ture is appropriate to the career aims and possibilities of the students as well as to the primary role of most as teaching scholars.

For many doctoral students, a program emphasizing broad subject matter competence and teaching skills and the development of synthesizing and disseminating abilities will be most appropriate. The title Doctor of Arts should connote this great emphasis on preparation of college teaching.

The orientation and preparation inherent in the Doctor of Arts degree have advantages beyond those for the teaching faculty who will find a greater continuity between their training and their actual careers. Colleges will be placed under less pressure to create research facilities if research accomplishment is no longer held up as the one single mark of success of undergraduate faculties. The present influence of research specialization on the undergraduate curriculum would also be reduced, and many students will welcome a broader orientation in curricular offerings. Much of the undergraduate curriculum today is oriented toward the research interest of the faculty members or toward the two percent of the students who will eventually seek the Ph. D. degree. We should now recognize that the great growth in enrollments and thus in teaching positions in the future will be in the community colleges, the comprehensive regional colleges, and in the university colleges—not in the research positions available in the universities or elsewhere.

The Committee recognizes that it is neither feasible nor desirable to separate sharply a university professor's teaching and research functions. Research activity is in many cases an essential element of a professor's teaching effectiveness and all graduate study must include research components. But the importance of research as a component of college teaching is considerably less for those not teaching at the Ph.D. level, and this group constitutes the majority of teachers in higher education. The necessity for research competence and activities at these other levels varies at least quantitatively and in emphasis, depending upon the subject being taught. For most college faculty it seems clear that the research competence required for the great majority of college teachers can be obtained through the proposed Doctor of Arts program.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Degree Doctor of Arts identifies a person with at least three years of graduate study and is designed to prepare students for careers as college teachers.

The program leading to the Doctor of Arts degree will parallel other doctoral programs but will be oriented toward developing teaching competence in a broad subject matter area. In contrast, the Doctor of Philosophy program is designed to prepare a graduate student for a lifetime of creative activity and research, although it will often be in association with a career in teaching at a university or college. The degree Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) should mark a professionally oriented program at the doctoral level in the field of education.

The Doctor of Arts program should be offered only by institutions with faculty, facilities, and equipment adequate to provide for the offering of these practice-oriented Doctor of Arts programs; they must be comparable in quality, although different in character, to accepted research-oriented Ph.D. programs.

Admission, retention, and degree standards for a Doctor of Arts program should be as rigorous as those prevailing for a Ph.D. program and should be under the control of the graduate faculty of the subject-matter field. Under no circumstances should the Doctor of Arts be utilized as a consolation prize or second class, attenuated Ph. D. While program requirements will inevitably differ because of different objectives, requirements for the Doctor of Arts should be no less demanding. If it is awarded at the completion of a program equal in quality and rigor to the Ph. D., its recipients should be employed in their areas of competence on a comparable basis to those holding the Ph.D. The standards and reputation of the graduate school awarding the degree are the significant determinants.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

To insure adequate preparation of college teachers, the Doctor of Arts program should provide for the following:

First, the formal course work in the Doctor of Arts program will deal preponderantly with the subject matter to be taught by the prospective teacher. Course selection will typically be broader within a particular discipline than for the Ph. D. and may also bridge several related disciplines. The individual courses in the Doctor of Arts program will be conducted at the same high level as Ph. D. courses and where the two programs exist side by side may well be the same courses in many instances. Foreign language or other research tool requirements will be truly functional. A comprehensive examination which is typically broader and less specialized than the usual Ph. D. comprehensive examination but not less demanding will be required upon the completion of formal course work.

Second, prospective college teachers will take an appropriate amount of formal course work and seminars in such areas as the psychology of learning, the history and sociology of higher education, and the responsibilities of faculty members within an institutional setting.

Third, as a parallel to the traditional research training for the Ph. D. degree, a structured teaching or other appropriate internship will be required. This normally will not be met by the usual teaching assistantships. The teaching internship will include progressive and responsible classroom experience in regular courses, preferably in more than one kind of course. The internship will normally be held for one year and it will be supervised, criticized, and evaluated by experienced faculty members and reinforced by relevant course work in teaching methods which are applicable to the student's particular discipline.

Fourth, the development of the capacity and habit of reading, understanding, and interpreting the results of new research and pedagogical developments appearing in the literature of the field will be encouraged.

Fifth, development of the student's ability to apply new, significant disciplinary research and teaching techniques for the benefit of college teaching is a significant part of the student's graduate education for the Doctor of Arts degree.

Sixth, independent investigation of an area in the subject matter field will lead to a suitable written thesis. Such an investigation might take the form of research on teaching problems and may make a contribution to the teaching of the subject matter. The evaluation and synthesis of materials that are potentially valuable in college teaching but have not yet been reviewed may also be acceptable.

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 7, 1970*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

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

O God of all grace, whose word teaches "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life," we pause this morning hour for a more vivid sense of Thy presence so that we may work not alone but in partnership with Thee. As we grapple daily with perplexing problems, help us to lay hold on those spiritual resources Thou hast placed at our disposal and appropriate them by faith.

As we give ourselves to the service of the Nation, may we and all the people honor America not only on one day with words, but every day with our lives. May we never be content with the lesser good and with small achievements when the higher way of Thy kingdom is open to all who follow Thee in sincerity and in truth.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. 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., July 7, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 6, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is now recognized for 1 hour.

THE MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 765

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me and my colleagues jointly, Senators GOLDWATER, CRANSTON, SCOTT, MCGOVERN, PACKWOOD, YOUNG of Ohio, DOLE, STEVENS, HARTKE, SCHWEIKER, and GOODELL, to the bill, H.R. 17123, to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 765) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a brief statement made by Daniel Webster in 1814 on the floor of the House of Representatives and a brief outline of a statement by H. B. Liddell Hart in 1945 relating to the subject of conscription.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, three times in our history, we have had national military conscription, and each time it has met with strong opposition from those directly affected by it. In response to President Lincoln's announcement in 1863 that a draft was being instituted, there were 10 days of rioting in New York alone, with over 1,000 fatalities resulting. Conscription was again introduced for a short period of time during World War I, and 250,000 draftees failed to appear for induction. The first time that conscription had virtually universal acceptance was during World War II when it was instituted for a third time. The past two decades, however, have marked a new era in American history with the advent of peacetime conscription. Today an estimated 60,000 young men have left this country for Canada and hundreds have gone to prison—because of the draft. Yet, the desirability of the draft or any possible alternative has generally gone unquestioned, and our Government has reflected the complacency of the public.

In March of this year, a Commission appointed by President Nixon over 1 year ago to study an alternative to the draft, made its findings public. The Commission was headed by former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates and was composed of individuals from various walks of life, including the economist Milton Friedman, the executive director of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins, and two former Supreme Allied Commanders, Gen. Lauris Norstad, and Gen. Alfred Gruenther. Their conclusions were unanimous: the draft is not the best method of maintaining our Armed Forces. It is inefficient, inequitable, and unjust. Their report stated, further, that the best alternative to conscription is an all-volunteer system, which is not only more ideologically compatible with our traditions, but economically preferable as well.

It has been generally assumed that conscription has been and is needed to maintain our Armed Forces, thus perpetuating the idea that the draft is a necessary evil whereby a small precent of our young men are compelled to join the military.

According to the Gates Commission report:

> During the early 1960's, 95 percent of those between the ages of 18 and 35 were excluded from the 1–A and 1–A–O pool. . . . The escalation of the Vietnam War in 1965 once again focused attention on the draft. . . . Of the 6 million men who have served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam War, 25 percent have been draftees.

But is this a needed inequity? Is conscription absolutely necessary to maintain our national security? The Gates Commission concluded that an all-volunteer military is feasible regardless of the manpower requirements of Vietnam. Today we have approximately 3 million men in our Armed Forces. It is anticipated by the Department of Defense that within 1 year the total force level will be 2.5 million or less. Our present mixed force, draftees, draft-induced volunteers, and volunteers, requires 584,000 annual accessions with 184,000 annual Army draft calls. The Gates Commission projects that the required accessions for the same total strength force, 3 million men, would be 410,000 with 193,000 going to the Army. This lower rate of accessions in an all-volunteer force would be the result of higher retention rates. Higher retention would result from numerous factors, including higher pay, higher reenlistment rates, and the absence of draftees, more than 90 percent of whom leave the Army after serving only 2 years. Furthermore, the report states:

> The higher retention rate for true volunteers inevitably produces a more experienced force. . . . Projections indicate that by 1980 (in an all volunteer force), 45 percent of Army enlisted men will have four years or more of service experience, as compared with 31 percent for a mixed force of the same size. Since experience involves on-the-job training, a more experienced force is more productive than a less experienced one.

Thus, a 3-million-man volunteer force would be more effective than a mixed force of the some number. In other words, because a volunteer force would have fewer noneffective men, it can be smaller than a mixed force and be just as effective.

What must be done to effect an all-volunteer military? The move cannot occur overnight, but the transition can occur within the next year. However, to accomplish this by July 1971, we need to have improved conditions within the military sufficiently to induce 75,000 more men annually, in addition to the 250,000 true volunteers who are presently enlisting each year. That assumes a force level of 2.5 million men by July 1971. There is an excellent possibility, based upon various statements and possible projections of the Defense Department, that the manpower level will be significantly less than 2.5 million.

Further, Congress could, of course, choose to reduce the manpower requirements. In either case, reductions below the 2.5-million level would reduce further the number of additional needed enlistees above the current 250,000 true volunteers. The additional men will come predominantly from the 1.5 million men who annually turn 19 and who meet the mental, moral, and physical requirements of the Armed Forces. Raising the accession rate to the necessary level will result from reasonable improvements in pay and benefits which, states the Commission, and in which I concur, should occur regardless of the fate of the draft.

To better comprehend this situation one must understand the difference between two methods of taxation that any government may use. The first, which can be called tax-in-kind, is the compulsory rendering of services or property by citizens on the behalf of the government. The other method of taxation is that of bearing the government's cost of goods and services through monetary taxes levied on the general public. Conscription is the first method of taxation—a tax-in-kind. There are few such taxes today in our Nation, and most governments no longer tax through the means of coercing the services of their citizens, or directly acquiring portions of their property. Such tax-in-kind is generally regarded as a medieval and outmoded form of taxation. The draft, however, is a modern-day continuation of such a form of taxation.

The average level of basic pay for military personnel is $180 per month. This is approximately 60 percent of what he could be earning in civilian life. In other words, the average first-term enlistee is being taxed 40 percent of what he could and would normally earn. And taking into account the income tax and indirect costs imposed on the enlistee, his total tax rate is in the neighborhood of 51 percent.

The Commission recommends increasing the pay of the first-term enlistee to $315 per month. Including fringe benefits, clothing, food and lodging, the total compensation would rise from $301 per month to $437 per month. This would make the pay within the military roughly comparable to that of civilian life, which, as I stated earlier, should occur irrespective of the fate of the draft. The budgetary cost to effect an all-volunteer force by July of next year would be a maximum of $3.24 billion for fiscal 1971. That is assuming that we maintain the high manpower force level of 2.5 million men by that date. Reductions in this

force level would result in significantly lower costs. This maximum estimate of costs would include increases in basic pay of $2.68 billion, proficiency pay increase of $210 million, reserve pay increases of $150 million, additional medical corps expense of $120 million, and recruiting, ROTC and miscellaneous increases of $80 million. Further, this cost does not take into account substantial savings in operation that would be created by a voluntary military.

But one must consider the difference between budgetary cost and actual cost. The first-term enlistee is bearing the burden of 60 percent of the cost of his service. And, as the Commission states in its report:

When the hidden costs of conscription are fully recognized, the cost of an all-volunteer armed force is unquestionably less than the cost of a force of equal size and quality manned wholly or partly through conscription.

The draft often results in the inefficient use of manpower by the military. A recently released study by the Defense Department points to one aspect of this problem. This report indicated that of the 41,974 college graduates entering the Army in 1969, 5,722 had acquired academic training that would have qualified them for certain military specialties with little or no further training. Of these 5,722 qualified men, only 222, approximately 4 percent, were assigned to the specialty for which they were qualified, while approximately one-third of them were assigned to combat infantry training. Specific examples which the study held to be generally valid included the following:

Of the college graduates who entered the Army last year, 270 had degrees in architecture. Eight were placed in this specialty while the Army had a need for 394 architects.

Sixty-two men who qualified for the Army accounting specialty were placed in those slots, while the Army had 463 openings for accountants and had inducted 912 men who had accounting degrees.

Generally stated, because budget expenses are presently underestimated for the cost of the first-term enlistees, the Armed Services, as the Commission points out, "are led to use more of them than they otherwise would." With compensation raised to equitable levels, the service would be forced to economize.

Perhaps the most costly factor of the present system is the low reenlistment rates among first-term servicemen, creating unduly high turnover rates. Two factors affect this: First, most inductees and draft-induced volunteers are not interested in military careers; second, the inductees' tour of duty is only 2 years in contrast to 3- and 4-year terms for enlistees.

With an all-volunteer force—

The Commission concluded—

these longer terms of enlistment will also reduce turnovers and the need for accessions.

The Commission estimates that the annual turnover rate for a volunteer force would be approximately 325,000 men in contrast to roughly 440,000 for a mixed force of 2.5 million men.

Consequently, real savings will be generated. In terms of dollars, the annual savings caused by increased retention for a peacetime force of 2.5 million men is estimated to be $675 million. Furthermore, there would be an annual savings of $61 million for the same force due to reduced transportation and administrative costs. In terms of manpower, a volunteer military would reduce the required size of the forces, thus reducing the number of men needed. For instance, it is estimated by the Commission that a 2.5-million man force of conscripts and volunteers would be effectively equivalent to an all-volunteer force of 2.44 million men.

Yet there are additional savings that a volunteer force would induce. These would result in eliminating what the Commission calls "subtle costs" of the present system. Although these are difficult to estimate in monetary terms, we can still analyze their potential influence. As the Gates Commission report states:

The draft erodes ideals of patriotism and service by alienating many of the young who bear the burden. . . . It thwarts the natural desire of youths to commit themselves to society. . . .

Young men distort their career and personal plans to take advantage of opportunities to postpone or avoid being drafted. . . . 'channeling' young men into college, occupations, marriage or fatherhood is not in their best interests, nor those of society in general.

It is these factors and others that indicate the great loss to society that the draft generates. One indirect method of gaging this in economic terms was stated in the Commission's report:

Prospective inductees also incur costs in their efforts to escape conscription—costs which manifest themselves in a variety of ways such as additional college attendance, movement into occupations which carry deferments, immigration, etc. Indirect evidence suggests these costs may be 1.5 times the implicit tax (i.e., the tax-in-kind born by the draftee). . . . Thus for each $1.00 of tax-in-kind collected, an average of $2.50 is forgone by the public. Quite apart from considerations of equity and freedom, this feature of conscription is enough to call it into question.

The institution of an all-volunteer military is desirable not only from economic and moral points of view, but also from a governmental and constitutional perspective. According to article I, section 8 of the Constitution, the Congress has the power—and the responsibility—to raise the armies and provide for the common defense. A volunteer military is a direct extension of this constitutional responsibility and would draw the military closer to the civilian population in general.

A volunteer force will be highly flexible, as conceived by the Commission, although the need for a great influx of men into the military such as required during World War II is not a realistic possibility because of the highly technical nature of warfare today—whether guerrilla or nuclear war. Nevertheless, the Commission recommended a limited standby registration should a sudden influx of men be required.

Aside from economic questions, one of the most often heard objections to a volunteer military is that it would put an undue burden on the black and the poverty stricken within our society. The assumption here is that with increased pay and benefits in a volunteer system a disproportionate number of our minority groups and depressed people would join the military. The Gates Commission report and other studies before it have amply demonstrated that this would not be the case.

Presently there are more than two times as many whites classified below the poverty line as blacks—17.6 million whites compared to 8.3 million blacks by 1967 figures. This year it is estimated that up to 63 percent, 628,740, of the black male population between the ages of 17 and 20—the age group from which first-term enlistments usually originate—will be eligible for military duty—that is, they will pass the physical, moral, and mental requirements for entrance into the Armed Forces. Under our present mixed recruitment system, blacks comprise 10.6 percent of the total force or slightly less than their proportion to the total population.

The Commission, taking these figures into consideration, projects that in a volunteer force of comparable effectiveness to a mixed force of 2.5 million men, blacks would comprise approximately 15 percent of that population—between 5,000 and 10,000 more blacks than a mixed force of the same effective size. In other words, the racial composition of the military will change very little between a mixed force and an all-volunteer force.

Monetary compensation is only one factor in attracting potential employees. Job security, opportunity for advancement, and fringe benefits are other considerations which influence a potential employee. While the attractiveness of the military will increase for the black in a volunteer force, it will increase more greatly among whites.

With present mental, moral, and physical standards of eligibility for military service, 30 percent of the men examined are not acceptable. Of this group a disproportionate number comes from the lower socioeconomic sector of our society. And although a recent study indicates there are over 12,000 military personnel on welfare today, compensation within the Armed Forces in most cases is above the income level of those below the poverty line. Consequently, the monetary attraction to the Armed Forces with regard to those individuals below the poverty level is already existent. To increase pay and benefits regardless of the method of recruitment will induce more qualified individuals to join than are presently attracted. Thus, the general composition of a volunteer military would not be significantly different from a conscripted force.

These facts notwithstanding, objections to an all-volunteer military based on fear of its creating an unfair burden on the black and poverty stricken are

misdirected. Not only do these objections question the poor and the black's capacity to make decisions in their own best interest but they also ignore the fact that it is the causes of racism and poverty in our country which should be attacked and not the military or any other institution that may provide people an opportunity for greater economic gain and increased social status.

Just as these questions are ill conceived and shortsighted so are those that assert an all-volunteer armed force would be a group of unquestioning mercenaries who would be loyal only to their commanders, isolated from civilian control, pose a threat to the internal security of our country, and increase the likelihood of foreign adventurism. A mercenary is a foreigner who is hired by another country to fight its wars. This certainly is not the case with a volunteer military. And to argue that there is something regrettable about a professional, equitably paid enlistee is overlooking the fact that our officer corps have been well paid and virtually totally voluntary. To question the loyalty of a soldier because he is paid a fair salary is like questioning the loyalty of doctors, lawyers or any other professionals who are well paid for the services they render. If the country is to have an effective military force, its members should be paid in an equitable manner. And an all-volunteer method of recruitment is one method of insuring this equity.

Critics have argued that a volunteer military would somehow increase the isolation of the military, and that conscription is an effective means of maintaining a civilian influence in the military. The Constitution could not be more explicit about its intention to insure that the army be fully under civilian control. However, it never intended that this be accomplished through military conscription. In fact, appropriations for the military have to be approved every 2 years specifically because the Founding Fathers wanted the entire idea of a standing army to be reviewed that often. The very thought of a peacetime conscription would have been viewed by them as reminiscent of the tyranny of European kings and contrary to the ideals of freedom which caused them to travel to the New World.

Civilian control over the military, as provided for by the Constitution, is to be maintained by the Chief Executive serving as Commander in Chief, and by the very broad powers and responsibilities given to the Congress for raising and supporting the armies. Civilian control should not and cannot be maintained by forcing unwilling citizens to serve for 2 years in the lowest ranks of the army. Further, a volunteer military will not mean that our Armed Forces are suddenly put into some kind of total isolation from civilian life. As I pointed out earlier, the annual turnover rate under a volunteer military a year from now would be approximately 325,000 men. That is a reduction of only about 115,000 from the turnover rate of 440,000 under a mixed force of equal size. Thus, there would still be a very significant flow of men in and out of the Armed Forces each year. So it is fictitious and contrary to evidence to suggest that a volunteer military will in any way create an armed force that is isolated from civilian influence or control.

It may well be that the principle of civilian control over the military is in danger of eroding in our land today. But if that is true, the issue must be solved by perfecting the constitutional relationship between the Congress and the executive branch, and between the Chief Executive and the Armed Forces. Maintaining conscription as a means to preserve civilian control is not only ineffective, but completely contrary to the spirit and the intention of the Constitution.

This is also the case with regard to foreign adventurism. One aspect of the question as to the commitment of troops to war is the preparedness of those troops, and admittedly a volunteer force would be more effective than a conscripted force. However, as the Gates Commission points out:

> Decisions by a government to use force or to threaten the use of force during crises are extremely difficult. The high cost of military resources, the moral burden of risking human lives, political costs at home and overseas, and the overshadowing risk of nuclear confrontation . . . enter into such decisions. It is absurd to argue that issues of such importance would be ignored. . . . To the extent that there is pressure to seek military solutions to foreign policy problems, such pressure already exists and will not be affected by ending conscription.

This pressure is in the form of foreign policy and the already totally volunteer officers corps which makes policy decisions within the Armed Forces. Today we have the worst of two worlds: conscription at the lower ranks and isolation at the upper—to the extent that our officer corps are isolated. An all-volunteer military would have two controls inherent within it that are not present in a conscripted force.

First, Congress would control the manpower level of the military by regulating the budget; the economic incentives to join would diminish beyond a certain manpower limit agreed upon by the President and the Congress. The military could have only a certain number of men in its ranks, which would be an additional constraint on the scope of foreign military involvement. With conscription the President has virtually unlimited manpower resources directly at his command.

This would not be the case with an all-volunteer force. To reinstitute the draft the President would have to make a request to Congress, and conscription could then be reinstituted by the joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives. This would be well within the purview of article I, section 8 of the Constitution and be a significant contribution to Congress' reassertion of its rights and responsibilities in the area of raising armies, declaring war, and influencing foreign policy.

Another frequently encountered argument is that the abolition of the draft and the institution of an all-volunteer military is important but not as high a priority as eliminating poverty, crime, racism, and other inequities our society needs to resolve. Consequently, the argument continues, we cannot afford at this time to spend the money necessary to create a volunteer armed force. This argument, however, overlooks the major difference between the draft on one hand and the other forms of inequities on the other: conscription is a government institution, created and sustained by the Government which bears the primary responsibility for the Selective Service System, its inequities, injustices, and inefficiencies.

It has been suggested that some form of universal service be implemented in order to equalize the burden among our youth. I favor the concept of service as long as it is voluntary in nature. But compulsory service is not only a contradiction in terms; it is inimical to the fiber of our republic as well. Compulsory national service, assuming there were no deferments and that it were for 1 year's tour of duty, would mean the employment of 8 million people, if women were to serve, and 4 million if only men. With a conservatively estimated expense of between $4,000 and $5,000 per person, the total annual cost of universal national service would range between $16 billion and $40 billion. As the Gates Commission points out, this would be an amount greater than the entire manpower budget of the Department of Defense and would be highly economically prohibitive.

If universal military training were to be adopted with no deferments, more than 2 million men in noncareer positions would have to be employed in the Armed Forces at any one time, assuming the current eligibility standards and a 2-year tour of duty. One year's service would be unrealistic because most of that year would be spent training. Universal military training would be a radical departure from our founding traditions. It would spread the burden of the tax-in-kind to all of our young men and give the military more men than could be productively employed.

Several sections of the legislation I am introducing today deal with important aspects of a volunteer military. These have not received much attention in the past, but the Gates Commission dealt with them in a very thorough and consistent manner. The military is similar in many ways to a business firm. And some of its jobs could be easily performed by civilian personnel requiring no special military training. Consequently, it is recommended that the Armed Forces increase and expand utilization of civilian personnel through lateral hiring, saving an estimated $100 million.

Furthermore, the Commission proposes an improved and expanded recruiting program for not only enlisted personnel but officers as well. In this connection, ROTC scholarships should be increased from 5,500 to 10,000 per service and specialist educational programs should be expanded as well.

Another important change recommended by the Commission is the formu-

lation of a new pay structure which would provide salary schedules combining basic pay, and quarters and subsistence allowances. The new pay structure should also include another much needed benefit—cash contributions to a retirement system similar to Federal civilian employees. Directions to the Secretary of Defense within this legislation instruct him to have a basic pay table for enlisted personnel and officers developed which will be utilized until the salary system is implemented, although I am hopeful that within the next month and before the final vote on this legislation I will be able to provide such a pay table.

The Gates Commission also called for an increase in combat pay from $65 to $200 for those who are actually taking the primary risks and not merely physically present in a combat zone. This would make combat pay more meaningful for those bearing the primary burden of war—those actually participating in combat—while avoiding some of the misuses of the present method of compensating those in combat zones.

One other aspect of military compensation and organization to which the Gates Commission directed its attention was medical treatment. Within its report the Commission recommends that those physicians serving in the military receive special pay increases, that the utilization of civilian medical facilities be maximized, and that a medical insurance program be created for all military personnel. If implemented, these changes would greatly enhance the medical treatment of military personnel while keeping costs to a minimum.

It is ironic that so unjust and inequitable an institution as peacetime conscription, with all of its inefficiencies, should be maintained by unproven assumptions, groundless fears, and the mere momentum of the past 20 years. Even more unfortunate is how the focus of concern is so easily lost when the issue of conscription is discussed. We always proceed by assuming that the status quo is naturally virtuous and preferable, unless proven otherwise. But in this case especially, the first question to ask should not be, will a volunteer military work, or how much will it cost, or what advantages would it have—rather, the first question to ask is why should we maintain conscription?

There is no institution of our Government more contrary to our democratic ideals, more limiting of our freedom, and more disruptive to the lives of our youth than the draft. Further, the draft is laden with inherent inefficiencies, and seems to be a clearly ineffective manner to provide for our Armed Forces and their needs. This opinion now has the support of a Presidential Commission. At long last, the time has arrived to take the first steps toward restoring military service to the degree of respect and regard and prestige it deserves, and to insure that such service will be the free choice of its citizens. In June of 1971, the Selective Service Act will expire. If we act now, and begin the process of building a volunteer military force, it will not be necessary to perpetuate conscription beyond that time. That must be the aim of all Americans who cherish freedom and value our democratic traditions and who want to meet the needs of our military organization.

EXHIBIT 1

IN BRIEF

CONSCRIPTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Daniel Webster in 1814 voiced a warning and a prophesy which B. H. Liddell Hart verified in 1945 when he reviewed historical events during the interim.

(It has been said of Daniel Webster (1782–1852), the great American statesman and orator, that his massive mind needed the spur of a great national crisis to make him render his best with words befitting a nation hanging in the balance. Such a situation, he felt, was that of the closing months of 1814, shortly before the end of the conflict with England. Under the pressure of war needs for men and money, a conscription bill was then before Congress, backed by the Secretary of War, in order to further the conflict for the conquest of Canada. The following is extracted from his speech in the House of Representatives on December 9, 1814, a copy of which is on exhibit at the New Hampshire Historical Society.)

This bill indeed is less undisguised in its object, & less direct in its means, than some of the measures proposed. It is an attempt to exercise the power of forcing the free men of this country into the ranks of an army, for the general purposes of war, under color of a military service. It is a distinct system, introduced for new purposes, & not connected with any power, which the Constitution has conferred on Congress.

But, Sir, there is another consideration. The services of the men to be raised under this act are not limited to those cases in which alone this Government is entitled to the aid of the militia of the States. These cases are particularly stated in the Constitution—"to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, or execute the laws." But this bill has no limitation in this respect. The usual mode of legislating on the subject is abandoned. The only section which would have confined the service of the Militia, proposed to be raised, within the United States has been stricken out; & if the President should not march them into the Provinces of England at the North, or of Spain at the South, it will not be because he is prohibited by any provision in this act.

