of certain waste materials will be permitted, to authorize the establishment of standards with respect to such deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18044. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 18045. A bill to assist the States in developing a plan for the provision of comprehensive services to persons affected by mental retardation and other developmental disabilities originating in childhood, to assist the States in the provision of such services in accordance with such plan, to assist in the construction of facilities to provide the services needed to carry out such plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 18046. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to extend educational benefits under that title to children of veterans having service-connected disabilities rated less than total, to pro rate benefit amounts on the basis of the degree of disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 18047. A bill to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 18048. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOREMAN (for himself, Mr. BARING, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. McCURE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 18049. A bill to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable; to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 18050. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 18051. A bill to provide general revenue to the U.S. Treasury, to regulate and establish fees for the importation and exportation of controlled dangerous substances, to amend the narcotic and drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 18052. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of national defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18053. A bill to make available an additional \$10 billion for the low-income homeownership and rental housing programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 18054. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. MCFALL, and Mr. TALCOTT):

H.R. 18055. A bill to assist in the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling accommodations for migrant and other seasonally employed farmworkers and their

families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 18056. A bill to improve warranty practice and thus improve the commerce of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 18057. A bill to appropriate an additional amount to carry out section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.J. Res. 1255. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the period January 10, 1971, through January 16, 1971, as "National Retailing Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, and Mr. RARICK):

H. Con. Res. 658. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that no further troop withdrawals should take place until an agreement has been reached by the United States with representatives of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong regarding the release of all American prisoners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H. Con. Res. 659. Concurrent resolution to modify certain tariff concessions granted by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Res. 1079. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H. Res. 1080. Resolution designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT introduced a bill (H.R. 18058) for the relief of Manuela Rosa Urbina, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

401. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to United Nations intervention in behalf of American servicemen held as prisoners of war by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

402. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the Selected Reserve of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

507. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, Jacksonville, Fla., relative to designating Cape Kennedy as the operational base for the space shuttle system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

SENATE—Thursday, June 11, 1970

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 10, 1970)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Reverend Charles S. Hubbard, minister, First United Methodist Church, Wilson, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we humbly pray for Thy presence in this place now, knowing that except the spirit of our God be here we labor in vain. We give Thee thanks for a Nation rich in privilege and great in opportunity—a Nation we are called in our time to serve.

Therefore, we ask Thy guidance for our President and Vice President, and especially we pray for Thy grace on these, Thy servants, who represent and defend the dignity, freedom, and well-being of all our people. Hold them in Thy hands, O God. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 11, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator

from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 10, 1970, be approved.

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

EULOGIES TO THE LATE HONORABLE GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, OF CALIFORNIA, AND JAMES B. UTT, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I am calling to the attention of the Senate membership that the closing date for eulogies to the late Congressmen Glenard P. Lipscomb, of California, and James B. Utt, of California, has been set for Friday, June 19, 1970. This will serve as the cutoff date for all insertions in the RECORD, which are then collected to make up the compendiums of eulogy to these two Members of Congress who, but for their untimely passing, would now be serving in the 91st Congress.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time between now and 1 o'clock is under the control of the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. At that time a vote will be taken on amendment No. 667, the Byrd amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to transfer my time to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the author of the pending modification to the Cooper-Church amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to transfer my time to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On whose time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be equally divided.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-