This, then, Sir, is a bill for calling out the Militia, not according to its existing organization, but by draft from new created classes;—not merely for the purpose of "repelling invasion, suppressing insurrection, or executing the laws," but for the general objects of war—for defending ourselves, or invading others, as may be thought expedient;—not for a sudden emergency, or for a short time, but for long stated periods; for two years, if the proposition of the Senate should finally prevail; for one year, if the amendment of the House should be adopted What is this, Sir, but raising a standing army out of the Militia by draft, and to be recruited by draft in like manner, as often as occasion may require?

The question is nothing less, than whether the most essential rights of personal liberty shall be surrendered, & despotism embraced in its worst form.

I have risen, on this occasion, with anxious & painful emotions, to add my admonition to what has been said by others. Admonition & remonstrance, I am aware, are not acceptable strains. They are duties of unpleasant performance. But they are, in my judgment, the duties which the condition of a falling state imposes. They are duties which sink deep in his conscience, who believes it probable that they may be the last services, which he may be able to render to the Government of his Country. On the issue of this discussion, I believe the fate of this Government may rest. Its duration is incompatible, in my opinion, with the existence of the measures in contemplation. A crisis has at last arrived, to which the course of things has long tended, & which may be decisive upon the happiness of present & future generations. If there be anything important in the concerns of men, the considerations which fill the present hour are important. I am anxious, above all things, to stand acquitted before GOD, & my own conscience, & in the public judgments, of all participations in the Counsels, which have brought us to our present condition, & which now threaten the dissolution of the Government. When the present generation of men shall be swept away, & that this Government ever existed shall be a matter of history only, I desire that it may then be known, that you have not proceeded in your course unadmonished & unforewarned. Let it then be known, that there were those, who would have stopped you, in the career of your measures, & held you back, as by the skirts of your garments, from the precipice, over which you are plunging, & drawing after you the Government of your Country.

It is time for Congress to examine & decide for itself. It has taken things on trust long enough. It has followed Executive recommendation, till there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. What is there, Sir, that makes it the duty of this people now to grant new confidence to the administration, & to surrender their most important rights to its discretion? On what merits of its own does it rest this extraordinary claim? When it calls thus loudly for the treasure & the lives of the people, what pledge does it offer, that it will not waste all in the same preposterous pursuits, which have hitherto engaged it? In the failure of all past promises, do we see any assurance of future performance? Are we to measure out our confidence in proportion to our disgraces, & now at last to grant away every thing, because all that we have heretofore granted has been wasted or misapplied? What is there in our condition, that bespeakes a wise or an able Government? What is the evidence, that the protection of the country is the object principally regarded?

Conscription is chosen as the most promising instrument, both of overcoming reluctance to the Service, & of subduing the difficulties which arise from the deficiencies of the Exchequer. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the regular army by compulsion. It contends that it may now take one out of every twenty-five men, & any part or the whole of the rest, whenever its occasions require. Persons thus taken by force, & put into an army, may be compelled to serve there, during the war, or for life. They may be put on any service, at home or abroad, for defence or for invasion, according to the will & pleasure of Government. This power does not grow out of any invasion of the country, or even out of a state of war. It belongs to Government at all times, in peace as well as in war, & is to be exercised under all circumstances, according to its mere discretion. This, Sir, is the amount of the principle contended for by the Secretary of War.

Is this, Sir, consistent with the character of a free Government? Is this civil liberty? Is this the real character of our Constitution? No, Sir, indeed it is not. The Constitution is libelled, foully libelled. The people of this country have not established for themselves such a fabric of despotism. They have not purchased at a vast expense of their own treasure & their own blood a Magna Carta to be slaves. Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article

or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, & parents from their children, & compel them to fight the battles of any war, in which the folley or the wickedness of Government may engage it? Under what concealment has this power lain hidden, which now for the first time comes forth, with a tremendous & baleful aspect, to trample down & destroy the dearest rights of personal liberty? Who will show me any constitutional injunction, which makes it the duty of the American people to surrender every thing valuable in life, & even life itself, not when the safety of their country & its liberties may demand the sacrifice, but whenever the purposes of an ambitious & mischievous Government may require it? Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations & references to prove that such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country. It is enough to know that that instrument was intended as the basis of a free Government, & that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free Government. It is an attempt to show, by proof & argument, that we ourselves are subjects of despotism, & that we have a right to chains & bondage, firmly secured to us & our children, by the provisions of our Government.

The supporters of the measures before us act on the principle that it is their task to raise arbitrary powers, by construction, out of a plain written charter of National Liberty. It is their pleasing duty to free us of the delusion, which we have fondly cherished, that we are the subjects of a mild free & limited Government, & to demonstrate by a regular chain of premises & conclusions, that Government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more arbitrary, more dangerous, more allied to blood & murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every sort & degree of misery, than has been exercised by any civilized Government, with a single exception, in modern times.

But it is said, that it might happen that an army would not be raised by voluntary enlistment, in which case the power to raise armies would be granted in vain, unless they might be raised by compulsion. If this reasoning could prove anything, it would equally show, that whenever the legitimate powers of the Constitution should be so badly administered as to cease to answer the great ends intended by them, such new powers may be assumed or usurped, as any existing administration may deem expedient. This is a result of his own reasoning, to which the Secretary does not profess to go. But it is a true result. For if it is to be assumed that all powers were granted, which might by possibility become necessary, & that Government itself is the judge of this possible necessity, then the powers of Government are precisely what it chooses they should be. Apply the same reasoning to any other power granted to Congress, & test its accuracy by the result.

If the Secretary of War has proved the right of Congress to enact a law enforcing a draft of men out of the Militia into the regular army, he will at anytime be able to prove, quite as clearly, that Congress has power to create a Dictator. The arguments which have helped him in one case, will equally aid him in the other. The same reason of a supposed or possible state necessity, which is urged now, may be repeated then, with equal pertinency & effect.

Sir, in granting Congress the power to raise armies, the People have granted all the means which are ordinary & usual, & which are consistent with the liberties & security of the People themselves; and they have granted no others. To talk about the unlimited power of the Government over the means to execute its authority, is to hold a language which is true only in regard to despotism. The tyranny of Arbitrary Government consists as much in its means as in its end; & it would be a ridiculous & absurd constitution which should be less cautious to guard against abuses in the one case than in the other. All the means & instruments which a free Government exercises, as well as the ends & objects which it pursues, are to partake of its own essential character, & to be conformed to its genuine spirit. A free Government with arbitrary means to administer it is a contradiction; a free Government without adequate provision for personal security is an absurdity; a free Government, with an uncontrolled power of military conscription, is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous & abominable that ever entered into the head of man.

Sir, I invite the supporters of the measures before you to look to their actual operation. Let the men who have so often pledged their own fortunes and their own lives to the support of this war, look to the wanton sacrifice which they are about to make of their lives and fortunes. They may talk as they will about substitutes, and compensations, and exemptions. It must come to the draft at last. If the Government cannot hire men voluntarily to fight its battles, neither can individuals.

Into the paradise of domestic life you enter, not indeed by temptations and sorceries, but by open force and violence.

Nor is it, Sir, for the defense of his own house and home, that he who is the subject of military draft is to perform the task allotted to him. You will put him upon a service equally foreign to his interests and abhorrent to his feelings. With his aid you are to push your purposes of conquest. The battles which he is to fight are the battles of invasion; battles which he detests perhaps and abhors, less from the danger and the death that gather over them, and the blood with which they drench the plain, than from the principles in which they have their origin. If, Sir, in this strife he fall—if, while ready to obey every rightful command of Government, he is forced from home against right, not to contend for the defence of his country, but to prosecute a miserable and detestable project of invasion, and in that strife he fall, 'tis murder. It may stalk above the cognizance of human law, but in the sight of Heaven it is murder; and though millions of years may roll away, while his ashes and yours lie mingled together in the earth, the day will yet come, when his spirit and the spirits of his children must be met at the bar of omnipotent justice. May God, in his compassion, shield me from any participation in the enormity of this guilt.

The operation of measures thus unconstitutional and illegal ought to be prevented, by a resort to other measures which are both constitutional and legal. I express these sentiments here, Sir, because I shall express them to my constituents. Both they and myself live under a Constitution which teaches us, that "the doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind." With the same earnestness with which I now exhort you to forbear from these measures, I shall exhort them to exercise their unquestionable right of providing for the security of their own liberties.

A military force cannot be raised, in this manner, but by the means of a military force. If administration has found that it cannot form an army without conscription, it will find, if it venture on these experiments, that it cannot enforce conscription without an army. The Government was not constituted for such purposes. Framed in the spirit of liberty, and in the love of peace, it has no powers which render it able to enforce such laws. The attempt, if we rashly make it, will fail; and having already thrown away our peace, we may thereby throw away our Government.

CONSCRIPTION

(The following extract is from the notable book 'Why Don't We Learn From History," by B. H. Liddell Hart (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1944). The author, a distinguished British military authority, is the Military Historian and Critic for *Encyclopedia Britannica.*)

We learn from history that the compulsory principle always breaks down in practice. The principle of restraint, or regulation, is essentially justifiable in so far as its application is needed to check interference with others' freedom. But it is not, in reality, possible to make men do something without risking more than is gained from the compelled effort. The method may appear practicable, because it often works when applied to those who are merely hesitant. When applied to those who are definitely unwilling it fails, however, because it generates friction and fosters subtle forms of evasion that spoil the effect which is sought. The test of whether a principle works is to be found in the product.

Efficiency springs from enthusiasm—because this alone can develop a dynamic impulse. Enthusiasm is incompatible with compulsion—because it is essentially spontaneous. Compulsion is thus bound to deaden enthusiasm—because it dries up the source. The more an individual, or a nation, has been accustomed to freedom, the more deadening will be the effect of a change to compulsion.

These logical deductions are confirmed by analysis of historical experience. The modern system of military conscription was born in France—it was, ironically, the misbegotten child of Revolutionary enthusiasm. Within a generation, its application had become so obnoxious that its abolition was the primary demand of the French people following Napoleon's downfall. Meanwhile, however, it had been transplanted to more suitable soil—in Prussia. And just over half a century later, the victories that Prussia gained led to the resurrection of conscription in France. Its reimposition was all the easier because the renewed autocracy of Napoleon III had accustomed the French people to the interference and constraints of bureaucracy. In the generation that followed, the revival of the spirit of freedom in France was accompanied by a growth of the petty bureaucracy, parasites feeding on the body politic. From this, the French could never succeed in shaking free; and in their efforts they merely developed corruption—which is the natural consequence of an ineffective effort to loosen the grip of compulsion by evasion.

It is generally recognized today that this rampant growth of bureaucratically-induced corruption was the dry-rot of the Third Republic. But on deeper examination the cause can be traced further back—to the misunderstanding of their own principles which led a section of the creators of the French Revolution to adopt a method fundamentally opposed to their fulfillment.

It might be thought that conscription should be less detrimental to the Germans, since they are more responsive to regulation, and have no deeply rooted tradition of freedom. Nevertheless, it is of significance that the Nazi movement was essentially a voluntary movement—exclusive rather than comprehensive—and that the most important sections of the German forces—the air force and the tank force—have been recruited on a semi-voluntary basis. There is little evidence to suggest that the ordinary "mass" of the German army has anything like the

same enthusiasm; and considerable evidence to suggest that this conscripted mass constitutes a basic weakness in Germany's apparent strength.

Twenty-five years spent in the study of war, a study which gradually went beyond its current technique to its well-springs, changed my earlier and conventional belief in the value of conscription. It brought me to see that the compulsory principle was fundamentally inefficient, and the conscriptive method out of date—a method that clung, like the ivy, to quantitative standards in an age when the trend of warfare was becoming increasingly qualitative. For it sustained the fetish of mere numbers at a time when skill and enthusiasm were becoming ever more necessary for the effective handling of the new weapons.

Conscription does not fit the conditions of modern warfare—its specialized technical equipment, mobile operations, and fluid situations. Success increasingly depends on individual initiative, which in turn springs from a sense of personal responsibility—these senses are atrophied by compulsion. Moreover, every unwilling man is a germ-carrier, spreading infection to an extent altogether disproportionate to the value of the service he is forced to contribute.

Looking still further into the question, and thinking deeper, I came to see, also, that the greatest contributory factor to the Great Wars which had racked the world in recent generations had been the conscriptive system—the system which sprang out of the muddled thought of the French Revolution, was then exploited by Napoleon in his selfish ambition, and subsequently turned to serve the interests of Prussian militarism. After undermining the eighteenth century "age of reason," it had paved the way for the reign of unreason in the modern age.

Conscription serves to precipitate war, but not to accelerate it—except in the negative sense of accelerating the growth of war-weariness and other unlying causes of defeat. Conscription precipitated war in 1914, owing to the way that the mobilization of conscript armies disrupted national life and produced an atmosphere in which negotiation became impossible—confirming the warning, "mobilization means war." During that war its effect can be traced in the symptoms which preceded the collapse of the Russian, Austrian and German armies, as well as the decline of the French and Italian armies. It was the least free States which collapsed under the strain of war—and they collapsed in the order of their degree of unfreedom. By contrast, the best fighting force in the fourth year of war was, by general recognition, the Australian Corps—the force which had rejected conscription, and in which there was the least insistence on unthinking obedience.

A system of conscription entails the suppression of individual judgment—the Englishman's most cherished right. It violates the cardinal principle of a free community: that there shall be no restriction of individual freedom save where this is used for active interference with others' freedom. Our tradition of individual freedom is the slow-ripening fruit of centuries of effort. To surrender it within after fighting to defend it against dangers without would be a supremely ironical turn of our history.

An argument in favor of conscription has long been the rule in the continental countries, including those which remain democracies, we need not fear the effect of adopting it here. But the deeper I have gone into the study of war and the history of the past century, the further I have come towards the conclusion that the development of conscription has damaged the growth of the idea of freedom in the continental countries, and thereby damaged their efficiency, also—by undermining the sense of personal responsibility. There is only too much evidence that our temporary adoption of conscription in the last war had a permanent effect harmful to the development of freedom and democracy here. For my own part, I have come to my present conviction of the supreme importance of freedom through the pursuit of efficiency. I believe that freedom is the foundation of efficiency, both national and military. Thus it is a practical folly as well as a spiritual surrender to "go totalitarian" as a result of fighting for existence against the totalitarian States. Cut off the incentive to freely given service, and you dry up the life-source of a free community.

We ought to realize that it is easier to adopt the compulsory principle of national life than to shake it off. Once compulsion for personal service is adopted in peacetime, it will be hard to resist the extension of the principle to all other aspects of the nation's life, including freedom of thought, speech, and writing. We ought to think carefully, and to think ahead, before taking a decisive step towards totalitarianism. Or are we so accustomed to our chains that we are no longer conscious of them?

"If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."—Attributed to George Washington during the Constitutional Convention.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. A question first: I understand the Senator had 1 hour, by unanimous consent.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I hope my name appears as a cosponsor on that legislation. I think the Senator has done, as usual, an excellent job in preparing his remarks and in studying the problem.

I might point out, before I make a few remarks of my own, some of the forces that might be working against the volunteer idea without really understanding what they are doing.

One of the reasons, I think, that we can go to volunteer force, is that the Army, which is the great user of men, is depending upon what our friend from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) discussed as the "electronic battlefield" yesterday. He did it in a very critical way, and I might say it is so highly classified that even the Armed Services Committee has not been able to hold hearings on it; but as long as he has sprung it, so to speak, I can mention it.

Seventy-five percent of the ground forces are used to discover the enemy; roughly 25 percent are used to destroy it. If the electronic battlefield will do as we feel it will do, and as I have seen it work in Vietnam, we can talk about a standing Army greatly reduced. I would hate to hazard the number.

It was on this discovery that General Westmoreland made a speech on the subject, "The Size of the American Army." I have put it in the RECORD. He is depending on this electronic-type sensing, plus the C–5 for rapid transport which removes the need to depend on large shipping that takes perhaps a month to get to a battlefield, plus heavy helicopters to lift from the C–5.

So I hope our colleagues, as we approach the debate on military appropriations—most of whom will support the voluntary military measure, I am sure—will realize that the C–5A, the heavy-lift helicopters, and the continued development of the sensor system are a necessary counterpart to this proposal.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon knows this, but the draft has not been with us forever. In fact, it took Napoleon to discover it. He, by an edict, drafted horses, men, and women. Up until that time, armies were pretty much volunteer. But since that time, because of Napoleon's discovery, we have the ability to raise vast armies, and this is a temptation to countries to engage in vast wars.

If the Senator will yield to me enough time to put perhaps 6½ pages into the RECORD, I would certainly appreciate it.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am happy to yield.

DO AWAY WITH THE DRAFT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to join today in the introduction of legislation that will abolish the draft and will put this Nation back on the course of a completely voluntary military system.

There is one thing that the American people—particularly young Americans—must understand about this measure. We who offer it mean business.

We have seen all the studies that we want. We know that our plan is a practical one. We believe it is right. We are going to get the job done.

Mr. President, first and foremost, this is a moral matter. As a conservative, I believe that the most precious and fundamental right of man is his right to live his own life.

When force is used to tell a young man how he shall spend several years of his life, then I consider this to be an invasion of his basic personal liberty. In the words of the late Senator Robert Taft, the compulsory draft "is far more typical of totalitarian nations than of democratic nations. It is absolutely opposed to the principles of individual liberty which have always been considered a part of American democracy."

Mr. President, not only is the draft wrong, but it is also wrong to assume that free men have to be forced to fight for their country. I am just old fashioned enough to believe that there still live among us a great many Americans who think enough of their freedom that they are willing to fight for it.

Furthermore, I think the rest of Americans are willing to pay those who do serve in the military forces a good and ample wage for shouldering the task.

Mr. President, these are not new principles to me. I have expressed this position time and time again. I might say, Mr. President, that I came to the conclusion to support this position during the last 5 years of my military service of 37 years as a Reserve officer, during which I served as Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel of the Air Force. I became convinced, watching the expense of maintaining the involuntary system, that this will work. I am proud that the Republican national platform of 1964 pledged to end the draft altogether, and

as soon as possible. I can remember that the very first speech of my 1964 campaign came down strong on the goal of replacing the draft with an efficient voluntary system.

While I missed the opportunity to do something about it right after 1964, I am reaffirming my intent during this session of Congress, and as many more as I am here, to devote as much of my energies as it takes to get action on an all-volunteer military force.

Not since 1948 has there been such an excellent chance for dismantling the draft. The President of the United States is solidly on record in support of doing away with it.

On March 27 of last year, President Nixon announced that he had appointed a blue-ribbon Commission on an All-volunteer Armed Force. The members of the Commission and its working staff were selected from among highly competent individuals of many diverse views and experiences.

The Commission was headed by former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, Jr. The Commission members were charged with developing "a comprehensive plan for eliminating conscription and moving toward an all-volunteer armed force."

This is exactly what it did. Indeed, I believe that the Commission not only produced a comprehensive report, but it has written the definitive study on the voluntary military proposal.

Its report is so thorough and so well documented that there can no longer be any doubt in anyone's mind that the voluntary military is practical.

The members of the Commission determined unanimously that the all-volunteer force is feasible, and I am happy to see that President Nixon agrees with this finding. On April 23 of this year, he said:

> I support the basic conclusion of the Commission. I agree that we should move now toward ending the draft.

The legislation that the Senator from Oregon has introduced today, with other Senators and of which I am a cosponsor, will accomplish the Commission's objectives. It will implement the recommendations made by the Gates Commission.

This includes ending the draft entirely by July 1, 1971. It includes raising the current value of basic pay for first-term enlisted men and first-term officers by almost 50 percent. In addition, it includes making numerous other changes that will cause military service to be more attractive.

For example, enlisted men generally should be granted discharges upon request; proficiency pay should be made available to all exceptional personnel, not merely those in the career force; promotions should be accelerated for the highly skilled; and military men should acquire vested rights to military retirement benefits after only 5 years of service just the same as civil service employees now acquire a vested interest in their civilian retirement benefits.

Mr. President, the recommendations of the Gates Commission are practical. In the first place, people must understand that a return to a voluntary military is not all that drastic a change from the present system.

The truth is that our current military forces are made up predominately of volunteers. Thirty-eight percent of the total Armed Forces are beyond any question true volunteers. This many men have more than 4 years of service.

Also, true volunteers now provide some 250,000 enlisted men annually. These are men who would have enlisted even had there been no threat of the draft looming in their future.

With this base of volunteers already available, the Gates Commission found:

> A fully volunteer force of 2.5 million men can be achieved by improving pay and conditions of service sufficiently to induce approximately 75,000 additional young men to enlist each year.

I repeat that all it will take to put a voluntary military force on its feet will be an additional 75,000 enlistees a year. This would cost no more than $3.2 billion in the first few years and would drop to $2.1 billion once the voluntary force is operating on a continuing basis.

These are not figures calculated to scare anyone. They are well within the bounds of reason. In fact, they look downright persuasive in demonstrating that the voluntary system will work.

It should be noted that the Commission study takes due account of the more difficult problem which the Army has in staffing itself in competition with the other services. The Commission wisely set its compensation tables at levels high enough to provide the Army with the quantity and quality of volunteers required by it. The Commission noted:

> The evidence is overwhelming that, if compensation is set at levels which satisfy Army requirements, the other services will be able to attract enough qualified volunteers to meet their respective requirements.

With President Nixon bent on fulfilling his promise to bring home all combat forces from Vietnam by next year, I am convinced that a level of 2.5 million men is a sensible one to project for mid-1971.

Indeed, the President's budget message of April 1969, suggested that active duty force levels will be brought down to 2 to 2.5 million men in post-Vietnam conditions.

Even so, the critics might ask, What do you do about grave national emergencies?

Again, the voluntary system must be considered in the correct perspective. For in the event of a national emergency it is not the ability to draft untrained men that will meet the Nation's immediate needs. I agree with the Gates Commission that when a rapid increase in the number of men under arms is required "the first recourse should be to Ready Reserves, including the National Guard."

The Commission continues:

> Whatever advantages may be claimed for it, conscription cannot provide emergency forces: it takes many months of training for civilians to become soldiers.

Thus, it will be the reserve forces who provide immediate support to the Active Forces. Like the active duty members, the reserves will have been recruited on a voluntary basis. Our legislation will automatically increase the drill pay for reserve participation at the same time that it provides pay increases for the active duty component. This increase should be enough to encourage reserve enlistments sufficient to provide a voluntary reserve force large enough to support the voluntary active duty force.

Furthermore, our proposal takes the commonsense approach of allowing for a standby draft. But the standby system can only take effect by means of an act of Congress at the request of the President. Thereby, the country could muster a major increase in its forces over an extended period in times of dire emergency.

Although I do not believe the standby system will ever need to be used, it will guarantee that the national security will be protected in any contingency.

Mr. President, the voluntary military proposal is sensible and it is morally justified. It represents a return to the best traditions of our country.

Few people remember their history. People I talk to seem surprised when they learn that up to the time of the Civil War there was no draft in America. The draft only appeared in this Nation in 1863, 1917, and 1940, and then only as a wartime expedient.

Prior to 1948, the draft was ended after each major war. The fact that it has continued since 1948 is contrary to almost the entire course of American history.

It is a practice that has no place in our scheme of things except as a temporary, last resort safeguard. It unquestionably deprives individual citizens of their personal freedom to live their lives where and how they choose.

On the other hand, as it was so well expressed by the Gates Commission:

> A force made up of men freely choosing to serve should enhance the dignity and prestige of the military. Every man in uniform will be serving as a matter of choice rather than coercion.

For these basic reasons, I urge Congress to act affirmatively and swiftly on voluntary military legislation.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, one, for having reintroduced his proposal and, two, for allowing me to be a participant.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am very grateful to the Senator from Arizona for the persuasive argument he has presented this morning on behalf of a voluntary army.

So far as his very succinct point about meeting a national emergency is concerned, when we had such a case, both in the situation of Korea and the Berlin Airlift, we found very clearly that we could not depend upon a draft system to produce the manpower, and we had to recall veterans from World War II to meet both of those emergencies.

This is further evidence to bear out the point that the crisis or national emergency will not be met by a conscription system but by a reserve, adequately trained, and the National Guards of the the various States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. I think this is a point that everyone in this body should heed as we go into the debate on the military authorization and appropriation.

Over the week, I read the story of the Air Corps during the 1930's and the efforts we were making to enlarge it to 15,000 men, and the efforts we went through in 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942 to train people for a new body of our military. This experience makes it likely that the draft would have to be used in a large-scale world war. But if we can keep our air forces, our Navy transportation—and particular keep the C–5A and the heavy lift helicopter—if we can improve the sensory capability of all the electronic systems we have developed for the ground forces and the air forces, and if we envision a battlefield that encompasses the sea and the land and the air, probably controlled from some airborne command center or centers that we will call AWACS when we finally get them into service, then I think we are looking at a greatly reduced overall military that will even be able to fight much larger wars than Vietnam, but will also be small enough to maintain on a completely voluntary basis.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Oregon in cosponsoring this important legislation. I was impressed with the thoroughness of the report of the Gates Commission, and am delighted that the Congress will now have before it legislation implementing many of the Commission's recommendations.

In my view, one of our most important national priorities is the early establishment of an all-volunteer armed force. As early as 1965, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I spoke out about the many inequities which existed, and continued to exist, in the Selective Service System. Then, in 1967, four of my House colleagues and I coauthored a book entitled "How To End the Draft—The Case for an All-Volunteer Army," outlining our views on the need for such changes in our military personnel recruitment policies. I continue to believe that this approach is both feasible and necessary if this country is to maintain an efficient, well-trained, and highly motivated uniformed service for our Nation's defense. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for the leadership he has given to this effort in the Senate.

For some years I have fought for and supported legislation to increase pay for enlisted men, particularly those in their initial term of service. I am pleased that the Gates Commission recognized the inherent inequities in the present pay structure for these individuals. I commend the President for his announced intention to propose such pay increases, beginning in 1971, and hope his proposals and this legislation can serve as the focus of long overdue congressional action in this area.

There are strong indications that the administration is moving toward its stated objective of zero draft calls. While I have long favored major reform of the many unfair aspects of the draft, I believe that the most desirable reform of all is to end the draft, preserving only a provision to register young men and reinstitute the draft at the request of the President by joint resolution of Congress in time of national emergency.

The senior Senator from Oregon has outlined the details of the worthwhile provisions of this bill, and I join him in the hope that our colleagues will give these proposals their close consideration. Many of our Nation's youth have expressed, in the strongest terms, their dissatisfaction with the draft as it presently exists. Many of their parents have also indicated their belief that the system is unfair in many ways. They look to this administration and to the Congress to take steps to change the system.

I have said previously: If there is something wrong with the system, let us change it. I believe there is something wrong with our draft system, and I believe we should change it—by eliminating it. It seems clear that the Nixon administration and a substantial number of Members of both Houses of Congress agree on this point.

I, for one, pledge to do all I can to achieve that goal, and hope that many more of our colleagues will join in this effort.

Mr. HATFIELD. I appreciate the eloquent comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I believe that his support will be very meaningful, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and that the long background he has achieved in military and veterans legislation will be helpful, also.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE).

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first, let me commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) for his leadership in this bipartisan effort to bring about a volunteer armed force.

Mr. President, during his campaign for the Presidency, President Nixon announced his support for the concept of a volunteer armed force for the United States. He, as many in Congress and among the general public, recognized that the present conscription system was inherently inequitable and ill suited to the maintenance of top-quality and efficient military establishment. Soon after he assumed office President Nixon appointed a commission to study our draft system and make recommendations replacing it with an all-volunteer armed force. As was pointed out on the floor this morning, Thomas Gates, former Secretary of the Navy, was chosen to head the Commission.

While the Commission was conducting its study, the President took several steps to improve the existing system, and in response to several Presidential recommendations, the Congress passed legislation granting him discretionary authority to institute a lottery to determine the order of induction.

These efforts, while they improved the draft system, did not fundamentally change it, for the basic statutory framework remained. In response to this situation, I joined the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) in introducing a proposal in January of this year which would end the draft and replace it with a voluntary military manpower program.

The Gates Commission report was issued in February, and it specifically proposed an end to all inductions by July 1, 1971, with the expiration of the present draft law. It also made a number of recommendations for improving military pay scales and for reducing the high turnover rate in the Armed Forces and making military life more attractive as a career for dedicated Americans.

My colleague from Oregon has now authored a bill which incorporates the findings and recommendations of the Gates Commission. I am pleased to join as a cosponsor.

In addition to halting inductions, the bill provides a pay increase focusing on the enlisted ranks and continuing registration in the event it becomes necessary to reinstate the draft. Specifically, this bill provides $3.2 billion to make the pay scale of the armed services competitive with opportunities in civilian life, and directs the Secretary of Defense to improve and expand specialist education, officer training, and recruitment programs. Moreover, in a time when the Reserve Officers Training Corps is being placed under more stringent academic regulation, this legislation allows for an increase in ROTC scholarships—which may help to offset the credit restrictions imposed at many institutions.

There are some who argue that an army of volunteers would be an army of the poor, the nonwhite, or mercenaries. Yet these arguments ignore our history, throughout which we have relied on volunteer service, and only in the past 30 years has the United States used its power of conscription to raise a standing military force. Such arguments also ignore the improved compensation and better service conditions which this bill provides, and they ignore the projections of the Gates Commission which demonstrate that the turnover in an all-volunteer force would be three-quarters of the turnover in a comparable mixed force.

As we consider this legislation, we cannot ignore the lessons of the post-World War I return to volunteerism which collapsed on a wage structure too fragile to support national manpower requirements. This legislation is realistic. It recognizes that the armed services cannot survive the competition for human talent without a viable salary structure or worthwhile career training.

This proposal makes the armed services more than the purgatory between education and employment. It makes them a respected and gainful career. And it demonstrates our awareness that a Nation's greatness does not lie in its power of conscription but in its ability to raise an army without it.

Again, I commend the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Kansas. He has one of the most distinguished military service records of any Member of this body. I thank him for his perceptive and clear analysis of the amendment and for his support and cosponsorship of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HONOR AMERICA DAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on July 4, Washington witnessed something in the way of a unique happening for this era, an affirmative, even joyful, mass demonstration. It was affirmative in the sense that, rather than focusing on problems, or differences, or shortcomings of our society, it attempted to point up those aspects of our life and Nation which set us apart from the rest of the world in terms of traditions, spirit, and heritage.

Widely publicized as a nonpartisan, nonideological celebration, Honor America Day was carried off with a smoothness and polish which attested to both the enthusiasm and competence of its principal organizers and participants.

In any account of the day, special tribute must be paid to the three men who, more than any others, made it a reality and a success, Bob Hope, the Reverend Billy Graham, and J. Willard Marriott. Their energy, imagination, and dedication to celebrating America's greatness were translated through the assistance of hundreds of entertainers and thousands of supporters, into a truly memorable Fourth of July.

The broad base of support and encouragement behind the event encompassed the entire spectrum of responsible political and social viewpoints, and that the day's festivities were shunned by both poles of radical opinion is some evidence of its catholic outlook and freedom from ax grinding.

While between 350,000 to 400,000 people attended the festivities in Washington, and millions more across the country watched on television, perhaps the most significant impact of the day's activities is to be found in other nations around the world. One of the favorite worldwide pastimes these days seems to have become speculation on the internal woes and weaknesses of this great country.

The foreign press has devoted considerable space to analysis and examination of America's ills—riots, marches, conflict, and upheaval. No wonder that many people throughout the world have come to question whether America still believes in itself and the ideals upon which it was founded.

I cannot but believe that Honor America Day had a tremendous impact on the peoples of the world, whether in friendly neutral or Communist states. In marked contrast to national day celebrations in most other countries, Honor America Day lacked the sober tones of militarism, the dismal regularity of governmentally organized demonstrations, and the flat, colorless rhetoric of politicians. Instead, Honor America Day was lighthearted, colorful, and relaxed. It was also a genuine and unregimented outpouring of pride, affection, and respect for our country—something which was not lost on the rest of the world. The United States was on display in its best light, and just as the American people were at least momentarily refreshed, so was the idea of America in the minds of people throughout the world.

Mr. President, I again express my congratulations to all those who took part in Honor America Day, the organizers, the performers, and the spectators. It was a Fourth of July we will all remember.

I ask unanimous consent to have the lead editorial from the July 6 Washington Daily News printed in the RECORD.

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

FREAKS AND THE FOURTH OF JULY

There was an engagingly old-fashioned air to the Honor America Day goings-on in the nation's capital: shirt-sleeved family groups picnicking on the grass, listening to patriotic oratory and stirring band music, hearing about religion's role in building America, watching fireworks light up the night sky.

There was the same easy familiarity in the entertainment program put on by Bob Hope. If some of the stars seemed to have been around since the founding of the Republic, it was good to know that they were alive and well in Washington.

We think that most of the 250,000 people who took part in the day and many millions who watched it on TV had a good time. And many of them may have benefitted, in this time of division and doubt, from the day's reminder of how much is right and decent in this country.

What was not familiar, or likeable about the day were efforts by a small number—about 4,000—of hippies and yippies to disrupt the celebrations. It may be news to beardies, weirdies, pot heads and freaks, but one of the things America is all about is fair play for the other fellow.

During the recent antiwar demonstrations here in Washington, we were struck by the restraint of the police and the majority of the citizenry who did not approve of the marchers. (Any attempt to interfere would, of course, have been met with loud cries of "Fascism!" or "Repression!")

But when Middle America gathered to honor the flag, a fringe of the New Left loosed obscene chants at Billy Graham and Kate Smith. It hurled bottles and firecrackers into crowds containing children, and it "liberated" (looted is a better word) refreshment stands.

There are, we think, a few lessons in the yippie behavior during Washington's Fourth of July. One concerns those who sewed the American flag on their trouser seats or paraded in the nude. They are poor, pathetic creatures trying to shock the bourgeoisie, and you don't have to discuss the Vietnam war seriously with a clown with a bare behind.

A second concerns the bottle-throwers, platform-seizers and obscenity-chanters. They are very few and not really dangerous, and there are plenty of disorderly-conduct laws to deal with them.

It would be a ludicrous mistake to be stampeded by a handful of violence-freaks into passing repressive laws that, in time, could restrict everybody's freedom.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS). Is there further morning business?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3274) to implement the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1456) to amend section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5106) for the relief of Rogelio Tabhan.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 9311. An act to declare that certain lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington;

H.R. 10517. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11766. An act to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966;

H.R. 12807. An act to amend the Act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12943. An act to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, to extend for 3 years the authority to make appropriations to carry out such act;

H.R. 13978. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize marketing research and promotion projects including paid advertising for almonds;

H.R. 14453. An act to authorize the Public Printer to grant time off as compensation for overtime worked by certain employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15118. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Ohio Northern University;

H.R. 15979. An act to provide that the interest on certain insured loans sold out of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund shall be included in gross income; and

H.R. 17068. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a partial exemption from duty for aircraft manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of foreign components imported under temporary importation bond.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1455. An act to amend section 8c(2)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to pro-

vide for marketing orders for apples produced in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio;

S. 1519. An act to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes;

S. 3564. An act to amend the Federal Youth Corrections Act (18 U.S.C. 5005 et seq.) to permit examiners to conduct interviews with youth offenders;

S. 3592. An act to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, to clarify the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations;

S. 3598. An act to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to extend the reporting date of the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 9311. An act to declare that certain lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10517. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15979. An act to provide that the interest on certain insured loans sold out of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund shall be included in gross income; and

H.R. 17068. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for a partial exemption from duty for aircraft manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of foreign components imported under temporary importation bond; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 11766. An act to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966; and

H.R. 12943. An act to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, to extend for three years the authority to make appropriations to carry out such act; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 12807. An act to amend the Act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13978. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize marketing research and promotion projects including paid advertising for almonds; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 14453. An act to authorize the Public Printer to grant time off as compensation for overtime worked by certain employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H.R. 15118. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Ohio Northern University; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. EAGLETON) announced that on today, July 7, 1970, he signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 16739. An act to extend until July 3, 1974, the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to change the name of Pleasant Valley Canal, California, to "Coalinga Canal"; and

H.J. Res. 746. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. EAGLETON) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF THE ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second annual report of the Alaska Power Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. EAGLETON):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 25

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the power of Congress and the states to levy and collect taxes upon the income derived from interest paid on evidences of indebtedness of the United States, the states and any political subdivision, agency or instrumentality of the United States or the states.

"Whereas, the imposition of taxes by the United States Government on the interest earned on indebtedness of States, their political subdivisions, and the agencies and instrumentalities thereof, would create a burden on and restrict the power of state and local governments to fund money; and

"Whereas, the constantly recurring attempts of Congress and the Treasury Department of the United States to impose or attempt to impose such taxes, directly or indirectly, has severely damaged and continues to threaten great damage to the ability of all state and local governmental units to borrow money for needed public improvements and has delayed many improvements and substantially increased the cost of those undertaken, to the detriment of the taxpayer; and

"Whereas, the continued attempts to impose such taxes violates the constitutional principle of reciprocal intergovernmental tax immunity first enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat 316) in the year 1819 and more specifically applied by that court in *Pollack* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U.S. 429) and later cases; and

"Whereas, it is urgent and essential to the best interest of the citizens of this and all other states that definitive action be taken to insure against further attempts on the part of Congress to tax such interests earnings by amending the Constitution of the United States to unequivocally reaffirm the principle of reciprocal intergovernmental tax immunity and thereby to restore investor confidence in the market for such evidences of indebtedness and consequently reduce the burden incident to borrowing by the states, their political subdivisions, agencies and instrumentalities, and ultimately the burden on the taxpayer.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana, the House of Representatives thereof concurring that, in conformity with Article V of the Constitution of the United States, application is hereby made by the Legislature of Louisiana to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall read substantially as follows:

" 'Article—.

" 'Without the consent of a state, the Congress shall have no power to levy or provide for the collection of any tax, direct or indirect, upon income derived from interest paid on evidences of indebtedness of such state or of any political subdivision, agency or instrumentality thereof, nor shall any state have power, without the consent of Congress, to levy and collect any tax, direct or indirect, upon income derived from interest paid on obligations of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.'

"Be it further resolved that duly attested copies of this Concurrent Resolution shall be transmitted immediately by the Secretary of State of Louisiana to the President and Secretary of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each member of the Congress from the State of Louisiana.

"Be it further resolved that this Concurrent Resolution shall continue in full force and effect until December 31, 1975."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7618. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla. (Rept. No. 91-1003).

By Mr. EAGLETON, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 2108. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1004).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 4059. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to authorize pilot and demonstration projects for the improvement of educational opportunities for American Indian children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 4060. A bill for the relief of Col. Paul E. Greiner, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S. 4061. A bill for the relief of Elvira Russo Rossetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 4062. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property, of the United States to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 4063. A bill to transfer the enforcement functions of the Secretary of the Interior under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, and the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act to the Secretary of Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 4064. A bill to provide for payment of survivor annuities to the widows of certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 4065. A bill for the relief of Peter Nicholas Pagotelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 4066. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to provide the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration with the authority to render assistance to State and local civil courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4059—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE PILOT AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN INDIAN CHILDREN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, after extensive investigations and hearings, issued a final report with 60 specific recommendations. The first three recommendations were that a national policy commitment be made to establishing educational excellence for American Indians and maximum participation and control by Indians, and that the United States set specific objectives for fulfilling the education, health, housing and employment needs of American Indians. So far there has been some activity within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and a lot of rhetoric in the Interior Department and from the National Council on Indian Opportunity, but substantive national goals and commitments have yet to be announced by this administration. The Indian people of this country have been waiting decades for our Government to make good on its obligations—obligations undertaken in return for cession of millions of acres of Indian lands—to provide the kinds of programs and services that can assure them a standard of living on or off the reservations commensurate with that of the general population. They should not have to wait another decade.

The majority of the Indian Education Subcommittees' recommendations were very specific, calling for legislative and administrative changes to strengthen Indian education programs. Some of these have been put into effect, including legislative action in the areas of bilingual education, school construction assistance, and the Teacher Corps. Within a short time I plan to introduce a general bill to implement further a number of legislative recommendations of the Subcommittee. Today I am introducing a bill to provide for grants for innovative demonstration projects to improve the education of Indian children.

Recommendation 21 of the Subcommittee Report:

> The Federal Indian School System be developed into an exemplary system, which can play an important role in improving education for Indian children.

The bill that I am introducing, with the cosponsorship of Senators HARRIS, MANSFIELD, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MONTOYA, and YARBOROUGH would provide funds for planning, developing, and operating exemplary programs, including innovative programs related to the education of deprived children; bilingual and bicultural education projects; special health and nutrition and related services; coordinating, planning, and operation of other Federal programs; in service and preservice training for personnel; and evaluation activities.

The benefits to be derived from demonstration projects are already seen in the activities at the Rough Rock Navajo School. The need for extending this concept is likewise clear.

The Rough Rock Demonstration School represented an attempt to break the conventional unimaginative educational practices of the previous century of Indian education. The Bureau of Indian Affairs agreed to turn over a new, $3 million school on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona, and the money allotted for its operation, to the Navajos for a new type of school. The Office of Economic Opportunity was anxious to stimulate experimental efforts at changing the traditional educational opportunities available to American Indians and granted over $300,000 for demonstration projects in native community involvement in education.

Rough Rock is run by a five-member Navajo school board. Only two of the members have had any formal education, and weekly board meetings are conducted in Navajo. The school is committed to the involvement of Indians in "their" school, and thus has become a symbol of Indian participation and control and has been extremely influential in shaping a new policy in Indian education.

Earlier this year the Navajo community at Ramah, N. Mex., initiated negotiations with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to reestablish a high school in that community. Although the elementary public school was still in operation, the high school was closed in 1967 and students were sent to off-reservation boarding schools. This winter the community decided to stop waiting for outside help and to take the initiative on their problem; they voted without dissent in favor of forming a school board and elected five members, only one of whom has gone beyond ninth grade in school. The community's ambition was the permanent establishment of a high school in the community, with local control of it.

After long negotiations the Bureau was able to respond, at least in part, to the problems at Ramah and in April committed itself to contributing a sum of money for each Indian child equal to the average per pupil cost of educating one Navajo child at a boarding school. The Office of Economic Opportunity and private foundations have committed additional assistance, and next fall Ramah will open with an enrollment of about 150 students.

At Rocky Boy, Mont., the Chippewa-Cree Tribe this past winter gained approval for controlling its own elementary school. The school will be financed through outside State aid and Federal impacted-area assistance, with some outside foundation grants. The community felt the importance of self-determination in educating its youth, and it presently appears that its efforts will be rewarded.

The history of the efforts at Rough Rock, Ramah, and Rocky Boy, however, does not suggest the ease with which progress and innovation come to Indian education projects. Rather, it attests first to the perseverance of individuals and communities in the drive for excellence and self-determination, and second to the kinds of results that can be obtained from Government commitments on exemplary and demonstration projects.

But these commitments are long in coming, and there is never sufficient funding or sufficient statutory leeway for innovative planning and coordination. What is needed is an injection of new funds and new flexibility in the planning Indian education programs. The legislation I am introducing today will provide the necessary ingredients.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the Vice President, together with a resolution of the Governor's Task Force on Indian Problems, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. EAGLETON). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4059) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to authorize pilot and demonstration projects for the improvement of educational opportunities for American Indian children, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and re-

ferred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The material, presented by Mr. KENNEDY, is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1970.

Hon. SPIRO AGNEW,
Chairman, National Council on Indian Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: One of the main concerns of the Senate Indian Education Subcommittee was the lack of coordination between Federal departments and agencies involved in Indian education programs. For example, the Subcommittee pointed out that both the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U.S. Office of Education are concerned with quality education for Indian children, yet there is little, if any, sharing of ideas and resources between the two units.

To alleviate this situation, the Subcommittee recommended a more coordinated effort in this area by all departments and agencies concerned. The specific recommendation of the Subcommittee was:

"That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of the Interior, together with the National Council on Indian Opportunity, jointly devise a plan of action for a united effort between the two Departments for the development of a quality education program for Indian children, and that such plan be submitted to the Congress no later than March 1, 1970." (Recommendation 20)

Four months have elapsed since the March 1 deadline, and we have had no response from either of the Departments or from the NCIO.

This recommendation was endorsed by all members of the Subcommittee, and we therefore encourage your prompt response.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, HAROLD E. HUGHES, W. B. SAXBE, WALTER F. MONDALE, PETER H. DOMINICK, HARRISON WILLIAMS, GEORGE MURPHY, ———— ————.

RESOLUTION BY GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON INDIAN PROBLEMS

Whereas, Report No. 91-501 of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate made the following numbered recommendations with regard to the administration and funding of the Johnson-O'Malley Act, to-wit:

48. That each state applying for a Johnson-O'Malley contract should be required to submit a definite plan for meeting the needs of its Indian students.

49. That better accountability and evaluation procedures should be instituted at state and local levels.

50. That Indians should be involved in the planning, executing and evaluating of Johnson-O'Malley programs. A state or district's Johnson-O'Malley plan should be subject to the approval of the Indian participants.

51. That technical assistants should be hired by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to work with local agencies, State departments of education and Indian participant groups in helping to identify special Indian needs and in developing programs which would meet those needs.

52. That Johnson-O'Malley funding should not be conditioned by the presence of tax-exempt land.

53. That the expanded contracting authority authorized by the Act's 1936 amendment should be utilized for the development of curriculum relevant to Indian culture and the training of teachers of Indian students.

54. That tribes and Indian communities should be added to the list of agencies with which the Bureau of Indian Affairs can negotiate Johnson-O'Malley contracts and that full use be made of this new contracting authority to permit tribes to develop their own education and programs, and

Whereas, The Governor's Indian Task Force of the State of Montana meeting in Billings on this 4th day of April, 1970, concurs in said recommendations and wishes to express its full support of the same.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that recommendations numbered 48 through 54 inclusive, of said report are fully endorsed by the Governor's Indian Task Force, and the Task Force further urges all concerned units and responsible officers of the Federal and State Governments and the Congress of the United States and the Montana Legislature to take appropriate action to implement said recommendations.

S. 4066—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE SAFE STREETS ACT TO IMPROVE THE COURTS OF OUR NATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the serious problems of court congestion and delay produced by the use of archaic, inefficient judicial machinery continues to plague the courts of our Nation. In both our criminal and civil courts, the maxim "justice delayed is justice denied" has been woefully illustrated time and again.

Our national blue-ribbon commissions on crime, most notably President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Eisenhower Commission on Crime, have stated that if we want to put safety back on the streets this must change. They have concluded that court reform must rank as a major front in our war against crime.

As part of the Safe Streets Act of 1968, Congress sought to meet this challenge. Unfortunately, however, the measure we adopted with regard to judicial reform represents only a half step. For while we authorize the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to channel funds and information to the criminal courts of our State and local governments, we failed to also grant the LEAA express authority to provide similar assistance to our civil courts.

Mr. President, in the field of judicial administration, one thing is elementary. It is impossible to adequately cure the problems of our criminal courts without attending to the ills of our civil courts as well. The judicial machinery of many of our civil courts is highly enmeshed with the machinery of our criminal courts. And backlogs and delays on one side breed backlogs and delays on the other. Indeed, to try to solve the problems of our criminal courts without reforming our civil courts is to try to sweep back the tide with a broom.

Moreover, we must not forget the important bearing that our civil courts independently have upon law enforcement. Peaceful settlement of disputes in an appropriate forum is a basic concept of our democratic process. Indeed, our civil courts constitute an important part of the domestic peacekeeping operations of government. If our citizens lose faith in the courts as a means of settling their disputes and instead seek alternative answers for redress, our social order will be weakened, if not destroyed. Indeed, our urban disorders, in their own cryptic way, express a lack of confidence in the ability or willingness of our courts and other legal institutions to redress those grievances which helped seed the violence.

Mr. President, in the 89th Congress and again in the 90th Congress, I introduced the National Court Assistance Act, a bill that is designed to comprehensively meet the serious problems of our State and local courts—both civil and criminal.

The National Court Assistance Act has two main features. First, it establishes a grant-in-aid program to encourage and financially assist the modernization and improvement of judicial machinery in our State and local courts. Second, it serves to create a national reservoir of up-to-date information on court management and organization.

On December 22, 1969, I reintroduced this measure. And in February 1970, the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which I chair, held hearings on the subject matter.

At that time, Mr. Richard W. Velde, the Associate Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration testified that the National Court Assistance Act was unnecessary because, in his words:

> Every major aim of this bill can be accomplished through the present statutory authority of LEAA.

Mr. Velde's interpretation that LEAA is authorized to provide grants and technical advice to civil courts was indeed encouraging news. But the more I talked to other knowledgeable officials about this problem, the clearer it became, unfortunately, that Mr. Velde's interpretation was strictly his own. This construction of the act has never been promulgated to State court judges and judicial administrators. It is unknown to State officials serving on State law enforcement planning agencies. And, this construction of the act is virtually unknown to other ranking officials within LEAA, itself.

Mr. President, when it comes to the critical task of improving our courts and fighting crime, I do not think Federal law can afford to be vague. Congress must articulate its understanding that slow-moving, congested, and inefficient civil courts can surely poison an otherwise healthy criminal justice system. And Congress must make it indelibly clear that LEAA has the authority to solve the serious problems existing in our civil as well as our criminal courts.

Mr. President, with this in mind, today I am introducing legislation designed to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to make it clear that LEAA has the authority to assist the civil courts of our Nation.

I request that this bill be expeditiously referred to the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures so that it may be considered in conjunction with other measures amending the Safe Streets Act that are now before this subcommittee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4066) to amend title I of

the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to provide the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration with the authority to render assistance to State and local civil courts, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4066

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307 of The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, Public Law 90-351, is hereby amended by adding immediately after subsection 307(b) a new subsection, 307(c) as follows:

"307(c) In making grants under this part, the Administration and each State planning agency shall construe the phrase 'comprehensive law enforcement plan' as found in section 201 and 'programs and projects to improve and strengthen law enforcement' as found in section 301 to encompass any plan, program, or project that is designed to improve the civil as well as the criminal courts of a State. Also, 'law enforcement' as found in Part D section 401 shall be construed as covering the activities of the civil as well as the criminal courts of a State."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2108

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be added as cosponsors to S. 2108, a bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3752

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3752, to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of consumer commodities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 765

Mr. HATFIELD (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. DOLE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. GOODELL) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. HATFIELD when he submitted the amendment appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 776

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) and myself, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to H.R. 17923, the appropriations bill for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and related agencies, which will restore $4.5 million to support research to seek improved means of nonchemical means of pest control. These funds were initially requested by the Agricultural Research Service for research in this area but were deleted by the Department or the Bureau of the Budget.

Last fall, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced plans to curtail the nonessential uses of DDT and other hazardous pesticides. The Department's first action to cancel four specific uses of DDT has been indefinitely stalled by the manufacturers of DDT who have initiated a long series of appeals which could delay final action for as much as 2 years.

In response to this delaying action, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, West Michigan Environmental Action Council, National Audubon Society, and Izaak Walton League filed suit in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to force the Agriculture Department to suspend immediately all uses of DDT. The court was strongly persuaded by the case presented by the environmental lawyers and ordered the Agriculture Department to show cause why DDT should not be suspended immediately.

The Department responded last Monday that while "scientific evidence indicates that there are some adverse effects upon certain species of fish and wildlife" caused by DDT, it does not constitute an imminent hazard to human health. The Department further stated that it will not eliminate any uses of DDT which are essential to the public health and safety.

But which of the current uses of any pesticides can be considered "nonessential" in the absence of effective alternative means of pest control? Many effective, economical, alternative means or pest control have been developed to make many currently used persistent pesticides obsolete.

For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture suggests an effective alternative for DDT on virtually every crop on which this most persistent pesticide is presently used. In addition, a host of nonchemical means of pest control have been applied with great success in many parts of the country, including the development of crop varieties that resist insect attack, the introduction of natural enemies into the pest's environment, insect sterilization, and integrated procedures which combine chemical and biological control measures.

However, it is my judgment that additional effective, economic alternatives could have been developed if the Agriculture Research Service had received the funds which it could have effectively used in recent years.

The Agriculture Department has admitted that its budget for the coming fiscal year lacks more than $4 million that could be effectively used for research in this area. Similar pest control research programs were underfunded by at least $4 million for the 1970 fiscal year. These funds were requested by the Agriculture Research Service but were deleted by the Department or the Bureau of the Budget.

Unless Congress provides the Agriculture Department with a firm mandate and sufficient funds for seeking improved nonchemical means of pest control, I am afraid most existing pesticide uses will be considered "essential." The result will find our environment further polluted by these long lived chemicals.

When the Senate considers the Agriculture Department's appropriation bill for the 1971 fiscal year, I plan to call up this amendment to restore $4.5 million to support additional research in this area.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this amendment together with a fact sheet outlining its purpose be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and fact sheet will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 766) is as follows:

On page 3, lines 14 and 15, strike out "$157,346,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$161,846,200."

The fact sheet, presented by Mr. NELSON, is as follows:

FUNDS FOR PEST CONTROL RESEARCH

(Senator NELSON'S amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill)

PURPOSE

To restore $4.5 million for research to seek improved methods of nonchemical pest control.

WHY

This increase must be made now in order to accelerate development of effective substitutes for the persistent chemical pesticides now harming the environment.

BACKGROUND

In its agency budget proposal, the Agriculture Research Service requested an increase of more than $4 million for nonchemical pest control research. However, the Agriculture Department or the Bureau of the

Budget failed to approve the request. As a result, the ARS must not only reduce ongoing programs, but is prevented from accelerating already promising work and initiating essential new research.

EXAMPLES

Biological control—Using insect parasites, predators, and diseases to eliminate harmful pests.

Hormones—Disrupting the natural growth and development of pests by introducing certain hormones into its system at critical times.

Sterilization—Inducing sexual sterility in male pests through radiation or chemicals to reduce breeding potential.

Attractants—Using sex or food attractants to lure pests into a trap.

Integrated control—Primary use of biological control with limited use of selective chemicals.

PROGRAMS TO BE FUNDED

$2,165,000—Establishment of a research and development fund to implement pilot programs testing and evaluating biological control techniques in the field. Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Oklahoma, Washington, Wisconsin.

$1,500,000—Eradication of the cotton boll weevil against which 75% of all DDT is used. Columbus, Mississippi.

$165,000—Research on biological control of citrus fruit insects. Orlando, Florida.

$165,000—Research on biological control of tropical fruit flies. Miami, Florida.

$165,000—Research on development of hormones to disrupt insect growth. Beltsville, Maryland.

$110,000—Research on Biological control of grain sorghum insects. Stillwater, Oklahoma.

$110,000—Research on the use of sterile males, attractants and other biological controls of cotton insects. Phoenix, Arizona.

$60,000—Research on the control of horse parasites by nonchemical means. Beltsville, Maryland.

$60,000—Research on the use of harmless insects for the control of water weeds. Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 763

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) be added as cosponsors of amendment No. 763 to H.R. 17923, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 202

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet on Thurday, July 16, 1970, to hold a hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 202, to extend the time required for the Securities and Exchange Commission to file a report on its institutional investors study.

The hearing will be held at 2 p.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES ON S. 2348, S. 3988, AND S. 3989

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet on Thursday, July 16, 1970, to continue hearings on S. 2348, a bill to establish a Federal Broker-Dealer Insurance Corporation.

During this hearing the subcommittee will also consider the bills S. 3988 and S. 3989, to provide greater protection for customers of registered brokers and dealers and members of national securities exchanges.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with this hearing should notify Mr. Stephen J. Paradise, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington D.C. 20510; telephone 225–7391.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF G. THOMAS EISELE, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, July 17, 1970, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination:

G. Thomas Eisele, of Arkansas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Arkansas, vice Gordon E. Young, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), chairman, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), and myself.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

USE OF TELEVISION BY BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, a most perceptive editorial appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, on Monday, June 29, 1970, commenting on the nationwide address of June 24, 1970, by the distinguished majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD). Not only did the editorial agree with the substance, the true, and the spirit of cooperation reflected by the address, but further appreciated the significance of the majority party of Congress having the opportunity to respond to the growing use of television by the executive branch to advocate positions upon important national issues. The coequal status of Congress under the Constitution with the executive branch was fully intended by our Founding Fathers. As the editorial states:

Similar rebuttals on a regular basis would result in a better informed public, and thus a sounder democracy.

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

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

TV REBUTTAL IS HELP TO PUBLIC

There is no denying that President Nixon, thanks to television, enjoys a tremendous political advantage over his critics. As the nation's chief executive, he—like his recent predecessors—gets free network time whenever he desires to explain and defend the activities of his Republican Administration.

A belated attempt to correct this basically unfair situation got under way last week. At the request of Democratic lawmakers, NBC–TV gave equal time to Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield for a reply to the President's noontime address on the economy exactly a week earlier.

Sen. Mansfield, a man we always have respected even while often disagreeing with him, came across just fine as spokesman for the loyal opposition. In disputing Mr. Nixon's assessment of the economy, and telling why, he gave the public a broader understanding of controversial issues than otherwise would have been fully presented.

It was the President's view that the Nation's economy, while admittedly unhealthy, is slowly responding to his tight money policies. Everything will be all right, he claimed, if the public has patience and if Congress gives him more cooperation in passing legislation he recommends.

Senator Mansfield was far less sanguine. In his view—and that of his colleagues—the economy not only is unhealthy but definitely in a worsening recession. Instead of hopefully waiting for good news, he said, the President should exercise far more vigorous leadership to halt inflation—and promised him every Democratic assistance if he would do so.

The Mansfield rebuttal, in our opinion, was a much needed response to Mr. Nixon's too optimistic report. It echoed our own conviction that the President could be taking firmer measures to ease the country's economic pains. It also helped correct the President's partisan innuendo that Democratic inaction is largely responsible for those pains.

We hope that the Mansfield broadcast will turn out to be a pilot program for similar rebuttals on a regular basis—a possibility now under discussion with the networks. Giving the President's responsible opposition equal time to reply to his broadcasts would result in a better informed public, and thus a sounder democracy.

PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, there has been an increasing partnership between business and government in approaching our social problems.

A nation that, with the coordination of governmental and industrial talent, can put a man on the moon within a decade of concentrated effort, certainly can solve its other problems.

Illustrative of this new corporate awareness and attention is a recent publication by the Chase Manhattan Bank, reviewing its efforts in urban affairs.

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

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

ONE CORPORATION'S EFFORTS IN URBAN AFFAIRS

American corporations have become increasingly involved in urban problem-solving

since the late 1960s and have learned from the experience that there are no easy solutions to the hard problems of housing, education, employment and environment.

Along with other major corporations, commercial banks have clearly recognized the need for direct action on social issues. Three years ago, The Chase Manhattan Bank established a full-time Urban Affairs unit and formed an Urban Affairs Advisory Committee of 14 senior officers to coordinate its expanding range of programs.

Since that time the bank has planned, developed and implemented numerous programs for job training, community economic development, housing, remedial education, children's activities and financial grants.

Experience gained from these efforts has resulted in a continued modification of many activities and an intensified commitment for the future.

As David Rockefeller, chairman of The Chase Manhattan Bank, said recently, "We have to expand our social consciousness as we expand our range of technical conquests unless we are to conclude that all progress is bound to founder on the shoals of democracy. Profit must remaiin the yardstick, because it is the measure of our efficiency, but profit must be based more and more on calculations of social costs and benefits as well as private costs and benefits. We must accept the fact that economic growth is not an end in itself, but rather a means to a greater number of social as well as private ends."

MANPOWER TRAINING

Manpower training is both a social and economic need that has been a major action area for many corporations. Chase Manhattan has stepped up its efforts to recruit blacks and Puerto Ricans. Minority groups now constitute approximately one-third of the bank's nearly 20,000 employees in the New York Metropolitan area, in jobs ranging from entry level to officerships.

Many of the applicants are high school dropouts from New York's ghettos and depressed areas. Often, the traditional training programs of brief orientation and on-the-job experience are not enough to ensure the capability to move up to better and more meaningful jobs.

To counteract some of these problems, Chase in 1967 started the Job Opportunities in Business (JOB) program which couples remedial education with skills and job training over a six-month period. More than 300 high school dropouts or young men without marketable job skills have graduated from JOB.

Initially, the program was designed to help every student receive a high school equivalency certificate. "Then after two years' experience," says Arthur Humphrey, director of JOB, "we found out that the program wasn't really relevant to the guys. They told us so and we changed it. Six months wasn't enough time for many of the students to prepare for high school equivalency exams and they made us realize that we shouldn't be a substitute for the public education system. Now we have developed two tracks—one for those who want to prepare for the exam as well as for their job training and one for those who want academic instruction only as it relates to job skills."

Trainees previously underwent six weeks of full-time study in mathematics, language skills, and business fundamentals. Then they received on-the-job training for six months with two hours off daily for tutorial help. Under the new structure, JOB participants get four weeks of full-time remedial education. Then they move into a five-month period of alternate weeks on the job and in the classroom. Students are paired so that when one is on the job, the other is in the classroom. As a result, each student gets 350 hours of job training and 350 hours of remedial education.

Since 1964, the bank has also tried to encourage potential dropouts to stay in school through its Business Experience Training (BET) program which provides part-time jobs, training and bank orientation for high school seniors from high dropout areas. They get on-the-job training five days a week after school and are eligible for full-time positions upon graduation. Nearly 80 per cent of the BET participants have stayed with the bank after graduation.

COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Employee training programs are only one part of the picture in upgrading employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. Just as businesses need people to operate, cities need economically healthy neighborhoods to survive. The infusion of new business and new ideas is vital to stemming the tide of decay. For these reasons, Chase as a matter of policy has made an intensive effort to increase its loans to minority businessmen and to promote economically viable ventures in disadvantaged areas.

There are a lot of reasons why banks like Chase Manhattan must continue to make high-risk loans, the most basic being that banks are tied to the economy of the areas in which they operate. If the area does well, the banks do well.

Chase executive vice president, Thomas W. McMahon, Jr., chairman of the Urban Affairs committee of the American Bankers Association, recently announced the ABA's goal of $1 billion in minority entrepreneurial loans. In 50 urban areas, commercial banks including Chase Manhattan will strive to meet this goal for minority business by 1975. Managerial assistance in operations, accounting, marketing, and other areas will be offered by participating banks.

Experience has taught the bank that it is not enough to set a man up in business in this highly competitive environment if you don't help him obtain the assistance and knowledge to be successful in it. The learning process in high risk business development has been a challenging one for both the lender and the businessman.

"It would have been easier for the bank to continue to make high-risk loans only through a headquarters program," says Lawrence J. Toal, Chase vice president and director of the Community Economic Development program. "But, by working through the branches, it will be possible to reach many more people who have the potential to contribute to the economic betterment of the city. Our hope for the future is that many more loans can be made in New York City to people who for too many reasons and too many years have been excluded from the mainstream of economic growth."

As one Chase lending officer says, "It takes a lot more time to make a small business loan to a new entrepreneur than it does to make a loan of several million dollars to a major corporation. Many lenders have been scared off by this time cost, and probably all have had to deal with the problem of loan officers who may have considered a corporate loan more valuable to their career record than a lot of time spent on a small business loan.

"There sometimes seems no end to the difficulties in getting a small business started, particularly in ghetto or fringe neighborhoods. Even when you get an experienced businessman who understands pricing, marketing, quality control and all the other complex problems of running a small shop, he can still be wiped out overnight by a robbery. We know of one case where a shopowner was robbed six times in eight months. It's not easy to get insurance in a neighborhood with that high an incidence rate."

Until recently, most of Chase's entrepreneurial development loans were made through regular outlets such as its headquarters installment credit division, branches and its small business investment subsidiary, The Chase Manhattan Capital Corporation.

To strengthen its effort, the bank established the CED program to coordinate all high-risk lending and ensure managerial assistance to developing businesses.

Loans under this program are available for sound business proposals which cannot get funding through traditional lending channels because of inadequate capital or unproven managerial experience.

Responsibility for each loan is spread among a Community Economic Development officer, a Chase credit analyst and the branch lending person. Each coordinates with the other to make sure the entrepreneur is developing according to his projected rate.

"Managerial assistance is probably the most important factor in the Community Economic Development Program," says Mr. Toal. "Experience has taught us that loans don't go bad when the proper kind of assistance is provided. And, this means we spend a lot of time finding the right person for the job, be it an accountant, a quality-control expert or an industry specialist."

Since its inception, the Community Economic Development Program has made 134 loans totalling $3.5 million, the majority of them in retail, service and light manufacturing operations.

Loan proposals now come not only from Chase lending officers, but also from organizations such as the Small Business Administration, the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, Coalition Venture Corporation, Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration and Development Corporation and Capital Formation.

Through its small business subsidiary, The Chase Manhattan Capital Corporation, the bank has established a program to increase the number of meaningful opportunities for veterans in developing small businesses. The Entrepreneurial Development Program, begun in February, 1970, with a small group combines expert bank counseling with classroom instruction and guarantees financing upon successful completion of the program. Each veteran has a senior and junior bank counselor to offer advice. Weekly three-hour classes are conducted in the evening by the Workshop for Business Opportunities at the Harlem YWCA. At the end of the training period, the veteran qualifies for a $25,000 loan from Chase Capital to start his business.

The Chase Manhattan Capital Corporation is one of the largest lenders to minority entrepreneurs among small business investment companies in the United States. This spring, CMCC announced the purchase of the $1 million-plus Watts Manufacturing Company, which was born in the aftermath of riots in the Watts section of Los Angeles in 1965. Under the purhase plan, 80% of the company's stock will be placed by CMCC in a trust fund for purchase by Watts employees. By 1977, the Watts Manufacturing Company will be the largest minority employee-owned and managed manufacturing enterprise in the United States.

HOUSING

The shortage of adequate housing facilities has reached crisis proportions in New York City. There is no indication that the demands of the future can be easily met.

It has become increasingly apparent that business can build good housing more cheaply and faster than government and is beginning to do so under the "turnkey" concept. Turnkey refers to housing financed and built by private developers and sold upon completion to the city government.

The Chase Manhattan Bank in the past year has financed a joint venture of the Celanese Corporation and American Standard, Inc. to develop five turnkey projects under Construction for Progress. The first was a 66-unit project built in Harlem in seven months, a construction time far below that of public

developers. Four others in the South Bronx are now planned.

At present, Chase has made loans or has commitments outstanding for rehabilitation and renewal efforts in the city amounting to nearly $80 million. The bank's Real Estate and Mortgage Loan Department has also joined with other financial institutions to provide $100 million in mortgage funds for the rehabilitation and renewal of the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn.

In addition, the bank's senior management is closely involved in the efforts of such groups as the National Corporation for Housing Partnership and the National Urban Coalition Housing Task Force which are developing more efficient and effective means of housing production.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVITIES

Government and business are by no means alone in working to solve the problems of the cities. Some of the most important contributions to neighborhood betterment in New York are coming from the people who live there. Grass roots organizations are tackling some of the most sensitive and difficult-to-solve urban problems.

The Chase Manhattan Bank Foundation makes annual grants totalling one and a half million dollars to organizations contributing to the well-being of the various communities served by the bank.

Most of the recipients of these grants have traditionally been well-established organizations in the social welfare, education and cultural fields. To increase its impact, however, the Foundation has established a Special Fund for Grants to Neighborhood Projects to provide grants of up to $1,000 to community organizations, especially smaller ones, many of which do not have the means or experience to seek support through normal foundation channels.

One such grant to Jobs for Youth, Inc. helps this small community organization in the Yorkville section of Manhattan offer job counseling, training and placement service to young people including a significant number of juvenile offenders referred by corrections authorities. Another grant supports a day care center. The Highbridge Conservation Program in the West Bronx has used its grant to help reverse the tide of neighborhood decay. An upper Park Avenue Community Association grant was used to develop a basic skills program for East Harlem residents.

Through its regular donations to nonprofit groups, the bank function has become involved in such areas as addiction control, civil rights, cancer research, consumer education, environmental control and conservation.

Financial aid to community projects is often coupled with "people aid" through the Chase Volunteers for Community Action program. CVCA was established to encourage staff members to become involved in the urban crisis and acts as a clearing house for matching volunteers with organizations. Nearly 200 staff member volunteers have spent hours in the evening and on weekends tutoring, organizing sports activities and providing general assistance. In good weather, they sponsor field trips for young people to points of interest in and around New York City.

Chase Manhattan also sponsors a Summer-Interns-In-Public-Service program to give college juniors and seniors an opportunity to learn more about the urban problems of New York City and contribute to their solutions. Twelve students from colleges across the country are selected to work for ten weeks with private and public urban action projects in New York. The students receive weekly salaries of $125.

"All of these programs indicate an increased commitment by the bank toward social progress," says Chase urban affairs officer John B. Davies, Jr. "The field of corporate responsibility is still very young, however, and it will be many years before we fully understand how to solve our urban problems.

SOME CONCERNS ABOUT NATIONAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. IRA C. EAKER

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there was recently brought to my attention an excellent address delivered by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, U.S. Air Force, retired, at the Air War College on June 5.

General Eaker, who has a brilliant military record, was commanding general of all U.S. Army Air Forces in the United Kingdom in 1943, and in January 1944, was made Air Commander in Chief of the Mediterranean Allied Forces. Two years before his retirement in 1947, General Eaker was deputy commander of the Army Air Forces and Chief of the Air Staff. General Eaker, addressing the Air War College graduating class, delivered a thought-provoking speech on national security that I believe deserves the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that General Eaker's address be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

SOME CONCERNS ABOUT NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Ira C. Eaker at Air War College, June 5, 1970)

General Clark, General Blank, Members of The Air War College Graduating Class, Ladies and Gentlemen.

No one here knows what I shall say today and none is responsible in any way for any of my comments. I alone bear the responsibility. This statement, like the warning on the cigarette package, is for your protection and continued good health.

There are two reasons for my presence here this morning. The first is illustrated by a war-time story I heard General Eisenhower tell in the summer of 1944, shortly after his forces crossed the English Channel to free Europe from the Nazis. He went on the night before D-Day to visit the 82nd Airborne Division, a few hours prior to the time it was to parachute behind the German lines. There he saw a little fellow who was obviously very frightened. The boy was probably only 16 years old. He had mis-stated his age by at least two years in order to be in the service at all. The General, in an effort to reassure the boy, engaged him in conversation. He said, "Son, do you like to fly in airplanes?" The boy said, "No, Sir, I hate it." He then asked, "Do you like to jump in parachutes?" The boy said, "No, Sir, it frightens me to death." General Eisenhower then said, "Well, paratroop units are voluntary organizations, why then are you in an airborne division?" The boy said, "Sir, I guess I just like to be with people who fly in airplanes and jump in parachutes."

Paraphrasing the frightened little paratrooper, I like to be with military people and especially professional leaders long dedicated to the security of our country.

The second reason for my being here is because my major interest and concern for fifty three years, since entering the military service in May 1917, has been the national security. I believe our country is in greater danger today than at any time in its history. Despite the fact that it is faced with the most powerful enemy it has ever had, it is now, incredibly, engaged in disarming. Our people appear unaware of their peril and there is an alarming paralysis of leadership. We have no Churchill or Lincoln with the vision and courage to warn and unite our citizens to the effort required for survival.

It is my hope that by sharing my concerns I can enlist, if not your support in remedial action, at least your thoughtful consideration of some of our problems with possible solutions.

My remarks will fall into three subdivisions, a brief look at the Vietnam War, my analysis of President Nixon's defense policy and some suggestions on what we in the military service could and should do to awaken our people to their peril.

I

It would never occur to me, in speaking to a War College class, not to discuss a war in progress, especially one of the magnitude of the Vietnam War. It is now the longest war in our history; more than six million Americans have been engaged; 50,000 have died and 200,000 have been wounded, and it has cost us more than $100 billion.

I have sometimes summarized the Vietnam War by saying that if we had fought World War II like we have Vietnam, Hitler would control all of Europe today and Japan all of Eastern and Southeastern Asia and the Pacific west of Honolulu.

When a nation with the resources of the U.S. fails to accomplish a military mission against a nation the size of North Vietnam, it must be obvious to the most myopic that there have been errors in strategy or tactics or both.

The first and fundamental error of course was to fight an undeclared war and the failure of our leadership to marshal our resources and obtain popular support, as in our earlier wars (except Korea where we failed to win anything but truce and stalemate).

The next decisive error, made by our political leadership, was to engage in a massive land war where every advantage lay with the enemy and the failure properly to employ naval and air power. This, combined with the creation of sanctuaries for the enemy, and placing unreasonable restrictions on our forces has made victory impossible.

Another major concern about the Vietnam War is the widely held contention that air power has failed in Vietnam. I see or hear almost every day some commentator's statement that "of course air power is ineffective in a guerrilla war."

As a matter of fact it has been clearly demonstrated in Vietnam that air power alone has the quick response and the detection capability to deal effectively with guerrillas. When guerrillas cannot, even in the densest jungle, light a fire to cook their rice and boil their tea without being detected and suffering a rain of bombs, it should be obvious that it was not air power which failed in Vietnam but the fact that it has been employed improperly.

This degradation of air power in this war must not be allowed to prevail for this will adversely affect force structure and weapons procurement in the future. I do not need to labor this point with this audience, since many of you have served in Vietnam and all of you know why we have not long since ended that conflict. But I do suggest that all of us must make a much greater effort to inform our people and convince our leadership of these facts. Otherwise our future security is in certain jeopardy.

II

My next major concern about national security lies in the loss of the deterrent credibility of our strategic posture.

I was deeply concerned during the eight years when McNamara was Secretary of Defense, in his unilateral disarmament program, based naively upon the conviction that the USSR would be happy to follow suit. I

thought when it was initiated that it was unsafe and unwise and subsequent events have completely verified this estimate.

At the time of the Cuban missile crisis our strategic superiority was four or five to one. The Kremlin had no alternative but to comply with President Kennedy's ultimatum.

The Politburo learned that lesson well, threw Khrushchev out, and began at once an all-out effort to gain strategic superiority. This they have now achieved. Secretary of Defense Laird recently told a Congressional Committee that Russia's nuclear delivery capability was at least twice that of the U.S. in megatonnage. It is long since evident that the Kremlin is not satisfied with strategic parity, since they continue to improve their strategic posture at forced draft.

In this situation the critical question is: What will the President, our Commander-in-Chief do? Is he aware of the loss of our strategic superiority and what will he do about it? When he was a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Nixon's campaign speeches expressed grave concern about Russia's growing strategic strength coincident with our unilateral disarmament. It has surprised me therefore that the process of U.S. disarmament has accelerated under the first two Nixon budgets.

This is my present analysis of the Nixon defense policy:

He will go to the country this Fall, in an effort to elect a Republican Congress, by reminding our people that he expressed the hope that we are leaving a period of confrontation with the Reds and moving into a period of negotiation. Since he became President, therefore, he has reduced our defense budgets by more than $10 billion and has not deployed a single offensive strategic weapon, relying upon SALT to provide for our continued security through negotiation. In the meantime, Mr. Nixon will continue to wind down the Vietnam War, reducing by more than half the extent and cost of that conflict and reducing our armed forces by about one million men, military and civilian.

Whether this plan will be politically effective, resulting in Republican control of Congress, I cannot say, not being a politician or political commentator. But I am certain, having spent fifty years as a Red watcher, that it will not favorably influence Kremlin policy. The USSR will never agree to return to strategic inferiority or parity at Vienna or anywhere else. There is no evidence that they have abandoned their plans for world domination and they know that parity is not the route to success in that area.

Instead of the period of negotiation, for which the President hopes, we shall, I believe, have a period of Red nuclear blackmail. Taking advantage of their strategic superiority, the Reds will begin to show their muscle and make hostile demands. Already since achieving superiority they have become much more aggressive. Their air and sea bases in North Africa, their missiles and fighters in Egypt, their growing naval thrusts into the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Ocean provide unmistakeable evidence of this.

On May 20th last their missile ships returned to Cuban waters and U.S. intelligence reports that Russian bombers are now using Cuban bases.

Faced then with positive evidence of Red truculence and blackmail, President Nixon will go to the American people in his own reelection bid in 1972 reminding our people and all the world that he bent over backward in an effort to support SALT. He even continued our own strategic disarmament for two years despite certain evidences of the Red strategic arms build-up. Since this effort failed, he proposes to begin at once to restore the strategic imbalance. He can point out that since we have twice the economic resources of the USSR we can and will do this without further delay. Such a campaign promise will be very effective as our people will by then have ample warning of the hazard in strategic inferiority, the loss of the credibility of our deterrent posture.

There is a danger in the Nixon defense strategy as I have outlined it. The Reds may not permit our rearmament. Over the Hot Line from Moscow could come this ultimatum: "As you know, Mr. President, we now have your land-based ICBM's well covered with our SS9's. Your own Secretary of Defense has told your Congress that we can destroy 95% of your ICBM capability in a surprise first strike. The only thing we now have to fear is your Polaris and Poseidon nuclear submarines. We now order you to send these vessels into the Black Sea where we can be sure they are disarmed. You will be wise to comply, since each of your subs at sea is now tailed by two of our killer subs which can destroy your ships at will."

In such a circumstance, when the USSR has about the same strategic superiority, four to one, which we enjoyed at the time of the Cuban missile crisis, the President will have no alternative but to comply with the Red ultimatum as Khrushchev responded in 1961.

What can be done to avoid such a tragic surrender?

First, at least half of our bomber force must be on airborne alert at all times. This bomber force must be modernized by the early development of the B–1 including its decoys and missiles.

Next, the Minuteman III and MIRV program must be pushed at maximum effort.

Then these more long-ranged steps must be taken, but initiated now:

The AWACS (Air Borne Warning and Control) system must be expedited.

We must make our land-based ICM's mobile, putting them on trucks as the USSR is now doing.

The Navy's recommendation for faster, quieter submarines must be approved.

In the meantime the ABM deployment must be expedited. It is obvious that such a system improves the credibility of our deterrent posture. The Reds believe in ABM effectiveness. They continue to develop and deploy such a system.

High on our priority list must be the rehabilitation of our Air Defense Command, including the earliest possible deployment of an interceptor like the F–12, capable in performance and in numbers of dealing with the Red bomber force. For the first time it now exceeds our own bomber capability. They now have two or three hundred heavy bombers capable of reaching any U.S. target and 700 medium bombers which can reach any U.S. target with air refuelling and they have such refuelling capability. The USSR also is now flight-testing a supersonic bomber like our proposed B–1.

Our own bomber force, as all of you know, numbers 450 B–52's now 20 years old plus 150 F–111's, medium ranged bombers which are grounded.

One of the most effective measures to restore the credibility of our ICBM deterrence would be to devise a system for automatic launch, sometimes called launch on warning. If an enemy knew that when his ABM's were launched it would trigger the release of our own and that the SS9's would hit empty silos, there would be little prospect that even a mad man like Hitler would try a pre-emptive attack.

All the evidence suggests that the USSR is marking an extensive effort in space weapon capability. To their FOBS capability has lately been added the launch of a space weapon capable of destroying our reconnaissance satellites. Without our spy satellites our warning vanishes and our deterrent capability entirely disappears. We then become the "helpless, blind giant," recently referred to by President Nixon.

The U.S. must develop a space capability to overhaul, inspect, and, if need be, destroy any enemy space weapon or satellite.

Perhaps our greatest present deficit vis-a-vis the USSR is in research and development. The U.S. program in R&D has become less and less, year by year and it is now considerably inferior, by any measurement, to that of the USSR. This assures the dismal prospect that in the years ahead the Reds will have strategic weapons of superior quality. Herein probably lies our greatest future danger.

With budgets at present levels, each of the armed services must review their weapons needs and establish priorities. These priorities must be coordinated at the JCS and DOD levels to insure that they mesh, are reciprocal and eventually will cover the whole security spectrum without duplication.

III

I am aware, of course, as you probably are, that few if any of these courses of action I have suggested as necessary to regain and retain the credibility of our deterrent strategic posture can be taken in the present political climate in this country.

We are now tragically and incredibly, for the first time in our history, witnessing large-scale treason. A traitor traditionally is one who knowingly gives aid and comfort to the enemy. A considerable number of our citizens, some in high places, have been engaged in treasonable acts and statements for some time. They hide behind the legal fiction that we are engaged in an undeclared war and there is therefore no official enemy.

I believe that when some historian of the future does the job on us which Gibbon did on Rome he will find that the first certain evidence of our decline was our tolerance of treason.

Another popular and political manifestation inimical to the national security is the attack on the military establishment and its people. The left-wing spate of invective and antipathy against the so-called Military-Industrial Complex and the demand of many college presidents, faculty members and campus revolutionaries that ROTC be eliminated are two other very dangerous manifestations of this condition.

The determination of pacifist groups and Congressional doves to reduce defense appriations and deny needed new weapons systems is but further evidence of the dangerous political and popular climate in which we live today. While some of this is, of course, Communist inspired and agitated by the traitors I mentioned earlier, many patriotic citizens simply do not believe that the Reds represent a menace to our present and future security.

In earlier times since World War II, whenever our defenses were at low level and military appropriations were reduced dangerously, the men in the Kremlin always came to our rescue. They invariably made some offensive gesture or took some definite hostile action to warn our people and our leaders of their hazard. Greece, the blockade of Berlin, Korea, the Cuban missile crisis and the invasion of South Vietnam fall in this category.

Some observers feel the present Soviet leaders are too smart to make that mistake now. I do not agree. I think they are showing more truculence, more muscle and less evidence of a desire for peaceful co-existence and accord than at any previous time. Their expanding fleets in the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Oceans, their missile ships sailing into the Caribbean, their bombers in Cuba and their missiles and fighters in Egypt, give ample evidence of aggressive designs.

The new factor in this warning process is that Russian aggression no longer worries U.S. leaders or disturbs the American people. Those who urge us to continue unilateral disarmament really do not believe the Reds represent a threat to the U.S. or to Free World security.

Now we come to the crux of the matter. What can we who realize our hazards do to awaken our people to their peril?

Military men have a dual responsibility. They must, of course, maintain the highest professional competence. They must at all times be prepared to execute any mission directed by the Commander-in-Chief despite any private opinion or personal hazard.

In addition they must exercise maximum influence to acquaint their fellow citizens with all pertinent facts concerning the strategy, tactics and weapons essential to that security. It is in this area I think we of the military have been most remiss in recent years. I credit McNamara's extraordinary effort to muzzle the military with much of the silence and detachment of men in uniform during the last few years. But McNamara is gone, fortuitously, and leaders of greater wisdom and sounder judgment have replaced him. Military men can regain their citizenship.

In earlier times when we had only a few thousand military officers we made a much greater effort and were much more successful in communicating with our people on all aspects of national security. If we do not return to this effort, achieve greater success and obtain more support and resources for the defense mission we shall not have the weapons, the forces, the budget and the popular support requisite to a safe defense posture.

I am doing all that I can in this area, more than at any time in my life, since the need is now infinitely greater, and I exhort each of you wherever you are and in whatever way you can to inform and influence our people about what must be their number one concern, the credibility of our defense posture, the security of our country.

I regret that I have not delivered a more cheerful message today. But these are not happy days. They are dangerous times. They call for extraordinary concern and involvement by all patriotic citizens and demand the careful selection of courageous leaders.

The Air Force is not the only military element in our defense system, of course. The land and sea approaches must be protected as well as the air and space frontiers. But there can be no credible deterrent defense posture without an effective aerospace force. For that reason I shall be hoping and praying for your complete success in your future professional careers. As you its future leaders go, so goes the Air Force. As the Air Force goes, so goes the national security.

SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE: WHAT MAKES HIM RUN?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an interesting article about the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) appeared in the June 19 issue of Science magazine. As one who has had the privilege of serving with him on the Joint Economic Committee, I believe the author correctly points out the very important role Senator PROXMIRE has had in revealing the gigantic waste of the taxpayers' money which has been characteristic of many of our defense programs.

In order that other Senators will have an opportunity to read this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE: WHAT MAKES HIM RUN?

(By William Connelly)

(NOTE.—William Connelly is the Washington correspondent for the Winston-Salem, N.C., Journal and Sentinel.)

Senator William Proxmire, one of the Pentagon's most persistent critics, leads the kind of disciplined life that a military man might admire. He awakens each morning at 6:30, performs a half-hour of calisthenics, eats a breakfast of juice, whole wheat toast, and skimmed milk, and then runs the full 5 miles from his home in Washington's Cleveland Park to Capitol Hill.

"Remember, now. He doesn't jog He runs," cautions a friend. "The distinction is important to him." Consistency is also important to him. The running and exercise are always observed, even if he has an early morning appointment or if he is in another city. At age 54, the senior senator from Wisconsin is lean, muscular, and youthful from this regimen.

His workday is as disciplined and programmed as the chaotic nature of Senate life will allow. But no matter how busy the schedule, he refuses to miss a roll call vote on the Senate floor. He has not missed one since 1966, probably a record in the modern era of year-round sessions.

Proxmire's office also has a spartan, military character. No paintings or pictures grace the walls. The furnishings are plain and functional—a stark contrast to the carpeted elegance in which most of his colleagues like to work. Even the staff meets high disciplinary standards: an employee who is tardy on too many mornings loses part of his vacation.

Despite this well-ordered style of life, Proxmire is not dour, stuffy, or unpleasant. He is as amiable and well liked as anyone in the Senate. But it is easy to understand why, many years ago, his classmates at the Hill School in Pottstown, Pennsylvania, voted him the "Biggest Grind."

In many ways he has become the biggest grind in the Senate during the past 13 years—a grinding critic of wasteful spending, a scourge of the Pentagon, a tormentor of sacred cows (except those that produce milk in Wisconsin), and an advocate of strict senatorial ethics. He manages to combine all these roles with a consistent social liberalism, a demonstrated concern for the poor, the black, and the young.

Proxmire has emerged in the past 2 years as an important figure in the growing public debate over national priorities. As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, an advisory and investigative body, he has searched for waste in the federal budget and has criticized many of the choices this country has made in its public spending. He has also contributed to the dialog by holding unique hearings—in July 1969 and again this month—at which national leaders from many fields are invited to say what they think the nation's goals should be.

Proxmire's committee assignments do not give him much direct leverage in scientific or environmental affairs, but he sometimes plays a useful provocative role with respect to such matters. In April, for example, Proxmire was the first witness to appear at subcommittee hearings chaired by Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine on legislation to curb water pollution. He proposed a system of "effluent charges" which would require firms to pay in proportion to the strength and quantity of the wastes they discharge into rivers and streams.

QUESTIONS SST

Although the effluent charge concept is neither new nor proven, Proxmire was pushing the subcommittee to consider an idea that has not received the careful consideration it deserves. He had first become interested in the idea through the testimony of a resource economist before his Joint Economic Committee. Recently, Proxmire threw cold water on the administration's supersonic transport project by holding hearings at which two administration officials—Russell E. Train, chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, and Gordon J. F. MacDonald, a member of the Council—acknowledged that the SST might be too noisy to operate and that this aircraft might produce major and possibly disastrous, environmental effects by susbtantially increasing the water vapor in the atmosphere.

Although Proxmire is not one of the more powerful senators, he is not without influence in asserting his views. He is in line to succeed John Sparkman, the 70-year-old Alabama Democrat, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, which deals not only with business and financial institutions but also with housing and urban assistance programs. He is also on the Appropriations Committee, where every seat is one of influence.

The scientific community has an obvious stake in the outcome of the debate over allocation of national resources. But some of its members have a more immediate interest in Proxmire's activities. He is now scrutinizing the $800 million that federal contractors in the defense and aerospace industries receive each year to pay overhead costs of independent research and development. The companies do not have to account specifically for how these funds are spent in bolstering their research capability. But if Proxmire has his way, these unrestricted payments will be eliminated almost entirely, and each R & D project will have to be contracted for a specific government purpose.

Proxmire's admirers see him as a free-wheeling critic and educator, a loner who makes a full-time job of sniffing out abuses, raising sensitive issues, and demanding that something be done about them. "Some senators concentrate on influencing their colleagues," says a friend. "He tries to get the word to the public and let the public influence his colleagues."

During his early Senate years, Proxmire's detractors said he talked too much on too many subjects and with too little authority. Some still make that complaint. But in recent years he has chosen his targets well, has hit his share of bull's-eyes, and is beginning to draw an audience.

Most recently, Proxmire has sought to impose some discipline on the Pentagon's weapons-procurement officers and on their friends in the giant defense industry. He has done much to make it socially and patriotically acceptable in Congress to question the $80 billion annual defense budget, which consumes almost half of each tax dollar.

As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee in 1969, Proxmire conducted hearings that the military-industrial complex will not soon forget. He revealed billion-dollar cost overruns on major weapons systems such as the C–5A cargo plane, the Minuteman missile, and the Navy's submarine rescue vehicle. Even worse, Proxmire showed that many new weapons are delivered late and do not work according to specifications—yet the contractors are not penalized.

Most important, perhaps, the Proxmire hearings shed light on the interlocking relationship between the Pentagon and the defense industry: some 2100 retired military officers now work for the 100 major defense contractors, and many Pentagon officials came to their jobs after working for these contractors.

Revelations such as these, combined with public disenchantment over the Vietnam war, have been largely responsible for the new congressional skepticism about military spending. Although the Pentagon budget is still wrapped in the flag, as far as most congressmen are concerned, it has been less sacrosanct since Proxmire and a few others, began producing evidence of waste.

In the Senate's clubby atmosphere, it sometimes takes a loner, a maverick, to step to the front on a sensitive issue like military spending. But Proxmire has always been willing to stick his neck out. He had been in the Senate less than 18 months when, in 1959, he took the floor to criticize the leadership methods of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, then the all-powerful majority leader.

He was one of the early critics of the space program, arguing that manned flights were too expensive unless undertaken jointly with other nations. He was among the first to oppose funds for the supersonic transport. He has even startled his colleagues by questioning the need for certain public works projects in their states. And he has argued that senators should be required to disclose their financial interests to the public.

THE LA FOLLETTE TRADITION

Such performances generally please the voters of Wisconsin, the state that during the first half of this century cherished the political independence, idealism, and aggressive liberalism of Robert M. La Follette and his Progressive Party. To some extent, Proxmire's record in the Senate is in the La Follette tradition. Certainly it is a marked contrast to the career of Proxmire's predecessor, Joseph R. McCarthy, who shocked the nation and discredited himself with his abrasive tactics in searching for Communists in government. Some of Proxmire's friends like to feel that he has, in a sense, redeemed the Senate seat by using the investigative process responsibly and effectively.

Proxmire's life has been characterized by a spirit of independence and persistence. He grew up in a conservative Republican family in Lake Forest, Illinois, a Chicago suburb, where his father, Dr. Theodore Proxmire, was a prominent physician. "My father was always a very tolerant man," the senator recalls. "But his window on the world was the Chicago Tribune editorial page . . . He just wasn't exposed to other views, as I have been."

After Bill Proxmire entered politics, his father was once quoted as saying, "I didn't raise my boy to be a Democrat. Harvard's where it happened." That was pretty accurate. Proxmire graduated from Yale in 1938 and from Harvard Business School in 1940, then followed a well-worn path to Wall Street, where he worked briefly for J. P. Morgan & Co. While stationed in Washington with Army Intelligence during World War II, he acquired an interest in politics. After the war, he returned to Harvard for a degree in public administration (1948), did some teaching, and became a registered Democrat.

"I began to notice," Proxmire recalled in an interview, "that on all the critical problems the Republicans found reasons not to act, while the Democrats worked at solving the problems. It made a tremendous impression on me."

Proxmire is candid about his reason for moving to Wisconsin. He was looking for political opportunity and had narrowed his prospects to New Mexico, California, and Wisconsin. Wisconsin seemed promising because its Democratic Party, always small and ineffective, was beginning to show new signs of life. For years, the Wisconsin Democrats had run a poor third to La Follett's Progressives and the Republicans. But when the La Follette party disbanded after World War II, the Democrats were presented a golden chance to rebuild. The party had much to offer a young man in a hurry.

As a foothold, Proxmire took a reporting job with the Madison *Capital Times*, a liberal Democratic newspaper. It was a short and unhappy association. Proxmire was fired within 7 months, after frequent arguments with his editor over what constituted objectivity. But by then he had enough contacts to land another job there with the *Union Labor News*, which proved a more appropriate outlet for his enthusiasm.

Soon Proxmire was deeply involved with the young, liberal forces, centered mainly at the University of Wisconsin, which were seeking to revive the Democratic Party. He won a seat in the legislature in 1950, after an exhausting campaign in which he claims to have visited every home in his district and to have mailed each family a handwritten letter. (To this day, he is known as a tireless campaigner who thrives on handshaking and personal contact.)

For this feat, he was given the Democratic nomination for governor in 1952. To no one's surprise, he lost. He tried again in 1954 and in 1956, coming closer each time but still losing. By every normal measure, his career was finished. Already he had become, like Harold Stassen, the brunt of jokes about perennial candidacy.

After this 1956 loss, Proxmire married Ellen Hodges, an officer of the state Democratic Party. (Both were divorced; both had two children.) He settled to a quiet life running a printing business. But when Senator McCarthy died on 2 May 1957, Proxmire's ambitions were revived. He was, after all, the best known and most experienced statewide Democratic candidate, and he could prepare quickly for the August special election, which would fill the Senate seat for the remaining 16 months of McCarthy's term.

He warmed up by defeating Congressman Clement Zablocki of Milwaukee in a primary. Then he was, as expected, a decided underdog in the special election against Governor Walter J. Kohler, who had beaten him in 1954 and 1956. *Time* magazine brushed Proxmire off as "a chronic candidate . . . classed in Wisconsin among the political sideshows."

But the scoffers were overlooking the progress that Proxmire and his party had made in the three previous races and in the passionate but losing presidential campaigns for Adlai Stevenson. Proxmire may, in fact, have turned the loser image to his favor. He told the voters, "My opponent doesn't know what it is to lose. I do. And I'll welcome the support of the voters who do too. I'll take the losers. I'll take the debtors. I'll take those who've lost in love, or baseball, or business. I'll take the Milwaukee Braves. The next senator from Wisconsin should be one who has known defeat."

To almost everyone's astonishment, Proxmire won.

He proceeded to a wild first year in Washington, during which his mind was constantly on the coming 1958 election. He almost set a record for speeches on the Senate floor (a reported 450 pages in the *Congressional Record*), conducted a one-man filibuster on the Chicago lake diversion bill, and proposed programs that would have added $23 billion a year to the federal budget.

Proxmire won his own 6-year term by a 57 percent vote in 1958. But those spending bills haunted him in the campaign. The Republicans called him "Billion-Buck Bill." President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon singled him out in campaign speeches as a big spender. "It was only after that experience," says a Wisconsin Republican, "that Proxmire became the watchdog of the Treasury."

If the talkative, aggressive Proxmire was taken lightly during his early days in the Senate, that is no longer the case. He has developed a reputation as a thorough, persistent legislator who does his homework.

If he is a maverick, he is a popular one. "He's so pleasant and accommodating," says one Senate friend, "that no one really dislikes him. . . . But he's so beautifully disciplined and programmed that sometimes we wonder what the real 'Prox' is like. He's the kind of guy you'd like to slip three or four drinks, just to see what would happen."

His reputation as a maverick may be overstated. The Democratic leadership, for example, is usually confident of getting Proxmire's vote on social legislation and on important party issues. "He votes on the low side for appropriations for a program," says one man, "but he always votes for the program. We consider him a liberal."

Yet there is a conservative streak in Proxmire that surfaces repeatedly. For one thing, his economic views are frequently those of a businessman. And he gets ample opportunity to assert them on the Banking and Currency Committee and on the Appropriations Committee. He also has made a valuable forum of the Joint Economic Committee, on which he rotates the chairmanship annually with Representative Wright Patman of Texas.

Certainly two presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, have called Proxmire a maverick. They found that neither friendship nor party loyalty would keep the Wisconsin senator in line.

Early in the New Frontier administration, when congressional Democrats were striving to help the new president, Proxmire exhibited his stubbornness. He filibustered for 19 hours in an unsuccessful attempt to block Kennedy's appointment of Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., a former oil company executive, to the Federal Power Commission. Then he blocked a key Kennedy farm program. But when the Milwaukee Democratic chairman complained, Proxmire retorted, "I was elected by the people of Wisconsin, not by the President."

Lyndon Johnson's first sting from Proxmire came on Washington's birthday, 1959, when the new senator from Wisconsin took the floor to deplore Majority Leader Johnson's domination of the Senate. To Johnson, this was rank ingratitude. Only a few months earlier, Johnson had bypassed older members to give Proxmire a seat on the Agriculture Committee, an ideal spot for a dairy-state senator. But to Proxmire, all that mattered was that more senators should have a hand in making party policy.

After the speech, there was a saying that on 23 February the Senate heard two addresses: Washington's Farewell Address (read annually) and Proxmire's Farewell Address. "Other senators called me and said 'Give it to 'im, Proxmire,'" he recalls. "But nobody would join me. . . ." Some say L.B.J. never forgot that speech. Proxmire insists, however, that it was not held against him. "President Johnson was a professional politician," he says. "He didn't bear that kind of grudge."

Some of Proxmire's closest friends in the Senate have also been known as maverick Democrats—Paul Douglas of Illinois, Wayne Morse of Oregon, and Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania. All three are gone now—Douglas was defeated in 1966, Morse and Clark in 1968—but Proxmire continues to operate in their tradition of outspokenness and independence.

He was especially close to Douglas, a respected professional economist, and has carried on much of Douglas' work. It was Douglas who initiated, a decade ago, the slow and unpopular inquiry into Pentagon spending. The administrative assistant who helped Douglas in the early effort, Howard Shuman, now works for Proxmire.

The year after Douglas' defeat, Proxmire picked up a truth-in-lending bill that Douglas had been pushing for 7 years, agreed to a few compromises, and got it through the Senate by a vote of 92 to 0. Proxmire also developed and put into the 1968 housing act some of Douglas' ideas for stimulating innovative housing experiments.

Proxmire and Douglas were allies in at least one historic floor fight. In July 1965, they began a filibuster that ultimately defeated Senator Everett Dirksen's proposal for a constitutional amendment to overturn the the Supreme Court's one-man-one-vote ruling on apportionment of state legislatures.

Now, with his disclosure of the Pentagon's financial excesses, Proxmire has made an important contribution to a growing campaign to reduce defense spending. The military budget still is hard to touch in Congress, as evidenced by the easy House passage last month of the huge procurement appropriation for fiscal year 1971. But this year, for the first time, there was an organized lobbying effort aimed at cutting this budget.

Proxmire points out that, since his committee's hearings and since the Senate debate on the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, both Congress and the Administration have been cutting the defense budget. The Pentagon got $77.9 billion in fiscal 1969, but its budget in fiscal 1971 will be about $71.2 billion. "I think we are creating an atmosphere now in which the budget can be cut," Proxmire says. "I think we are just beginning."

In his recently published book *Report from Wasteland,* Proxmire contends that the United States could cut $10 billion from annual defense spending without endangering national security. He deplores the arms race, which he feels is based on an exaggerated view of the Soviet Union's military and economic strength. And he advocates establishment of an independent civilian arms procurement agency to act as the military's purchasing office.

Proxmire also warns, as President Eisenhower did a decade ago, about the influence of the military industrial complex. "The complex has more tentacles than an octopus," he says in the book. "Its dimensions are almost infinite. It is a military-industrial-bureaucratic-trade association-labor union-intellectual-academic-service club-political complex whose pervasiveness touches nearly every citizen."

His battles with this creature should put Proxmire in good position for his reelection bid this year. By opposing Pentagon waste and favoring withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, he has staked out what appear to be generally popular positions in Wisconsin. Some Republicans believe, though, that a dramatic turn in the war—for good or ill—could make him vulnerable on the issue of support for President Nixon.

Proxmire's Republican opponent seems certain to be John Erickson, general manager of the Milwaukee Bucks basketball team and a former coach at the University of Wisconsin. Erickson, a moderate conservative, is a good speaker and is well known in the state. He received the endorsement of the state Republican convention recently but could still be challenged in a primary. (James Lovell, the astronaut, considered the race but then backed off.)

Unless the war and military spending develop as issues, the Republicans are expected to use much the same arguments they employed against Proxmire in 1964. They will question his effectiveness as a senator, particularly his ability—and willingness—to deliver from the pork barrel. They will charge that he talks economy but votes for big spending programs. But Proxmire is likely to be heavily favored. He prepares for campaigns as much as 4 years in advance, perhaps remembering the defeats of the 1950's. And he still can be expected to stump the state as energetically as he did 20 years ago. "What can you do," asks one exasperated Wisconsin Republican, "with a guy who talks like a Republican and votes like a Democrat? . . . That sort of thing just happens to be popular in this state."

Proxmire has not become one of the truly powerful men of Congress. He has never been a member of the Senate "club," nor has he been particularly respectful of its traditions. He has never been regarded as a likely candidate for national office, except for an occasional mention as a dark horse choice for vice president. But he has created a role all his own as an informed critic and educator, and time may prove that it was a powerful role after all.

RETURN OF GEORGE TODT AS A NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, after a 3-year layoff, George Todt is back as a newspaper columnist. For more than 15 years his column appeared in the Los Angeles area.

A native of Mesa, Ariz., whose heritage is of pioneer Western stock, Mr. Todt has been a rewarding independent voice for freedom and free enterprise and the American values.

Through the years, his column appeared often in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his "return" column published in the Conejo Valley Times of April 29, 1970.

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

"MASS MEDIA IMBALANCE"

"It is a condition that confronts us—not a theory."—Grover Cleveland—Annual Message, 1877.

It is sometimes remarked that the journalistic pen is mightier than the sword. After an interim of three years layoff, I have decided to commence writing my editorial column again. Before that it ran successfully for more than 15 years in Los Angeles.

Most of them were happy years in which I wrote my opinion in an honest and forthright manner under moderately conservative editors and publishers, with but one exception. Usually I was afforded the luxury of intellectual honesty, without pressure brought against me.

In writing an opinion based on moderately conservative views as honestly interpreted by this columnist, a large following expressed their friendly approval in letters to the newspapers involved. Circulation figures went up.

As I continued to bear down for many years on such icons of the ultra-liberals as the world government syndrome (one of whose top leaders is a certain California Senator), AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education, Secretary of Disarmament Robert S. McNamara, leftwing peaceniks and Communist subversives, et cetera—ultimately a strange thing happened: I disappeared. Period. Mighty intolerant, what?

What happened to George Todt's right to dissent with the Liberals in the newspaper? Or, simply stated, was Spiro Agnew right? I think so!

Without going into boring personalities, this columnist is one who has observed the intolerance of some of the liberal masters of the mass communications media at first hand. As one who believes, like Voltaire, in the right of others to differ in their honest opinions in America—meaning to dissent—I find this hard to take.

According to recent Gallup and Harris polls, the conservatives and those who consider themselves moderate conservatives number 70 per cent of the nation. They deserve appropriate representation in the mass media.

Yet the sad truth is that upwards of 90 per cent of the "opinion formers" in the media—columnists, commentators, editorial writers, reporters, et al—range from "moderate liberal" to "extreme radical".

Such proportions are decidely unfair to the American people. The American people are getting sand-bagged by the wicked arithmetic of the situation. The actual conservative majority of the public is made to believe they are an unpopular minority.

The radical liberals in the media have helped unleash the new, new leftist revolution on our people by conditioning us to believe the old standards of religion, morality and ethics no longer apply to our evolving modern generation.

They have deliberately lowered our aesthetic standards in order to confuse us so we cannot distinguish readily between good and evil any longer.

Today the mass media is busily engaged in concentration on some of the most degenerate garbage the world has ever suffered—and calls it news.

Sometimes I believe the revolution we have in our midst nowadays, so cunningly maneuvered by the scheming subversives, has been brought upon us by perhaps 200 radical "thinkers" and 5000 irresponsible television cameramen. We have been taken for a king-sized ride.

Certainly I believe now, as before, that there is a minority of Liberals in the Republic of the United States and they have a right to be heard. But not to the practical exclusion of the Conservative majority of the public. It has a right to dissent, too.

Today the great fault of the mass media lies in its imbalance. This is what Vice President Agnew was driving at in his recent blasts at those who have offended grossly in this area, particularly in the television networks.

The media is not the only offender against proper balance of American ideological composition. There is the matter of the United States Supreme Court, as an added example. At the moment we have one Moderate Conservative, eight Liberals seated.

Listen to the outraged screams of the Liberals in the Senate when the President of the United States has the temerity to suggest a second Conservative.

The radicals in our country have lost their sense of balance, belief in tolerance and the right of others besides themselves to dissent.

Time to pick up the sword of truth again, it says here.

A LABOR UNION AND A LARGE CORPORATION HELP BRIDGE THE RETIREMENT GAP

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the dream of retiring to a "promised land" where living is easy and the climate is mild after years of hard work is not new. Americans have nurtured this dream through their working years for generations. What is new today is that our increased mobility has enabled more and more retirees to make that dream a reality.

Unfortunately, when one pulls up stakes and moves away from lifelong ties the dream may be shattered by the unforeseen problems of settling in a new community. That cozy retirement village may not prove so ideal after all. Apartment rentals may be high, and food prices higher than anticipated. Those who move to another State to be near their children may find the new locality unfamiliar and unfriendly compared to the easy familiarity that comes from a lifetime spent in one place, building long friendships. The resulting loneliness can be unbearable—especially for those who have spent their entire work life with one firm.

For these retirees even staying in the same city can be much like pulling up stakes and moving away. After the gold

watch and the testimonial dinner most retirees lose contact with coworkers; the daily routine that was comfortable and rewarding is abruptly broken with no time to adjust to a new life style.

For all of these people some form of contact with the old firm could bridge the gap between work and retirement.

I recently came across two syndicated articles in the Record, a newspaper published in Hackensack, N.J. One was by Martin E. Segal and the other by Theodor Schuchat. They discuss how a labor union and a large corporation are recognizing the lifelong devotion of employees in very personal terms.

The United Auto Workers is developing a temporary retirement community in Florida for union members who wish to retire to that State. The retirees may rent mobile units in the community until they find permanent retirement homes. The union will also provide information and counseling about apartment rentals, home sites, and retirement communities.

Western Electric has had a "Pension Visitors" program since 1906 and the program has grown with the company until today 1,300 retirees are visited throughout the United States. The Pension Visitors do more than "friendly visiting." They also contact hospitals, nursing homes, and social security offices across the country, explaining Western Electric's retirement benefits, thus making it easier for retirees to take advantage of benefits, wherever they reside.

I feel this is an important trend—and one that should be encouraged.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNION IS HELPING FLORIDA RETIREES

(By Martin E. Segal)

Where to live in retirement is one of the most important questions older folks have to answer. Not only is it important to consider such matters as present housing, retirement budget, conveniences, friends and neighbors; it is also essential to take into account personal feelings.

Again and again it has been found that this matter of personality may be more important than plumbing, stairs, climate, or anything else in the decision to move or not to move. In some of the most pleasant retirement communities, there are people who moved and regretted what they had done. The new place just wasn't right for them, although others in the same community loved it.

For example, pulling up stakes and moving to a place with an ideal climate in search of a cozy retirement cottage can prove to be a very costly and harrowing experience. All too often, retired persons who blithely pull up stakes find upon arriving at their chosen destination that they have no place to go and nowhere to turn for help. And when confronted by the sometimes confusing claims of land developers, these retired homeseekers may make hasty and unwise investments or down payments. Some return home broke and very disillusioned after such discouraging journeys. Others stick it out because they don't want to admit failure to their family and friends.

FLORIDA VILLAGE

The United Auto Workers Union has conceived a plan which hopefully will spare their retired members much grief and expense. It recently created the UAW Retirees Village in Palatka, Fla. This centrally located village is designed to provide a place where retirees can stay temporarily at reasonable rates while they shop for permanent homes at various retirement sites in Florida.

According to Raymond Berndt, UAW regional director in Indiana and one of the original planners of UAW Retirees Village: "The main objective of this program is to help UAW retirees find permanent living quarters. The international union is ready to provide them with accurate information about legitimate real estate developers and steer them away from land speculators."

The village located on a 31-acre site adjacent to the St. Johns River is comprised of 80 new mobile homes. It also features a modern community center overlooking the river and a colorful marina with a 50-foot canal leading into the river. UAW retiree couples will be able to rent a mobile home unit for $100 per month including utilities. Tenancy will be limited to a maximum of two months in order for the village to accommodate the greatest number of retirees.

EVERYTHING PROVIDED

Each five-room mobile home unit contains a large double bedroom, complete bathroom, living room, dinette, and kitchen. The units come equipped with air conditioners and heaters. Also provided are all utensils necessary for light housekeeping, including electric toasters, coffee makers, dishes, cutlery, bed linens, and towels.

"UAW retirees renting these 12 by 50 foot mobile homes will enjoy most of the comforts of home," said Berndt. "All they have to bring with them is their luggage, groceries, fishing poles, and golf clubs."

The village community center will contain a recreation-lounge, storage room, and open porch with shuffleboard. It will also house a laundry room with automatic washers, dryers, and vending machines. A picnic area is located next to the center.

The design for the village itself calls for eight circular courts each containing 10 mobile homes with large patios and paved walks linking the units with nearby parking areas. The village will have its own sewage treatment plant and water supply pump.

According to a spokesman for the union, all UAW retirees will be eligible to rent the trailers on a first-come, first-serve basis.

THE FIRM KEEPS IN TOUCH

(By Theodor Schuchat)

You spend a big part of your life working for a company, working hard, giving the firm your skill, intelligence, ambition, and time. The company keeps its end of the bargain, with paychecks, benefits and a pension.

When you retire, what of the company? A monthly check comes, and perhaps magazines or a company newsletter. Contact with the company and its people on a personal basis usually ends, however, especially if the retiree moves away.

Except at Western Electric. In 1906, when the first 10 Western Electric employees retired on pension, company people visited them all. They still do. By the end of 1970, there will be nearly 14,700 Western Electric retirees, and most will be visited this year by a man from the company.

Western Electric's 12 pension visitors cover the country, each keeping in personal contact with about 1,300 retirees. Together, they visit each State except Alaska, calling on 90 per cent of the company's retirees each year.

The pension visitors take a personal interest in the retirees. Are they getting their pension checks on time and at the right address? Are they taking advantage of the company's medical, insurance and other employee benefits? How about Social Security and Medicare?

Howard Ring has been visiting Western Electric retirees since 1948, working out of the Hawthorne Works in Chicago at first. Since 1964, the pension visitors have been headquartered at regional benefit offices instead of local plants and offices.

"I've met many neighbors of Western Electric retirees who are surprised that a company would keep up an interest in someone who is no longer active," Ring comments. "By word of mouth, the visitation program is letting people know the company cares."

Howard covers Iowa, Missouri, and parts of Wisconsin and Illinois. He recently logged 2,300 miles in three weeks of visiting retirees, all in Illinois.

From Newark, N.J., Ernie Roberts visits retirees in southern New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

"Previously, each location had its own method of keeping in touch with its retirees," he explains. "Now pension visitors across the country have a uniform program. Our training is thorough and the program well defined."

One pension visitor, Jerry Vanatta, concentrates on 1,200 Western Electric retirees in Florida. From his home in Largo, he travels about 20,000 miles a year, calling on retirees. He also explains Western Electric's retirement benefits at hospitals, nursing homes, and Social Security offices.

"Western Electric is the only company I know of that tries to maintain personal contact with its retirees coast to coast," he says. "I'm proud to be a part of the program. I can't imagine work any more rewarding."

Western Electric's retirees find the visits rewarding too. After C. I. Armstrong visited a retiree in Arkansas, the company received a letter from the grateful senior.

"We feel that we have especially benefited from his visit inasmuch as when the Extraordinary Medical Expense benefit was fully explained we found that each year since retirement we were entitled to that benefit and so have already filled in the proper forms for the past two years," the retiree wrote.

"As we have a continuing medical and drug problem," he added, "words cannot express to you what this means to us and will mean in the future."

AID TO RUMANIAN FLOOD VICTIMS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, while Mrs. Nixon's gracious and generous visit to Peru has dramatized as no other act could the tragedy in Peru and our country's determination to help that beleaguered country, the less heralded but no less tragic floods in Rumania also deserve the attention of the American people. These long, catastrophic floods which have ravaged the nation since May 12, and which continue to produce substantial damage, will leave scars on the Rumanian countryside which will not be erased for many years.

Since the floods began, more than 2 million acres have been inundated with the resulting loss of vitally needed crops, homes, buildings, and other structures which lay in the path of the waters. More than 1 million acres remained under water as of last week; 70,000 homes had been destroyed or badly damaged; more than 80,000 people remained homeless; and approximately 170 persons were known dead in this tragic natural disaster. In addition, approximately 40,000 animals have perished; and 2,000 bridges and more than 2,000 miles of highways and roads have been damaged or destroyed. In all, the property damage is approaching $1 billion.

I am sure that all Americans were saddened by the losses of life and property which have been visited on the Rumanian people. President Nixon spoke for the nation when he stated that this Nation stands ready and willing to provide assistance to ease the suffering of the injured, bereaved and homeless, and to help restore the losses of property and productive capacity which have occurred.

The White House has announced that approximately $11 million in relief assistance will be made available to Rumania. In addition I have sent a list of much needed medical supplies to the American Pharmaceutical Association in the hopes that their memberships or other interested parties will be able to provide some assistance.

I am pleased that the demonstration of compassion and good will on the part of President Nixon follows other positive initiatives which have been taken in recent months to foster improved relations between this country and Rumania.

Earlier this year the administration moved to delist some 200 items which had been previously subject to export control restrictions when destined for Rumania. This move toward greater trade with Rumania is in line with the passage, late last year, of the Export Administration Act. That legislation signified an end to cold war trade policies and the beginning of a new era of mutually beneficial trade with the countries of Eastern Europe, where such trade does not adversely affect the national security or foreign policy interests of the United States.

I have been informed that the State Department is also endeavoring to promote private lending to Rumania and I commend the administration for such initiatives. We must demonstrate a zeal for self-improvement and which foster an attitude of mutual understanding with the nations of the world.

The time has also come to reexamine other policies governing trade with the Rumanians. I am hopeful that most favored nation treatment will be accorded Rumania shortly and that other inhibitions on mutually beneficial trade will be removed. I look forward to the day when Rumania and the United States will enjoy healthy trade relations as well as expanded cultural programs designed to develop improved understanding between the peoples of the two countries.

I hope that other governments will join in a common relief effort with the United States at this crucial time.

Finally, I salute the Rumanian people for their efforts to restore normality to their country. I am confident that with the aid of concerned friends in the world community they will meet with success.

TIME FOR ADMINISTRATION TO MEET UNEMPLOYMENT THREAT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I am releasing a letter to Secretary of Labor James D. Hodgson, asking him to come prepared on July 21 to recommend to the Joint Economic Committee a shelf of specific programs and proposals to relieve the unemployment situation.

Secretary Hodgson is scheduled to appear before the committee when it conducts its mid-year review of the economy.

Unemployment has been rising. The drop in the unemployment rate in June to 4.7 percent may well be only a temporary fluctuation. Secretary Hodgson himself had estimated that it could rise to 5.6 percent this year.

The better part of wisdom demands that we be prepared to act.

Equally important, the rate for Negroes rose from 8.0 to 8.7 percent, or more than double the 4.2 June unemployment rate for whites.

In my letter I said:

The Nation deserves to know what positive action will be taken both to halt the rise in unemployment and to put idle men to work during the period when unemployment is excessively high.

In addition to Secretary Hodgson's 5.6 percent estimate, other estimates, including those given by several eminent economists before the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee recently, range to 6 percent and above. Some of the other estimates follow:

I believe that when unemployment reaches the 5.5 percent level, the Federal government should have ready a series of programs and proposals which can stimulate employment in constructive endeavor for those who are able and willing and urgently desire to work. I was dismayed in recent hearings when representatives of the Administration testified, essentially, that no such shelf of programs was available. The fight to stop inflation must not be waged largely or exclusively through an increase in unemployment.

I am concerned with the absence of such a comprehensive program to provide for the useful and constructive employment of those who desire to work during periods of economic slack. I hope that you share this concern and that idle men and idle resources should be put to work in productive ways. Such action is not inflationary and it need not be costly.

It can be done, in my judgment, with the outlay of relatively small sums. The matching of those out of work in one area with the available jobs in another, is one long overdue step which could be taken now. Channeling federal purchases into areas of high unemployment is another. Where federal funds are needed, relatively small amounts can often stimualte much larger amounts from the private sector. For example, for less than $100 million or the cost of two C–5A airplanes, some 150,000 low income houses can be subsidized for a full year under the new low interest rate housing programs. That small sum would not only buy bricks and mortar and provide employment for the construction trades, but it would stimulate a wide number of other industries, such as furniture and appliances which are closely associated with housing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the letter I wrote to Secretary Hodgson be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 1, 1970.

Hon. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On July 21st you are scheduled to appear before the Joint Economic Committee when it conducts its mid-year review of the economy. The current high level of unemployment, together with the increasingly strong evidence that unemployment will go even higher, make this set of hearings and your participation in them especially important.

By your own recent estimate, unemployment is expected to reach 5.6 percent this year. Other estimates, including those given by several eminent economists before the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee recently, range to 6 percent and above.

I believe that when unemployment reaches the 5.5 percent level, the Federal Government should have ready a series of programs and proposals which can stimulate employment in constructive endeavor for those who are able and willing and urgently desire to work. I was dismayed in recent hearings when representatives of the Administration testified, essentially, that no such shelf of programs was available. The fight to stop inflation must not be waged largely or exclusively through an increase in unemployment.

I am concerned with the absence of such a comprehensive program to provide for the useful and constructive employment of those who desire to work during periods of economic slack. I hope that you share this concern and that idle men and idle resources should be put to work in productive ways. Such action is not inflationary and it need not be costly.

It can be done, in my judgment, with the outlay of relatively small sums. The matching of those out of work in one area with the available jobs in another, is one long overdue step which could be taken now. Channeling federal purchases into areas of high unemployment is another. Where federal funds are needed, relatively small amounts can often stimualte much larger amounts from the private sector. For example, for less than $100 million or the cost of two C–5A airplanes, some 150,000 low income houses can be subsidized for a full year under the new low interest rate housing programs. That small sum would not only buy bricks and mortar and provide employment for the construction trades, but it would stimulate a wide number of other industries, such as furniture and appliances which are closely associated with housing.

I am writing, therefore, to request that when you testify before the Joint Economic Committee you give us your detailed views on the specific steps which can be taken if unemployment continues to rise, and the specific steps the Administration intends to recommend to relieve high unemployment.

In this connection I would like to call to your attention the recommendation made by the Joint Economic Committee in its 1970 annual report that:

"If it has not already done so, the administration should prepare immediately a coordinated program of specific discretionary actions which could be taken quickly in the event that the magnitude of the current economic downturn exceeds present expectations. This coordinated program should include measures to quickly channel additional funds into low and moderate cost housing and State and local public facility construction."

Since unemployment has already exceeded the levels anticipated at the time of our annual hearings last February, and is still rising, great urgency now attaches to this recommendation.

The nation deserves to know what positive action will be taken both to halt the rise in

unemployment and to put idle men to work during the period when unemployment is excessively high.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS CONTAINED IN H.R. 17548

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am gratified that the independent offices appropriations bill (H.R. 17548) as reported by the Appropriations Committee recognizes the need for additional funds for medical care of our wounded Vietnam veterans.

The bill as reported by the committee provides $100 million more for such care than the House-passed version of H.R. 17548. I commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for their judgment in raising this appropriation.

As Senators are aware, the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has completed a 5-month study of conditions in our Nation's 166 Veterans' Administration hospitals. The subcommittee's report proves conclusively that for the past 5 years there has been a slow but steady erosion of VA health care for wounded veterans. This period is coincident with our combat presence in Vietnam.

We have asked so much of these men, and they have given so much. We cannot let them down.

In our list of priorities, we must put these brave young men first.

We cannot hesitate for a moment to provide all the funds necessary to give our wounded men the best health care our country can provide.

The additional $100 million contained in H.R. 17548, as reported by the committee, must be considered the very minimum additional appropriation over the House figure necessary to provide the health care our wounded veterans need and deserve.

I commend the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee (Mr. CRANSTON) for bringing the VA health care crisis to our attention. I also commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for their well considered response.

I urge the Senate conferees on this measure to hold fast to the additional $100 million. We cannot afford to let our brave young veterans down.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION DEVICE HELPS BOTH YOUTH AND ADDICT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in many metropolitan areas of our country, private individuals and organizations are trying to meet the challenges of drug abuse education and rehabilitation. These are dedicated men and women, some of them former addicts, who have devoted their time and talents to helping others out of their own valley of despair.

I have had opportunity to discuss some of these programs with their originators and administrators, to visit their facilities, and talk with some of the residents.

Mr. President, my visits have convinced me that, while there is no panacea, these privately organized facilities are making a contribution to drug abuse rehabilitation. It is a measure of my hope for their effectiveness that on April 15, 1969, I introduced S. 1816. This bill, titled the Drug Abuse Prevention and Rehabilitation Act, specifies that a substantial portion of Federal grant funds go to private organizations, and particularly to those developing and utilizing innovative methods of user rehabilitation.

One such center, located in Newark, N.J., is titled "DARE," meaning "Drug Addiction Rehabilitation Enterprise."

DARE, like other privately organized and responsibly administered groups, needs continued evaluation to help them achieve the effectiveness we would all like to see. They need and deserve our support. The problems of drug abuse and rehabilitation are so broad that the approach must necessarily be full-spectrum. We must consider all possibilities for rehabilitation at the same time increasing our educational efforts as the real long term solution. We must present facts and let our youth come to the hopefully obvious conclusions.

DARE, founded by Mr. Richard Roselli, recently has begun distribution of educational tools to combat drug experimentation and abuse. A recent addition to their educational aides is called "Dial AIDE For a Friend" wheel. This device is a slide wheel permitting one to dial a specific drug or narcotic. There then appears on the wheel the drug type, medical purpose, method of use, slang terms, identification, and signs of abuse. This educational tool can serve a very useful purpose, if distributed widely enough to educators, parents and our youth. I mention the wheel because it is an easily used device, requiring no reading of extended text. It requires no study and is worded in terms that are easily understood.

Mr. President, the scope of this problem is such that we must search for and encourage such programs. I urge my colleagues to continue their interest in private organizations in their own States and to consider favorably legislation that provides grants for their programs. They can become an evermore effective force in our total commitment to ridding our youth and our country of this scourge.

RURAL MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT BY TELEVISION

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I am proud to report on an Arizona project that brings hopes for better and faster medical and diagnostic care for people living in rural areas.

This project and its hopeful expansion in the future will mean improved health for our citizens in rural and isolated areas.

I ask unanimous consent that a report prepared by Mrs. Natalie Denney of Bisbee concerning the project be printed in the RECORD.

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

BISBEE, ARIZ.—An experiment in medical and diagnostic care for people living in rural areas of our country was carried out in Southern Arizona on April 4, and appears destined to have a tremendous impact of far-reaching significance.

With a portable medical laboratory and a van equipped with television equipment, Jack Reeves, director of Arizona Rural Effort programs in a five-county area of southern Arizona, undertook the experiment. Through it, patients were photographed on the cameras, necessary laboratory tests were run by B. L. Mart of Bisbee, Arizona, and, through telemetry and the television equipment, Dr. Ken Dregseth, Dr. David E. Glow of the nearby Sierra Vista Community Hospital were able to provide diagnoses and treatment for the patients.

Mrs. Lois Holland, Sierra Vista registered nurse, and Mrs. Margarite Hanley, Santa Cruz Public Health nurse, assisted with the project.

The project is an outgrowth of the dreams of Reeves, whose job is assistance for poverty groups in the rural areas. Reeves submitted the program to the federal government, and funding came through a special grant from the Research and Demonstration Division of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

A "van" was equipped with the necessary television and recording equipment, at a cost of about $35,000. The lab equipment which was used was the property of B. L. Mart, technician for the Warren Medical Laboratories in Bisbee, Arizona.

Reeves got the utmost cooperation from people in Bisbee and Sierra Vista, when he presented the plans to them, through which medical care can be taken to people in outlying areas where they find it difficult, if not impossible, to get into a community where doctors are available.

Realizing that about 60 per cent of the poverty families are in rural areas, and having other supporting statistics from John Segura, director of Cochise United Recovery Enterprise (the OEO community action agency in Cochise County, Arizona), Reeves wants to bring better health care to these people.

He envisions a future plan which could be brought to everyone in rural areas; those who cannot take the time to go into a city for care; those who have no transportation; and those who are "afraid" to go to the doctor in the city.

Reeves believes that symptoms of incipient illness can be detected by doctors, before the patient is aware of them himself; thus, avoiding possible hospitalization, or a need for emergency treatment.

The Saturday pilot experiment was most successful, Reeves said. The doctors who participated, apparently, felt that the program could be of great value to them, also, in that they can remain in their offices, and treat many, many people via television successfully, where office calls are more time consuming.

With the constantly rising costs of hospital care creating problems for people, everyone concerned in the project feels that this could be, at least, a partial answer and solution to many of the people.

Reeves and representatives of agencies who have heard about the experiment feel that the television medical care program might be used, also, in the performance of delicate operations, by doctors who could be in constant contact with specialists, via satellite, as they perform operations.

In fact, enthusiasm is running rampant about the television medical-diagnostic care for rural areas, and Reeves spends considerable time on the telephone these days, explaining and discussing the project with interested people throughout the U.S. Foreign countries are interested, and Indian peoples on reservations in the Southwest feel

that it is a made-to-order plan for their nations.

With the success of the experiment in Arizona, it would appear that the next step is for qualified agencies to step up and get the program working all over the country. Said Reeves, "Now, we have the technological knowledge, let's use it."

THE NEED FOR JUSTICE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of Senators a speech by Charles H. Silver, consultant to the mayor of New York, which describes the tragic plight of Iraqui Jews. Mr. Silver gives eloquent expression to the need for a sensitive awareness to the rights of all men.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Silver's thoughtful address, which he gave on February 1, 1970 at Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER REGARDING JEWISH POPULATION OF IRAQ, CONGREGATION KEHILATH JESHURUN, FEBRUARY 1, 1970

Sometimes the greatest horror is that there is no horror.

Perhaps because of the constant impact of surprise and violence in the world around us, we are becoming immune to shock.

Much of the last century has seen outrage of such enormity in other lands that we not only look back upon the nightmare of Hitler, but view such current human calamities as the slaughter of civilians in Saigon with a certain cool detachment.

That is why our gathering today does even more credit to its sponsors. The plight of the Jewish population in Iraq which has been hanging delicately on the balance for many decades now is hanging on a public gallows.

And I am particulary proud that one of your inspired leaders is an eminent member of the professional staff of Beth Israel Medical Center, our cherished friend, Dr. Heskel Haddad.

Standing in the shadow of that gallows is the terrified remnant of a community that numbered 150,000 less than twenty years ago. Today, there are only 2500 persecuted and tormented Jews left in Iraq.

After the war of 1948, the Jewish exodus began, and, by 1951, more than 98% had left their homes and everything they owned. Those who remained were required to carry yellow identity cards. By gradual oppressive steps, they have been deprived of the means to earn a living, stripped of their civil rights and denied the common liberties of any civilized land. Prominent Jewish citizens have been flung into jail without a trial or even a hearing. Many died, more are still being detained.

Jews have been dismissed from employment not only in public office, but in private firms as well. The young people are refused admission to colleges and universities. Jewish homes are not permitted to have telephones. Jews are not able to travel or to sell their property. When a new government seized power in 1968, these unbearable restrictions became but the prelude to outright terrorism and torture, to false accusations, mass arrests and public hangings.

There have been contrived incidents, secret trials, and life in Iraq for any Jew has turned into a nightmare from which there seems to be no escape, for they are not allowed to emigrate to other lands or to Israel.

A year ago, when 14 accused spies were hanged in Bagdad and Basra, nine of them were Jews, and other Jews have been executed since. The victims were charged with spying for the United States or for Israel, but the so-called "trials" were a farce and the hangman conducted a circus of savagery with military bands and entertainment in the public square, with radio and television urging people to come and view the dangling bodies.

And as the entire civilized world watched in disbelief, crowds numbering up to half-a-million gathered to shout and dance in a bloody carnival of race hatred.

Pope Paul joined world leaders in denouncing the barbaric display, which he said caused "dismay and disgust in the entire world." Indeed, the Holy Father stated the fact that nine of the executed men were of the Jewish Faith generates the suspicion that racism is the motive.

We are here because we have blood ties with the Jews of Iraq—and blood is thicker than water—even thousands of miles of ocean between us. And history will prove that the ties of blood are stronger than the greed for oil.

You don't need me to tell you what a sorry mess is being made of the whole mixed-up Middle Eastern foreign policy. Arms that have been ordered and paid for have been denied to the little state of Israel by the faithless French government while the overwhelming power of its menacing Arab neighbors is fortified by jet planes, tanks and guns of French and Communist origin.

This is a matter of tremendous impact upon the fate of humanity and the preservation of freedom. The death of one Jew in Iraq . . . the bombing of one kibutz in Israel . . . the persecution of the Jews of the Soviet Union . . . all are part of a general pattern that pushes peace farther into the remote future. It is not a question of who sells planes to Egypt or tanks to Arabia, or what percentage of those hanged in Bagdad are Jews. It is a question of how long civilized people will remain silent while the fear-makers and merchants of death destroy our last hope of security in a world without war.

Every human being should feel, as do those in this room, that we cannot be truly civilized while limitations are placed on any man's freedom in any area of the globe. Although I address myself—as do all of you by your presence today—particularly to the position of our own people, my remarks are equally pertinent to all minorities who are victims of repression, restraint or persecution. The Jew is not the only object of oppression and hatred. His is not the only cause for us to plead, and Iraq is not the only land where ethnic, racial and religious suppression is rife.

The lofty ethical and humane policies of true social justice which were the dominant concern of those who founded our Democracy have become dimmed with time. There seems to be a tarnish on the words "justice, equality and brotherhood." But it is still true, as it was in the time of Isaiah, that we must "undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free."

And while the immediate spark which touches off the flame of our outrage against the crimes committed on the gallows of Bagdad should spur us to contact our Senators and Congressmen, to write the White House, to organize every possible means of pressure against the government of Iraq, we must not end there.

As members of the American Jewish community, we must dedicate ourselves to the creation of a climate of increasing confidence and fellowship. In these days of momentous decision, we must appeal to the simple everyday men and women of every country to resolve their differences and to join together in building the better world we hope to achieve. Here in America we must dramatize the soul-stirring principles of democracy and bring them to life in the classroom—and keep them alive in the minds and hearts of our children.

We must rededicate ourselves to this task within our own borders, on the far-flung boundaries where our troops do battle, on the seething frontiers of Israel, in Moscow, in Warsaw, in Geneva, in Bagdad and wherever there is evil to be undone . . . and men and women of good will to undo it.

America will remain the Land of the Free only so long as it remains the Home of the Brave. We must be brave enough to say "So far you have gone—but no further" to the murderers in Iraq, the madman in Egypt and the tyrants in many other lands. We must share the price of liberty with those who are paying with their lives. We must stand by them always, eternally bound together in faith and freedom so that they will know they are not alone.

So that they will know we will fight for liberty beside them . . . for their cause is our cause.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the week of July 12 to 18 has been set aside for the official annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

Captive Nations Week gains significant recognition in 1970, because this year marks the 25th anniversary of the conclusion of World War II in Europe. I wish to commend the people of these nations for their display of self-determination and for demonstrating their dedication to freedom to those governments which limit or deny these rights to the people under their rule.

I express my deep concern for the unfortunate circumstances under which the people of these nations live and hope for the ultimate triumph of justice, even though they have been deprived of their sovereignty and independence at this time.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we continue to wait for some sign that North Vietnam's intransigence toward prisoners of war will end; that North Vietnam will begin to abide by the Geneva Convention; that a complete list of captives will be made public; that mail will be delivered. Autumn to winter, winter into spring, spring into summer, summer into fall we wait; and we pray for the safekeeping of our men.

NEW ENGLAND'S FUEL OIL NEEDS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to support and commend the work of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) for his efforts in insuring adequate funding for further study of New England's fuel oil needs by the Office of Emergency Preparedness. The committee, in its report on H.R. 17548, has included a special $600,000 appropriation to provide the resources needed to monitor the supply and price changes resulting from the June 17th proclamation providing 40,000 barrels a day of No. 2 fuel oil for New England. This is in keeping with President Nixon's assurances that a constant review will be made of New England's fuel oil needs.

President Nixon's recognition of our region's special fuel oil hardship is a commendable first step. I hope that it will evolve into a major program whereby our region will be given adequate relief from high prices and short supplies of home heating oil.

The appropriation of $600,000 is an essential step toward the goal of fair treatment for New England. It will provide the resources for careful and constant study of the needs of our region, and it will allow the compiling of facts and figures to establish precisely the extent of those needs.

Therefore, I again commend the fine efforts of Senator PASTORE, who has worked long and hard with other Senators from New England on this matter, for his work in achieving the necessary money to carry out further reform.

OIL POLLUTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in recent months there has been a surge of interest in a new human right: The right to a clean environment. Although this new right has not yet been included in the constitutions of any nations, it is becoming increasingly accepted as more nations recognize the threat which environmental pollution poses to their citizens. One of the most serious forms of pollution is that caused by oil leaks and spills. Recently President Nixon submitted two treaties to the Senate which are aimed at curbing one of the most dangerous and visible forms of pollution—oil spills on the high seas. One convention would, if ratified, empower the United States by international agreement to take preventive action against vessels on the high seas which threaten imminent pollution danger to American coasts. Nixon told the Senate in a message:

> Had this treaty been in force at the time of the Torrey Canyon disaster in 1967, effective action could have been initiated without delay to prevent or limit the damaging effects.

A second convention imposes strict civil liability upon the owner of vessels responsible for pollution damage to coastal areas, regardless of the location of the vessel.

Mr. President, these are two very important treaties which will provide invaluable assistance in the fight to limit oil pollution of the Nation's coastal areas. In the next few days I shall explore the problem of oil pollution further.

Both of these treaties deserve immediate Senate consideration. They represent the first step toward a truly international solution to the pollution problems facing the planet.

HAROLD STRASSNER—AN INSPIRATION TO THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, a column by Peter B. Taub, published in the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union, caught my attention with a story of personal courage that I would like to share with Senators.

Mr. Taub wrote about Harold L. Strassner, blind since the age of 4, who has become a valued employee of the Kodak Corp. in Rochester.

I found Mr. Strassner's conquest of blindness an inspiration, and I hope that it will be an example for handicapped people throughout the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent the column and my letter to Mr. Strassner be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAKES CAMERAS HE HAS NEVER SEEN

(By Peter B. Taub)

For almost 20 years Harold L. Strassner has been putting together cameras he's never seen.

Sightless as a result of an accident 42 years ago when he was 4, Strassner has adjusted so well to blindness that it's no longer a handicap.

Not only has he mastered 12 assembly operations in the Still Camera Department at Kodak Apparatus Division's Elmgrove Plant, but he's also come up with improvements.

His duties include placing 16 millimeter magazines on a conveyor belt feeding a machine designed to remove residue gum. Feeling the magazines after they'd been processed, Strassner came across traces of gum. Also, the machine often broke down.

He suggested the operation could be done more efficiently and economically by hand. The idea, his third suggestion award, won him $1,760.

A blind man's battle, Strassner says, isn't in doing assigned jobs but in convincing others to let him try. After five years with another company, he was dropped in 1948. Three years later he joined Kodak, where his record is free of accidents and absences.

Strassner, married and the father of four children, all with normal vision, doesn't use a cane or Seeing Eye dog.

He could probably get around the plant by himself, but, because of safety regulations, a friend guides him from one work area to another.

Strassner attended the State School for the Blind at Batavia from kindergarten to high school.

"They teach you to be independent, that you can do anything you want to do," he said.

Strassner has earned his fellow workers' respect as well as their friendship.

"He amazes me," a colleague said. "He's twice as fast as any of us with good eyesight."

JULY 2, 1970.

HAROLD L. STRASSNER,
Rochester, N.Y.

DEAR MR. STRASSNER: Occasionally, I see an item in the newspapers that is not only informative but inspirational.

Such a story was Peter B. Taub's column on your many accomplishments.

I was inspired, as I'm sure many other readers were, by how you have overcome blindness to become a highly regarded worker, citizen, husband and father.

In the hope that your accomplishments may be an example to handicapped people beyond the Rochester area, I am inserting Mr. Taub's column in the *Congressional Record*.

It is an honor to represent you in the Senate. If I may ever be of service to you, please contact me.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GOODELL.

EXPERIENCES AND OBSERVATIONS IN CAMBODIA—ARTICLES BY RICHARD DUDMAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Richard Dudman, the chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has written a fascinating series of articles describing his experiences and observations during the 5 weeks he was held in enemy hands in Cambodia. I believe that the articles speak most eloquently for themselves and, without further comment, ask unanimous consent that the six articles which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 22, 1970]

EXPERIENCES AND OBSERVATIONS IN CAMBODIA

(By Richard Dudman)

The rice paddies stretched emptily on both sides of us. The countryside was deserted. We were frighteningly alone.

Suddenly a Vietnamese in a sports shirt and carrying a Chinese-made automatic rifle slid from behind a big tree. We stopped our car and scrambled out, hands up.

"Don't shoot," called Mike. "We are journalists."

That was the beginning of my 40 days with the guerrillas. We were prisoners in Cambodia.

It was the start of an extraordinary experience in the new war that America is fighting in Cambodia. Of 23 correspondents who have been captured there by the enemy, we three are the only ones held for any length of time who have been released.

TIMES OF TERROR

In nearly six weeks of hiding in jungle and paddyland there were times of terror when our lives were at stake. There also were much boredom and occasional happy times playing chess with our captors and making a feast of roast dog. We lost weight, but except for some ant bites, minor infections and dysentery, we came out in reasonably good health.

It also was a newspaperman's once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to see life on the other side in the chaotic new conflict that has spilled over from the war in Vietnam.

We saw a well-organized movement of Cambodian and Vietnamese guerrillas in a determined war against American tanks and planes. We gradually learned about their hatred of America, their tactics, their relationship with the Cambodian peasants and what kind of people they are, as we traveled with them on foot, bicycle and occasionally by truck from one village to another.

Being the first to be released, we feel an obligation to the 20 correspondents still missing. Although we made no deal for our release, we decided to withhold a few details, such as the exact place of our release, for fear of jeopardizing our colleagues.

TAKEN FOR SPIES

Our captors suspected us of being spies for the Central Intelligence Agency, and we are determined to avoid doing anything that would feed their suspicion of other correspondents they have captured.

It was May 7 when it all started. Just a week earlier President Richard M. Nixon had opened a new dimension of the war in Southeast Asia by announcing that American and South Vietnamese troops were invading Cambodia.

At noon Miss Elizabeth Pond of the Christian Science Monitor, Michael Morrow

of Dispatch News Service International and I set out from Saigon to see how far the invasion had penetrated.

Driving down Highway 1, the main route from Saigon to Phnom Penh, we were waved on at a checkpoint manned by friendly Cambodian forces. The sentry gave us no warning, but suddenly about a mile west of Svay Rieng, in the Parrot's Beak area of Cambodia, we realized we were alone. The rice fields were deserted. No peasant trudged along the highway.

When we reached a blown-up bridge with no warning sign, we knew the worst. We had unwittingly entered the no man's land between Allied forces and the guerrilla troops supporting Norodom Sihanouk, the ousted Cambodian head of state.

Swiftly we turned our International Scout and headed back along the destered road toward Svay Rieng. We had gone only 100 yards or so when a Vietnamese with an automatic rifle stopped us. In a moment a Cambodian joined him.

With rifles trained on us, they ordered us to empty our pockets on the pavement and then motioned to us to start walking. Hands raised, we clambered down a collapsed bridge span and up the rubble on the other side.

CAPTORS STARTLED

The sudden throb of a helicopter engine alarmed our captors. "Di, di, di (hurry, hurry, hurry)"—they ordered us to run. There was no cover except an occasional tree. Some of the trees had been felled and lay across the highway as makeshift roadblocks.

When Beth lagged behind, a man on a bicycle who had joined us gave her a lift. After running about two miles, we were led down a side path. In a thatched-roof hut, Mike and I had to take off our pants and shoes. They were returned to us after a thorough search and we were given cups of tea.

Our first interrogation began a few minutes later in another hut. A young man wearing a pistol did the questioning. Mike explained in Vietnamese that we were international journalists. He said that he and Beth are Canadians, and I was an American.

An older man with one eye, who had been listening skeptically, took over the questioning. He accused us of being CIA agents. It was the first of many such accusations that would be made against us in the next five weeks.

A young man who spoke French arrived and took a friendlier tone. He said he was a Cambodian student from Phnom Penh and was working the Cambodians and Vietnamese revolutionary forces fighting the Americans and South Vietnamese. He told us we would not be shot in any event. If we were what we said we were, he promised, we would be set free.

But the friendly tone vanished when a gray-haired man with a stern manner arrived. He didn't believe a word of our story. Over and over Mike told him how we had set out from Saigon that morning to see and report what was happening in Cambodia.

After more questions we were taken from the hamlet on bicycles. We pedaled two or three kilometers and then came to a big Czech-made truck. Camouflaged with tree branches, it stood at the side of the road in what appeared to be a large village. We were herded into the vehicle with about 10 Cambodian soldiers. One carried a Chinese AK–47 automatic rifle; another, a light machine gun.

Their mood was getting more dangerous. The Cambodians watched us intently but impassively. We offered a smile; no response. The soldier with the automatic rifle kept it pointed at my chest. When I motioned politely to him to point it to one side, he waved it angrily at me and put the gun to my head. He kept it there all the while the truck bounced along jungle roads.

ANGRY CROWDS

The danger mounted at each village, an angry-faced crowd of men and women gathered and climbed the tailgate of the truck for a look at the hated Westerners. The French-speaking Cambodian student got into the spirit of the capture, and his friendly manner disappeared.

Each time the truck slowed, he leaned out to boast about "the three Americans" inside. I suppose the villagers thought we were downed flyers from one of the American planes that had been bombing Cambodia since Sihanouk's overthrow.

At the last stop—at a sizable village—hatred reached a critical level. In twos and threes boys and young men climbed the cab and tailgate of our truck to glare down at us. They shook their fists. Several made obscene gestures. At one point an older man clambered to the cab roof and berated us.

There was a respite when a young Vietnamese soldier arrived and ordered the villagers off the truck. He asked a few questions and then he, too, assured us we would not be shot. He and others tied strips of toweling tightly around our heads, blindfolding us. Someone took me by the hand. Linking hands with Mike and he with Beth, we climbed over the tailgate to the ground.

A slip knot of binder twine went over my right wrist, and the other end was tied to a motorbike. Mike's wrist was tied the same way. "Di, di, di" came the command. Blindfolded, stumbling, fearful of breaking an ankle, we ran as fast as we could to keep up with the bike.

Several hundred villagers had gathered, and the motorbike pulled up through their gantlet. Fists and hands hit and shoved us from both sides. "Beat the Americans to death," the people shouted angrily.

Eventually the voices faded. The motorbike kept going, and we kept running. We must have run half a mile. I could feel under foot the path trailing off into heavy dust or sand. All I could think of were the mass graves I had seen outside Hue for civilians killed there by Communist forces during the Tet invasion of South Vietnam in 1968.

I was sure we were being taken out of town to be shot.

At last the motorbike stopped. We were cut loose. Then our hands were lashed tightly behind our backs.

We were led into a darkened building with a dirt floor. I heard a muttered conversation, then a sharp crack and a moan. It was Mike. I felt him slump to the floor. I thought he had been shot. I knew I was next.

Someone struck me on the back of the head with a wooden club and I dropped to the floor. Mike was unconscious for a few moments, but I was not. I lay there expecting to be kicked and beaten. Instead, I was yanked to a sitting position and ordered to spread my legs.

Our captors barked questions at Mike accusing us of being American spies. Then they were quiet. In the distance I thought I heard a woman's voice shrieking in pain. I was sure Beth, who had been separated from us when Mike and I were tied to the motorbike, was being tortured.

The first kindly voice we heard was that of a man who said he was a lieutenant. He asked if we were frightened. We said we were.

He said, "You are not going to be shot."

In a moment he brought a metal bowl of water and held it to our lips. He loosened Mike's bindings, which were so tight they had impaired his circulation.

Another period of silence—then we were told to get to our feet. We were led to another building, this one with a concrete floor. Beth was already there. She helped the soldiers remove our blindfolds and wrist bindings. I must have imagined those screams; she had not been harmed. She said a Cambodian soldier had make a half-hearted effort to rape her. Quick-witted, she had told him that he (the soldier) was her brother and she his sister and he stopped.

Six long hours had passed since our capture at noon; it was early evening and dark. Our captors brought a large can of water, and we bathed. The room looked like a school room or briefing room. A blackboard on a crude easel was moved to the corner as an improvised screen behind which Beth could bathe in privacy.

We also washed our clothes. Our captors brought in the small bags we had been carrying with a change of clothing and toilet articles and a few medicines. My bag contained three small cakes of soap that I had taken from an airliner in case of emergency. Later we shared the soap with the guerrillas.

After a meal of rice and chicken, apparently left over from our captor's dinner, a tall man in uniform whom we had not seen before visited us. He said our beatings had been a mistake.

"Cambodian peasants hate all Americans because of the invasion and bombings, and they can still try to hurt you," he told us. "We Vietnamese know that there are good Americans and bad Americans, but the Cambodians still think they are all bad."

We judged this tall man with the broad confident smile to be a North Vietnamese. This officer turned out to be a most important figure in our entire captivity. By the end, I was convinced he was North Vietnam's senior military adviser for the region.

With an air of authority he told us that a thin-faced Vietnamese who was at his side would remain with us. His job was to protect us and, said the tall man, explain that we were "good people"—a phrase we were to hear many times in the days ahead. He explained that they would investigate to make certain we actually were news correspondents and not spies. After telling us to rest, the tall officer departed.

Not long afterward, the thinfaced Vietnamese returned with several other soldiers. They led us out single-file in the moonlight to a Land Rover parked nearby. We were to spend many nights in it in the weeks ahead traveling through eastern Cambodia. Among the men with us were four guerrillas who were to remain with us throughout our captivity.

We drove for several hours through the soft, warm night. Finally the car stopped and we were blindfolded briefly again and led up a ladder into a house on stilts. We found ourselves in a wooden house with tile roof, which appeared to be the home of a prosperous farmer. There we had the only bed of the entire 40 days—one bed for the three of us.

We came to know the Cambodian man and woman who lived there and their 4-year-old daughter, who playfully kept peeking through the curtain of the room assigned to us, the best in the house. We came to know, too, a 9-year-old neighbor girl whose parents, we were told, had just been killed in a bombing raid.

Two days later we were taken from the house hurriedly to escape an attack. After our eventual release we were told that South Vietnamese troops had found in the house Beth's bag containing my White House press pass, my notebook and other papers.

We learned also that it had been announced in Saigon that three Viet Cong had been killed in that building in a ground attack by South Vietnamese troops.

Our captors told us at first that those killed were the man, woman and small daughter we had come to know. Later they said they had additional information that the child and the orphan girl had survived. But the 4-year-old had lost an arm. It was shot off.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 23, 1970]

EXPERIENCES AND OBSERVATIONS IN CAMBODIA

(By Richard Dudman)

For more than two weeks we and our captors fled westward in the midst of a massive migration of guerrilla troops and Cambodian peasants.

Night after night our Land Rover overtook long lines of shadowy figures, walking in single file or sprawled on the edge of the dirt roads.

A dirty rear curtain was kept down much of the time. At frequent stops, where a silent sentry sometimes gave a brief signal with a flashlight, we usually were directed to shield our faces with the cotton batik sarongs that had been given us for a change of clothing.

But sometimes, by moonlight or the frequent phosphorus flares protecting Allied outposts a few miles away, we could make out that the troops carried mostly repeating rifles or carbines. Some bore the small haversacks that we came to know as standard guerrilla equipment.

It was impossible to judge the nationality of the troops we saw. We thought it would be unwise to ask directly where a man or woman had come from. Even later, the five guerrillas who held us—Miss Elizabeth Pond of the Christian Science Monitor, Michael Morrow of Dispatch News Service International and me—prisoner in Cambodia for 40 days gave us only limited information about themselves.

The fleeing peasants had with them all the household goods they could carry—mostly pots, dishware and a little food. Several women whom we picked up with babies in their arms, as well as lugging bundles and chickens, spoke only Cambodian. Occasionally they shouted greetings to acquaintances among the troops that had pased them earlier and whom our automobile overtook.

We saw hundreds of persons, both civilan and military. One night alone, I counted 200.

SIGNIFICANCE OF UNITY

In this massive migration we felt that we were watching the terrorization of the peasants of Cambodia. We felt we were observing the welding together of the local population with the guerrillas. The peasants were turning to the fighters as their best friends. We felt that this held the most serious significance for American policy.

At each house where we stopped the villagers appeared to offer willing co-operation and friendship to the guerrillas. Our guards told us that our rice was furnished free by the peasants when it was available, but that side dishes such as vegetables, chicken, dog, and in one case porcupine, were purchased. We saw the soldier in charge of supplies for our little group peel off a few riels to pay for a chicken.

Our guards often lived under the bamboo-slatted floors of the houses, which were raised on stilts. They stayed with the farm implements, the pigs, chickens and ducks while we always had the best place in the house. The owners of the houses went to work each day in the rice paddies, apparently unworried at leaving their families and homes at the disposal of armed strangers.

In the late afternoons and evenings, by fading daylight or the tiny flames of a guerrilla's kerosene lamp, those of our guards who spoke Vietnamese sat around with the Cambodian villagers taking the first step in friendship—learning each other's language.

In political discussions, our guards told us repeatedly of "the solidarity of the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, and of their unified struggle that will continue until all Americans are driven out and all of Indochina is free and independent." They represented Norodom Sihanouk, the deposed ruler of Cambodia, as a key figure in this partnership.

GESTURE OF RESPECT

We noticed that when our guards passed a pagoda they unobtrusively removed their hats. It was a gesture of respect for local religious beliefs—all the more marked, because, as we learned later, they were atheists.

In the first few days of our capture we had three tough sessions of up to two hours each with harsh investigators from a higher headquarters. They accused us of being spies for the Central Intelligence Agency. They said the first announcement of our capture described us as American personnel, not as journalists.

Fortunately, neither Beth Pond, Mike nor I was wearing military-style clothing. All three of us customarily avoided such attire to be sure we were not mistaken for military personnel. In white duck and white French polo shirt, I was about as far from a military uniform as it was possible to get.

The interrogation sessions were frightening. Questions were barked at us and the strain was intense, especially for Mike. Speaking Vietnamese, he bore the brunt and translated for Beth and me. Once I had to massage his back for 15 minutes to help him relax afterward.

One of our questioners was a stern-faced soldier whom I judged to be a North Vietnamese. He was in uniform and carried an official-looking khaki pouch. He ordered us to write statements giving details leading up to our capture—whether we had ever reported to the CIA or knew anyone connected with the agency, the dates on which we had visited Paris, Vientiane, Hanoi and Saigon and a summary of all stories we had written, as well as a list of personal references in those cities and elsewhere, and "international journalists" whom we knew personally.

Later he said our reports were not neat enough nor complete. He thought they contained errors and told us to rewrite them. Mike was convinced that it was the old Chinese technique of asking a prisoner to rewrite a statement time after time as a form of torture or punishment—to wear him down and catch discrepancies.

SECOND STATEMENT ACCEPTED

The second statement, however, proved to be the last, except for a later addendum when they wanted us to state that everything we had written was true.

Another interrogator—a shifty-eyed, French-speaking man whom I took to be Vietnamese—told Beth in French, "We notice you have very peculiar cameras. They don't look like press cameras."

One of the most unpleasant persons we encountered, he always spoke with his hand held over his mouth, covering his buck teeth.

But the interrogations ended, and our relations with our captors began to ease a few days after we were catured. I sensed a change when the guerrilla beside me in the Land Rover, before getting out to ask the way one night, slipped off his pistol and cartridge belt and laid them in my lap. Often Beth, Mike and I were left alone in the back of the car with half a dozen Chinese and American repeating rifles, carbines and machine guns.

It never occurred to us to make a break. The guards surely would have shot us if we had tried. And if we had escaped them, we still would have been caught in a strange country among a totally hostile population without even the protection of our team of guerrillas.

Gradually we came to think of the five guerrillas who had us in tow as escorts rather than guards. Before we were released, they were describing us as "not prisoners of war but travelers who lost their way."

Our life began to have its little pleasures. Sometimes our two meals a day of mainly rice were augmented with a snack of sweetened condensed milk, or a glass of tea with three heaping spoons of coarse sugar. Twice we had pastry similar to Boston crullers. Once we had fresh pineapple. On May 19, the guerrillas gave us one of the blocks of sweetened popped rice that were a special treat in their celebration of Ho Chi Minh's birthday. It was something like candied popcorn.

PREPARING FOR ACTION

At the big house where we had been staying, Friday, May 22, was a day of rest and preparation, but Saturday began as a day of action that was the longest and hardest yet.

We had driven much of Thursday night. On Friday morning everyone seemed to be getting ready for something. One of the soldiers was using a needle and thread to repair his shirt. A nurse was filling her kerosene lamp.

Three other young South Vietnamese nurses, looking calm and gentle in their fitted blue blouses and black satin pajama pants, sat in the center of the slatted bamboo floor combing their long, black hair, inserting silver clips and braiding it. Later we saw the nurses, whom I judged to be from the National Liberation Front, march off in the dusk across the paddies, packs on their backs and rifles on their shoulders.

A thin-faced Vietnamese soldier—this was Anh Ba—spotted a big gecko, a kind of lizard, twitching upside down on one of the rafters looking for insects. With a bamboo spear he poked at it until he pried loose its suction feet and it dropped to the floor, Grabbing it by the back of the head, to keep clear of the jaws, he took it to the kitchen for an addition to the evening's soup.

At three o'clock Saturday morning Anh Tu (number four brother) woke us with a touch and said, "Get ready to go." Presently he brought a snack of rice gruel and salted peanuts and told us to eat quickly. Moments later we slipped out of the house and climbed into the Land Rover among packs, repeating rifles and a small wicker basket of chirping chicks.

After driving several hours we arrived at another village at dawn and were hustled into a house. We had a big breakfast and had just lain down together on the floor when suddenly we were told to get ready to go quickly. We ran barefoot down a back ladder. I carried my shoes, the laces tied together and slung through the straps of my flight bag.

Soldiers and townspeople were running, too. One soldier carried a dog. Another, a live chicken. A woman with a baby ran with us. They stared in utter amazement when, on hearing someone puffing alongside them, they looked around and saw an American.

RUN FOR COVER

We ran a mile across paddies, some of them nearly a foot under water. The helicopters came into sight only 10 minutes after we reached the brush country. The soldiers who had been fleeing with us went in another direction and we and our escorts ran on through the brush for another half mile or so. Then we three correspondents were separated.

I went with a guerrilla we called Twitch, because of his slight facial tic. He ordered me into a small burrow in a thicket where it looked as if a small tree had been felled under a larger one, to make even thicker cover.

"Be nam hai," said Twitch. That means B-52 in Vietnamese. I thought I could hear the big bombers overhead. After we had settled in our shelter, Twitch opened his pack and pulled out some cotton. He gave me two wads and motioned for me to put them in my ears. He signaled for me to close my eyes and push my face down into the dirt. I didn't know for sure whether this was in the event of a bombing attack or whether he was going to shoot me.

But, sensing my fear, he pointed to his unsnapped pistol holster and indicated that

it was not for me but for the plane. Then he gave me six lumps of sugar in a scrap of paper.

I was on an ant hill and only a few feet from a swarm of bees. For several hours we could hear smaller bombs striking within four or five miles of us, but the huge bombs from the B–52s never fell.

TANKS APPROACH

Helicopters flew very close to us. At one point we heard a tank column approach within a couple of kilometers, but the sound soon receded. A little later Twitch and I joined Beth and Mike and their guards. At sunset, when the raid was over and a villager brought word that it was safe, we went back across the paddies and brushland.

A few days later, Anh Hai and Anh Ba told us what had happened that day. They said that 110 tanks and 3000 men—apparently Americans and South Vietnamese—had taken part in a drive that came within two miles of the burrow in which we had hidden. "But the tanks stayed on the road," they said.

The night of the bombing raid we had dinner with our captors for the first time. Previously, we had eaten separately, usually after them. This night we all joined the family of the house. There was lots of rice with many side dishes—fish pastes, peanut paste and chicken soup. Then we passed the rice wine around, each drinking from the same glass.

It was a pleasant dinner but a fast one. It wasn't a safe place. Anh Ba said, "Eat fast. We must go."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 24, 1970]

EXPERIENCES AND OBSERVATIONS IN CAMBODIA

(By Richard Dudman)

"As long as there is one of us left, we will fight on."

The toughness and dedication of the guerrillas in Cambodia, as we came to know them in 40 days of captivity there, made that seem a statement of fact rather than a propaganda slogan.

During the two weeks we spent in and around a base camp behind the guerrilla lines, we three correspondents from America—Miss Elizabeth Pond of the Christian Science Monitor, Michael Morrow of Dispatch News Service International and I—often heard our captors discuss the revolution they are waging against heavy odds.

None of them seemed to doubt for a moment that victory is inevitable. How long it would take did not seem to matter.

Several guerrillas told us, in almost identical words, "To live without our freedom and independence is as good as being dead. To die for the revolution is nothing."

The individual is submerged in the struggle. Even the family, so important in Asia, takes second place to the revolution.

Anh Qui, one of our five guards, told us one day, "We miss our families, but we have an obligation to oppose American aggression. When we have won we will go home and live in peace."

Qui, 31 years old and of Chinese extraction, had left a comfortable life in Phnom Penh a few months before the March 18 coup that overthrew Norodom Sihanouk as ruler of Cambodia. He was the bookkeeper and purchasing agent for our little task force.

Another of the five, Anh Tu, once showed us a photograph of his wife and said that she had been killed in a bombing raid and that his young daughter had been left with friends. This pained him, he said, but he would not resume the responsibilities of parenthood until the revolution was won.

The political officer, Anh Hai, said, "A revolutionary either has no family or leaves it. He takes all the people as his mother, father, brothers and sisters. When the revolution is won, then he can return to his family and home and lead a normal life.

He spoke to us one day squatting at the door of our room in a house where we had stopped. He was a short, stocky man with a constant smile and a shock of graying hair in a two-inch brush cut. A 25-year veteran of a hundred battles against both French and Americans, he was concerned when we were bored or depressed.

"Talk is a good thing at driving away sadness," he said. That led him to some observations about the joys and sadnesses in the life of a revolutionary. He said:

"A revolutionary is sad when the people are poor or when they are oppressed or colonized. But this is not the sadness that makes him do like this"—he buried his face in his hands—"but the kind of sadness that makes him fight.

"The revolutionary is happy when the people are liberated, when there is a good and improving society, and when the working class is well cared for.

"This is the complete opposite of the imperialist. He is happy only when he holds the control of many countries and can exploit their people and resources for his own interests, and he has many wives and children and an easy life."

He turned to strategy. He told us how the guerrillas deal with the B–52, the terror weapon that drops loads of bombs, each one blasting a hole the size of a house. American military men consider the planes extremely effective in keeping enemy forces off balance.

But Anh Hai was disdainful of them. "I have been through three B–52 raids," he remarked. "Once you have the experience, you don't fear it next time." Jumping to a crouching position on hands and feet, he showed how to ride out the jolts of the raid.

"Only a direct hit can hurt you," he said. "The radius of destruction is small."

Two weeks had passed since our capture by the guerrillas on May 7. We had spent most of the time moving from village to village. We drove at night, sometimes without lights, usually on narrow dirt roads. One night our Land Rover went off the road at a broken culvert and became mired in a rice paddy.

The moonlight was bright, and the phosphorous flares from Allied fire bases came closer. Long lines of guerrilla troops in a variety of uniforms passed us carrying all kinds of weapons, including an enormous rifle or rocket launcher that I had never seen before. Many of the soldiers were on crutches—I counted 10 in a row once. Sometimes two of the men carried a pole between them with a suspended hammock containing a fighter who had been wounded too badly to walk.

We were ordered to sit at the side of the road with our batik sarongs pulled over our heads. Several times when a soldier caught a glimpse of our faces and saw we were Westerners, he would pull one of his companions to the side and point excitedly as if to say, "See, I told you."

Those who passed carried word of our difficulty to the next village. Before long 20 young Cambodian men arrived. By sheer manpower they shoved our automobile back up on the road. When the Rover was freed, everyone clapped in the peculiar manner they have, hands above their heads.

They stayed with us for mile or so along the hazardous dike road running between paddies two feet deep in water. Whenever we came to another broken culvert where the vehicle could have slipped off again, they grabbed chunks of mud and brush from the paddies and literally rebuilt the road.

The guerrillas pointed out to us that the incident showed they were getting co-operation from villagers. They said the young men had come out voluntarily to help us.

We eventually came to a better road, only to be stopped at a crossroads. Without explanation we were ordered out of the Land Rover—that was the last we ever saw of it—and began marching single file down a side road. We had hiked for about seven miles when it became apparent that something was wrong. We were told to wait in a little hatched-roof shelter. We were so tired that Mike lay down on the ground and Beth leaned against a tree while I stretched out on a bench.

At dawn we set off to walk for another hour. We went from house to house. We waited outside each while one of the guerrillas went inside to see whether we could stay there. At each place the answer was no. Finally we were taken in at a little hut.

This was an unusual ordeal, and the next morning Anh Tu, the mild-mannered guard who looked after our personal needs, gave us the explanation: "The people here didn't know us, and when they saw we were with three Westerners they would not believe we were with the United National Cambodian Front (the name the guerrillas always gave their movement). We had to show them pictures of Norodom Sihanouk and Ho Chi Minh, and finally we were able to convince them. Now they have made us welcome and brought us gifts of food.

"The Thieu-Ky (South Vietnamese government) soldiers are not like this. They arrest anyone who does not give them what they want."

Without any apparent reason we shifted from house to house frequently during this period in the base-camp area. Long lines of soldiers passed often, 100 or more at a time. The troops apparently were returning from battle, for usually there were wounded with them.

At one little house where we spent a week we began to develop a kind of friendship with the guerrillas. The turning point came one night when Anh Hai and a soldier whom we called Yogi because he resembled Yogi Bear in the comics—began clowning. With Yogi singing weird Cambodian music, Anh Hai, joined by Anh Tu in his blue sport shirt and green pants, began prancing around the room in a kind of modern dance. Later, to the amusement of the others, Yogi wrapped himself in a blanket and piled three pillows on his head so that looked vaguely like a Buddist monk. In a pointed ridicule, this atheist spent 20 minutes in a hilarious recitation of a Buddist chart.

A few nights later we provided the entertainment. We heard their radio playing a Cambodian song containing animal sounds. It sounded almost like "Old MacDonald had a farm," so after the music ended we sang it for them. I think they liked it because several days later Anh Tu suddenly asked, "Would you sing that song about the animals again?

This week saw a quiet period in which the guerrillas replenished their packs, refilling the salami-shaped cotton sacks of rice that they carried over their shoulders and cleaning their rifles. They cut one anothers hair carefully and shaved their sparse beards, using a kind of nail clipper attached by a chain to their cigarette lighters. One of them gave Mike a very good haircut. They were very clean. They wore thin shirts and pants of nylon or a similar synthetic material. They would dry in an hour after washing. They wore dark clothing at night for going outside. But most of them had crisp white sport shirts to wear around the house.

CAMBODIAN TIC-TAC-TOE

Our guards began too think that we were getting listless by being penned up too much. So they began taking us out to exercise in a wood about half a mile away. On the first of these outings we were a bit bored and passed the time playing Cambodian tic-tac-toe with Yogi. The game has an unlimited number of squares and requires five x's in a row instead of only three to win. We used a mat of woven palm leaves as the playing surface.

When the novelty of the game waned, Mike and I began carving chessmen from tree branches, using my pocketknife. It was a two-day project and the guerrillas watched us with great interest. Beth carved the pawns. We turned out a good little chess set. We shaved the bark off one set, and that became the white team and the other served as the black set.

QUICK ANALYSIS

Anh Hai watched Mike and me play the first game and caught on immediately. He already was familiar with elephant chess, a somewhat similar Oriental game. Anh Tu joined him to play a game against Mike, with the two guerrillas arguing with one another over the moves to make. They lost, but when it was over, Anh Hai offered a typically obscure Oriental remark—"we can't lose yet because we have never won from you. We're just like Nixon in Southeast Asia."

The two guerrillas soon were playing pretty good chess. They delayed only a few seconds between moves. They would size up a situation instantly. If they lost a man, they did not seem to mind. They would fight with what was left. When Anh Hai finished one particularly hard game, we asked him whether he wanted to play another.

"No," he replied. "Fight, fight—sleep, sleep." He unrolled his mat and lay down for a nap.

It later turned out that the chess set we had carved was the only thing the guerrillas would accept from us as a parting gift when we were released.

We had given them a chess set. But it soon turned out that they would give us our lives.

It happened on June 9. We and the guerrillas were spending another of our several days in a wooded area. We did some exercises—bend-downs and running in place. Then we squatted around the rice pot for a late breakfast and talked of poetry, Chinese history and America and of what our first meal would be like if we were released.

The tedium broke with a snap when we heard some United States helicopters coming closer than they had all month. We pulled down some shirts and underwear we had hung out to dry, and with our knees under our chins, we hunched back in a little thatched shack where we would go to get out of the rain. Yogi crouched with his carbine and pack next to a tree. Anh Ba grabbed his M-16. Warning us to stay out of sight and, whatever happened, not to run, he took off along a trail through the forest.

Helicopters began zooming low. They sounded right overhead although we could not see them through the canopy of branches and vines. We heard one burst from a machine gun—probably "reconnaissance by fire."

45-MINUTE RAID

At a lull in the attack Yogi told us to scramble beneath the stilted shack. We thought the five 50-kilogram rice sacks on the floor above would stop machine gun bullets. But they would have been no protection against rockets. The raid lasted about 45 minutes as the helicopters circled repeatedly and dived almost at us.

When the choppers left, we were ordered to leave the hut, for it was too good a target. Yogi led us along tangled paths a quarter of a mile to a fall-back hide-away under a bushy tree where additional brush had been placed over the branches to make a dense cover. For an hour we sat silent and motionless against the chance that the attackers would return or that the air raid would be followed by a ground attack.

Finally Anh Ba returned, and we learned what a close call we had had. Brushing aside the leaves and twigs to make a bare spot on the dirt, he scratched a map and showed where we had hidden in the hut. A circle marked where one of the five helicopters, just 50 yards away, had been swooping down looking for a target. It was so low over the treetops—only about 150 feet above the ground—that Anh Ba said the rotor wash swayed the trees and could easily have disclosed the location of our hut.

DREW COPTER FIRE

Drawing a circular line around the attack zone, he showed how he had skirted the area to a point on the opposite side. He said he showed himself and fired three shots at the lowest helicopter to draw its attention away from us. He very probably had saved our lives.

Anh Ba slapped the captured American M-16 he had used. "This is an inferior weapon," he remarked. "I could have hit it if I had been using an AK-47." He said he thought the Chinese repeating rifle could bring down a plane from an altitude of 500 meters (about 550 yards). He said he had shot down six U.S. planes during the course of the war, including a helicopter just a few days before we were captured and put in his charge.

The raid had brought us all closer together. When the choppers had gone and all was quiet, we returned to our house. As we drank tea, Anh Ba told us, "The worst thing you could have done would have been to run into the open and show yourselves to the Americans. I carry this pistol on my hip, and if that had happened, I would have had to shoot you. But no matter what happened I would not have shot you because I know you would not do that. I don't say very much, but I have been observing you carefully. I know that you are good people."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 25, 1970]

EXPERIENCES AND OBSERVATIONS IN CAMBODIA

(By Richard Dudman)

In our long talks with Anh Hai, he always controlled the conversation.

He didn't seem to want us to interject questions or observations. Sometimes I would try to add a thought of my own. But it wasn't a two-way dialogue. He was talking and we were listening.

We had a number of these political discussions with the guerrillas in the 40 days we spent as their prisoners in Cambodia. The conversations were revealing, for they showed a shrewd political sophistication and knowledge of the United States.

We decided soon after our capture on May 7 that we would not argue with our five guards. The three of us—Miss Elizabeth Pond of the Christian Science Monitor, Michael Morrow of Dispatch News Service International and I—agreed that we were in no position to do so. Even when they said something patently false, we just let it pass.

There never was any attempt to brainwash us. We experienced none of the brainwashing techniques you hear of. There was no effort to humiliate us, to starve us or tire us so that our resistance would weaken.

In all of these discussions there was never any denial that the Viet Cong and North Vietnam have a lot of troops in Cambodia, although both the National Liberation Front (Viet Cong) and Hanoi maintain the fiction that they are not involved. The guerrillas did not admit openly the presence of outside troops, but it was implied in a number of things they said.

Yogi, the former Cambodian army officer who joined the guerrillas as a plain soldier the day before Norodom Sihanouk was ousted, touched on this point one day. With more candor than the others had displayed, he said he could see that the Cambodian United National Front could not succeed by itself and that it had to have the support of the people of Laos, North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

There was no hard-sell to the approach. Nor, except in one instance, was there any catechizing. We were not asked to repeat what they told us. What they were doing was telling us their story.

Anh Hai, whom we came to like personally, told us one night that 21 governments had recognized Sihanouk's government in exile whereas only Saigon, the United States and a few others had recognized the regime of Prime Minister Lon Nol, leader of the March 18 coup.

Sihanouk is well known in Cambodia Anh Hai said, and led his country in 15 years of peace. Lon Nol, he went on, is little known and has brought war to the Cambodian countryside. He said that Lon Nol had doubled the pay of the Cambodian government's soldiers, but that morale remained poor.

"Six of Lon Nol's 30 battalions have come over to our side during the month of May," he related. "The others sit home. Youth is with us. Those young men who came from across the rice paddies to help us," he said, recalling a night when our Land Rover ran off the road, "they were not asked to come. They heard of the difficulty and that we were from the revolutionary front and came to help."

We had seen for ourselves the willing help given by the young men, but we had no way of knowing whether we were hearing the truth about desertions or about the recognition of the rival Cambodian governments. The U.S. Department of State says 24 nations have recognized the Lon Nol regime against 17 for Sihanouk.

Anh Hai was both critical and scornful of American policy in Southeast Asia. He said, "President Nixon's invasion into Cambodia has played right into the hands of DRV (North Vietnam) and the NLF.

"First, the invasion has brought the Cambodian and Laotian people together in a unified struggle along with the DRV and the NLF against American aggression.

"Second, it has taken troops out of South Vietnam and has made it easier for us to fight the Americans there. Finally, it has made new difficulties for Nixon in the United States, strengthening the opposition in Congress and among students."

A veteran of 100 battles against both the French and Americans, Anh Hai was disdainful of his enemy.

"The American strategy in Cambodia is easy for us to counter," he told us. "They all stay together. When they go to a place, we go somewhere else. We just stay out of their way. We are happy when they use up their ammunition and fly their planes.

"You have traveled with us several times now by truck at night, and you see how we live. We keep moving. Wherever the Thieu-Ky (South Vietnamese) forces are not, there we are. If there is the smallest space within a territory that they occupy, we fill it.

"They are nowhere; we are everywhere."

Anh Hai said that if American troops had not been sent to Cambodia, "the Lon Nol government would have collapsed," and added, "If Nixon had sent only weapons we would have captured them."

We asked whether at some point the Paris peace talks would become an important element in settling the war.

"The Paris talks are like a show," he replied. "They are just a place to make statements that the press can carry around the world."

The guerrillas have a shrewd understanding of America and a sophisticated grasp of how deeply the country is torn by the war. Their knowledge comes largely from nightly Vietnamese language news broadcasts of the BBC. They listen to the British broadcasting network more than to their own radio stations.

On one occasion Anh Hai remarked, "This is the BBC. This is not propaganda."

Names of some of the major members of

the Senate were familiar to them, especially those of J. William Fulbright (Dem.), Arkansas; Mike Mansfield (Dem.), Montana, who have been critical of American policy in Southeast Asia.

They were watching developments on the Cooper-Church amendment designed to assure that American troops are not kept in Cambodia beyond June 30. They knew about the committee that President Richard M. Nixon sent to report on the American invasion of Cambodia. They had great hopes for it at first, but because the group was made up of hawks and Administration supporters, they soon changed their view and called it a fraud.

They listened to their radios every night for news of any new student demonstrations in the U.S. or protests against the war.

Some of our discussions were not of high caliber. There was a 30-year-old Vietnamese photographer who came to take pictures of us. A nonstop talker, he told us he had spent six years in the liberation movement, first as an undercover agent in Saigon and then as a guerrilla in Cambodia. Two sisters were secret agents in Saigon, one of them was on assignment to shoot Americans from the back of a motorbike. He claimed she could shoot a pistol with either hand.

He strongly defended the presence of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops in Cambodia.

"We do not look upon our coming here to help the Cambodians as aggression or expanding our country," he asserted. "We look upon it as helping poor and oppressed peoples who resist aggression."

Talking on, he urged me to give a special message to Senator Fulbright.

"You must tell him for me," he said, "that what he needs is not many strategies, but just one strategy.

"He should just go and live and work with the poor and oppressed. Where there is poverty and oppression there is war. Where poverty and oppression are eliminated, there is peace."

Then, apparently struck by a second thought, he continued, "Before you give this message to Fulbright, I would like to check it with my superiors because I am just an ordinary soldier."

I worried at times lest the guerrillas think we could be used as propagandists for their revolution. I was afraid that perhaps we had been too docile in our responses. The worry was fed by several other developments. Once Anh Hai said that by living with them we could write articles "and maybe a book of great historical significance about the successful war of one small nation against the U.S., which would be read around the world, especially by other small nations that want to oppose the U.S. and want to know how."

At the guerrillas' request Mike had written two or three articles about our experiences. They said they would be transmitted to his news agency. But like the single letter each of us was allowed to write, they never were.

All of these factors made me worry that they might try to use us as propagandists. I made up my mind that if such suggestions were made, I would quote the old American saying, "My country right or wrong; if right, to be kept right; if wrong, to be set right." I would try to make them understand that I could never work for a foreign government.

After four weeks of captivity we were worried and doubtful. We were sure we would not be killed. But we couldn't tell how long we would be held. On June 7 our first month was up, and there was no firm indication whether we would be released soon or held for the duration of the war, perhaps to be "re-educated."

About this time we began to get a few hopeful hints. One day Anh Hai asked unexpectedly how long we would like to spend in the "liberated zone" if we could have our preference. He noted carefully that it was just a hypothetical question because it had not yet been determined whether we were "good people"—that familiar phrase we had first heard the day we were captured.

We suggested that a month as accredited journalists would give us full advantage of this opportunity if we could then be released.

"Good answer," said Anh Hai.

A day or two later Anh Tu asked whether we missed our families. We said, "Yes, very much." He then told us he hadn't seen his for seven years and that a month or two would not be so very long. Our families would be happy to see us if we were released at the end of that time, he told us.

On June 9, after our escape from the helicopter attack had brought us and our guards closer together. Anh Ba began to reminisce. "Do you remember on the day you were 'arrested,' and you were sitting tied and blindfolded?" he asked.

"I was the one who gave you water and loosened the ropes and said that you would not be shot and that if you were truly journalists, you would be freed.

"That was a very dangerous situation for you. The people wanted to beat you to death. Some wanted to hurt madam (Beth).

"And that evening," he went on, "do you remember when you talked with the big man and he told you that I would take care of you? He told me that you were my personal responsibility, to protect your security no matter what happened, and this has been my major concern the weeks we have been together.

"I want you to live. I want to see you safely back with your families. The Americans have told your families that you are dead (this was untrue). I just want them to see your faces again.

"Nobody has told you yet, but it has been decided. You will be freed."

After dinner the guerrillas told us we would be visited by someone of higher authority. So we put on our shirts, which we often didn't wear, and combed our hair. Then we sat crosslegged on the floor waiting for what we thought was going to be good news.

We heard a step on the rickety ladder leading up to the door of our hut, and then there appeared the smiling face of the big, authoritative man whom we had not seen since the day of our capture. He was in plain khaki uniform. There was no evidence of his rank as North Vietnam's senior military officer in that region, as I judged him to be.

Followed by a natty aide with a red bandana knotted around his neck, the commander stepped into the little room. With a powerful grip and using both hands, he shook hands with each of us.

Our visitors sat down opposite us. Then over tiny glasses of tea, the big officer smiled and asked almost teasingly, "Why do you think I'm here?"

I said, "I hope it is that you have found that we are what we said we were."

"Yes," he replied, "that is it. You will be released. The decision has been made by the general staff of the United Front of the Cambodian nation under Norodom Sihanouk that you will be released as soon as arrangements can be made. This took a long time because of this war situation."

The whole interview took only about 10 minutes. The commander said he could not stay with us long.

"I must leave," he said. "And you must be prepared to walk 13 miles tonight."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 26, 1970]

EXPERIENCES AND OBSERVATIONS IN CAMBODIA

(By Richard Dudman)

Under a new moon we set out on a 13-mile hike that took us eventually to freedom.

It was just over a month since we had been captured. It would be another week before we would be out from behind the guerrilla lines in Cambodia.

The tall North Vietnamese officer had just given us the happy news that at last we were to be set free.

When he had left, Anh Ba, the military leader of our guards, squatted beside my two fellow correspondents and me as we made ready and told us we would have to move fast because there might be some bombing.

Beth—Miss Elizabeth Pond of the Christian Science Monitor—put the batik sarong the guerrillas had given her around her shoulders to conceal her face if necessary. Mike—Michael Morrow of Dispatch News Service International—and I each had a 10-pound, salami-shaped sack of rice over our shoulders. "If we see people," said Anh Ba, "they will think you are soldiers."

It was a long silent and exhausting march with three stops. The sliver of moon shone brightly for an hour or so and then it became very dark. We traveled through forests and a long open prairie. In the distance we could see the light from an American military base on Black Widow Mountain across the border in South Vietnam. Near the start we met several dozen soldiers, each carrying two projectiles of some kind in a pack.

At 3 a.m.—six hours after we started—we reached our destination. To our surprise we found ourselves back in the big Cambodian house from which we had fled three weeks earlier ahead of a predawn attack by Allied forces.

After we had slept for awhile, Beth, Mike and I set to work on a joint statement that the North Vietnamese officer had asked us to prepare. He wanted us to tell of our treatment, to compare the actions of the guerrillas and the Allied forces and to evaluate the results of the invasion.

We recounted our experiences, including the rough treatment Mike and I underwent the first day and the relationship between guerrillas and villagers. We concluded by saying:

"On the basis of our observations we believe that the invasion of Cambodia by American and Saigon troops cannot be successful. It has done nothing except to bring a bitter and prolonged war to a peaceful country and has made peace in the Indochina war more difficult to achieve."

A day or so later the guerrillas asked us to record something for use on their radio station. They suggested that I read our joint statement and that Mike record an article he had prepared for his news agency. It was the only such request they ever made of us. I don't know whether they ever broadcast our remarks.

While we were waiting for our release to be arranged, we decided to show our guards that we appreciated the safety they had given us. At a small ceremony we offered them little farewell gifts—Beth's scarf for Chi Tinh, a Vietnamese nurse who was with us for a few days; Mike's door key for Anh Ba; my beret for Anh Tu, who had admired it; my nail clippers for natty Anh Qui, the young man who had an eye for women; my knife to Yogi, who was fond of slicing up strange little fruit that he was always gathering in the woods; and to Anh Hai, the chess set that Mike and I had carved.

They were touched but refused to keep anything but the chessmen. Anh Ba explained, "We understand that these things do not have much value. They are very simple little mementos, but in another way they are very important things. For example, the key that you have given me means that at any time I want to I can go into your house. It means that your house is my house and symbolizes that we all are very close friends."

They offered us no gifts, because they said, "You still have some difficult times to go through." The maintenance of face was involved here, for reciprocity is a firm rule in the Orient. So is the concept that to return

something you might like is to have a higher virtue than to accept it.

This gift-giving ceremony must seem strange to people in this country who see our captivity as an ordeal. We didn't feel that way about it at all. I told our guards when we offered them our gifts that I wouldn't have missed the whole experience for the world. I still feel that way. During the 40 days we were prisoners, I often said jokingly, "If we get out of this alive, we'll have one helluva story."

On June 14 a number of strangers came to the big house where we were staying. There was the shifty-eyed little man who always spoke with his hand covering his buck teeth. Two local village chairmen arrived for tea and told us they were happy that we decided to come and visit them.

Another arrival was the talkative photographer who earlier gave me a message for Democratic Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas. Anh Hai had told us earlier they would take a picture of us with the gifts we had offered them. But then there was an abrupt change in our plans. The gifts were omitted and the only guerrilla shown with us in the picture was Yogi, the former Cambodian army officer, who was posed wearing a pistol as if to guard dangerous prisoners. The photographer apparently had suddenly been ordered to emphasize the Cambodians and omit the Vietnamese.

That day, too, we received a promised interview with a local Cambodian military commander. We had been required to submit written questions several days earlier. He arrived that day with seven other armed men, walking single file along a path through the rice paddies at noon. From our little room a bit later we could hear the commander going over the answers that were to be given to us.

Mike, Beth and I reported his remarks immediately after we were set free. Although we could not verify his claims, we regarded them as potentially significant. He said that forces loyal to Norodom Sihanouk, the ousted head of state, completely controlled three provinces of eastern Cambodia and a total population there and elsewhere of 2,000,000 persons.

During that interview we saw for the first time the flag of the Cambodian Liberation Front. It uses the Cambodian national flag with blue stripe top and bottom and an outline of the ruins of Angkor Wat on a red field. The revolutionaries have added in white the letters FUNK, standing for the French name of the front, Front Uni de la Nation Khmer.

DINNER AND SPEECHES

When the Cambodian commander and his party had marched off, we feasted on rice, dog meat and other dishes contributed by neighbors. They gave us each a neat stack of 5000 piasters in crisp new bills and 100 Cambodian riels. At black market rates it comes to about $15 for each of us. Several of our guards made speeches, for this was our farewell dinner. The time for our departure had arrived although it was to prove a false start.

About 2:30 p.m. we three correspondents and all five of our guards piled into a small Italian taxi-bus. With a single motorbike escort patrolling ahead, we took off. It was the first time we had traveled in daytime except when fleeing from imminent attack.

It must have been a comic sight. We were well known in the area by this time so we waved to people as we drove along. Youngsters on bicycles would do a double-take and then race after our car as we passed through hamlets.

Nearing a large village, we saw people from the surrounding countryside streaming along the road toward a parade ground in front of the elementary school. Our taxi-bus pulled to a halt at the grounds, and we suddenly realize that this was a mass meeting in our honor.

TABLE IN PARADE AREA

About 1000 persons had gathered. We were ushered into the parade area and seated at a table covered with blue paper. Thirty Cambodian soldiers, armed with a variety of Communist-made and captured American weapons, kept the crowd in place.

Red and blue banners with gold letters were carried on poles. One said, "Long live the Khmer people" and another, "Long live solidarity of the Indochina people." A third that appeared to be brand new said, "We thank the American people who support our struggle for independence."

When the speeches started, I took off my beret, and a snicker swept the crowd. Bald heads are rare in Cambodia.

An officer spoke to the crowd in Vietnamese over a public address system, expressing "thanks to the American people who support our struggle. Unfortunately," he added, "the American people have at their head Richard Nixon, who is an aggressor."

A rainstorm broke up the meeting. The crowd began dispersing. We sought shelter on the porch of the elementary school. By then it was dark and we were directed to climb through a window.

In the dark classroom we sat at a table with an attached bench. Then a dim flashlight was switched on and we found ourselves once again face to face with the tall North Vietnamese army commander who was such a key figure in our whole experience, as well as the Cambodian commander who had given us the interview.

They gave us safe-conduct passes. Typed in Cambodian on flimsy onion-skin paper with our names inserted in ink, they were headed "Military region 203—independent Cambodian front. Certificate of release of prisoners."

FAIR TREATMENT

We learned later that the passes contained a peculiar statement to the effect that they were releasing us because they considered us "awakened." I take this to mean that they believed they would be given fair treatment in any accounts we wrote of our experience.

The passes were to be shown only to any guerrilla forces we might encounter after our release but not to Allied troops. In addition, we carried truce flags that they helped us fashion out of my two handkerchiefs and a piece of white cloth.

We were told to keep the little flags with us at all times. If an attack occurred, we were not to run with the guerrillas but, instead, to show ourselves and hold up our flags. Our guards would run the other way.

The monsoon rain had caused an unexpected hitch in our release. The pathway had become so muddy that it would be difficult to travel on the motorbikes we were to use for the rest of the journey. Disappointed, we returned to our house.

We set out again the next afternoon after a second farewell dinner and more speeches. Anh Hai had left us by then and Anh Ba was in charge. With his khaki-colored pith helmet and square sunglass with blue lenses and silver rims, he was an impressive figure as he sat in the front seat of the green jeep we were using and watched for Allied helicopters.

GUARDS, MOTORBIKES

At dark we left the jeep and climbed aboard motorbikes. Each of us rode on the back seat of a bike behind an armed guard. In the column were four other bikes ridden by three of our guards—Anh Tu, Anh Ba and Anh Qui—and by a stranger, a heavy-set smiling soldier wearing a Mao Tse-tung medallion.

The stranger, who clearly was of Chinese descent, led the way on tiny, winding paths in the forest and over narrow dike roads between rice paddies. Using relays of bikes, we bounced along the bumpy pathways at speeds up to 25 miles an hour.

Toward the end of our three-hour ride we turned off our lights and proceeded by bright moonlight for several miles. Then we came to a stop while two of the guerrillas went 200 yards ahead to reconnoiter. They came back to report it was safe, and we rode our bikes onto Highway 1, the same road on which we had been captured 40 days earlier.

We pulled under the marquee of a darkened restaurant. Our guards roused the owner, and he brought us a snack of tea and a sweetened Chinese pastry wrapped around chopped meat. We were supposed to spend the rest of the night at the restaurant, but the owner balked.

Straddling our motorbikes again, we rode a quarter of a mile down the highway to another building. We shook hands and embraced the three guerrillas who had been with us throughout our captivity. They warned us to be sure to use our white flags. We urged them to hurry back to a safer area.

As they climbed onto their bikes, one of us asked, "What time is it?" One of them answered, "Ten minutes to eleven." Then they were gone, putting off in the direction from which we had come. It seemed a strange ending.

TEN HOUSES, 200 MILES

We were free at last. We had stayed in 10 Cambodian houses. We estimated we had traveled 200 miles.

For the first time since we had been taken prisoner on May 7, Beth, Mike and I were alone again. I can't think of two persons I would rather have shared such an experience with. I had come to admire Mike's coolness and good judgment and Beth's courage and placid nature.

I think Mike's knowledge of the Vietnamese language saved our lives the first day and it proved invaluable the rest of the time. Beth complained only once in nearly six weeks—when beetles were falling from the ceiling of one of our houses into her soup. I'm sure the three of us will remain good friends the rest of our lives.

We agreed that night as we stood on the deserted highway that we would not disclose the exact place on Highway 1 where we were released. We were afraid that to do so might jeopardize the chances of other Western correspondents still held prisoner. We had asked for information about these colleagues a number of times but could learn nothing. We can only hope that they will be as fortunate as we were.

After sleeping that night in the building where the guerrillas had left us, we were up at dawn on June 16 to hitchhike into Saigon. All the traffic seemed to be going in the opposite direction, and it was four hours before an American army truck picked us up and took us part of the way.

A few minutes later we caught a ride in a 24-truck convoy of South Vietnamese forces returning empty from Phnom Penh to Saigon. Because they did not have to stop at checkpoints, we arrived in town shortly after noon without anyone knowing it.

CABLE TO SIHANOUK

We tried to hide to avoid interviews, knowing our most important work was to write our own stories as quickly as possible. One of the first things we did on reaching Saigon was to send a cablegram to Sihanouk, expressing appreciation for our release and saying it gave us hope that our colleagues still missing in Cambodia also would be set free.

We still don't know why we, rather than others, were released. I suspect it is partly because of the enormous amount of publicity over our capture and certain personal appeals made to Sihanouk and the government of North Vietnam.

Until we arrived in Saigon we had no idea of the massive effort that had been made to obtain our release. Pleas had been sent through diplomatic channels, peace groups, private and public organizations. News-

papermen throughout the world had helped. I am most grateful to all of them.

Almost the first thing I did on arriving in Saigon was to place a telephone call to my home in Washington, D.C. Surprisingly, it got through without much delay.

I heard the operator say, "I have a call from Richard Dudman in Saigon." There was a gasp at the other end, and then I heard my wife saying over and over, "Richard, Richard, Richard."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 28, 1970]

EXPERIENCES AND OBSERVATIONS IN CAMBODIA

(By Richard Dudman)

From behind guerrilla lines the great success that President Richard M. Nixon has claimed in Cambodia has the doubtful look of imminent failure.

I feel some hesitancy about making broad judgments of this kind because in the 40 days that I was a prisoner of Cambodian guerrillas I saw only a small slice of the new war that is raging there. I had no opportunity to talk to high-level policy makers.

Yet it was a unique chance to see the war from the other side. As a result, in this final article describing my experiences I feel a responsibility to do what a reporter seldom does—express some personal opinions.

What I saw and heard during nearly six weeks as a captive in "liberated" Cambodia convinced me that President Nixon's policies inadvertently were helping to create conditions for a Communist-controlled "people's war," a savage, prolonged struggle by an elusive, determined guerrilla front with strong popular support.

The two-month-old invasion by the United States and South Vietnam has not succeeded despite the capture of enemy weapons and supplies. Instead it has created hatred of the United States and strengthened the influence of both North Vietnam and the Viet Cong in Cambodia.

I saw the early development of what appears to be a Cambodian people's movement: the Front Uni de la Nation Khmer, popularly known as FUNK. It is loyal, not to the shaky government of Premier Lon Nol, but to Norodom Sihanouk, who was ousted in a military coup March 18 and now heads a government in exile from Peking and Hanoi.

The American action, when viewed from the enemy's side of the combat zone in Cambodia rather than from Washington or Saigon, appears to be the latest in a series of disastrous moves that have carried the U.S. deeper into the conflict in Indochina ever since 1954. I saw no reasonable prospect of a successful outcome or even of an end to the fighting.

These are some of the impressions that developed as my two fellow prisoners—Miss Elizabeth Pond of the Christian Science Monitor and Michael Morrow of Dispatch News Service International—and I were taken from one hiding place to another. We were well treated as we traveled through a large area of eastern Cambodia where enemy forces appear to operate at will despite the presence of thousands of American and South Vietnamese troops.

Our captors let us keep notes of our experiences, occasionally even going to a village to get a new ball point pen when one of ours wore out. One night in a Cambodian farmer's hut, by the flickering light of a tiny kerosene lamp, I jotted down some of my conclusions. Here is what I wrote:

Three weeks after the United States and South Vietnam crossed the border into Cambodia it appears evident from this vantage point that the results will be the exact opposite of what was intended.

The Cambodian "sanctuaries," far from being wiped out, are being forced to spread out over wider territory, with no foreseeable limit on their westward expansion.

The Cambodian countryside, where most of the population lives, is being radicalized and quickly turned into a massive, dedicated and effective revolutionary base. Already friendly relations between the Cambodian people of the countryside and the Vietnamese revolutionists who have been living and operating here for a decade are being strengthened to form a solid revolutionary front with Sihanouk as its leader and Ho Chi Minh as something approaching a saint.

Above all, what was once properly called the Vietnam War, has been widened to the point where it involves all of former French Indochina, and no limit is in sight either in breadth or duration.

Even if President Nixon keeps his pledge to remove American troops from Cambodia by June 30, the forces of the U.S.-sponsored government of South Vietnam are expected to remain indefinitely on Cambodian soil in an effort to maintain the fragile Lon Nol regime.

Meanwhile, the thunder of B-52 strikes and the frequent rumble of smaller U.S. bombs and artillery foreshadow continued and increasing use of American firepower in Cambodia after the American troops leave. So Asians will be fighting Asians while the U.S. reduces its own casualties by releasing the indiscriminate terror of bombs and shells from the relative safety of the sky and distant fire bases.

It is the full flowering of the Nixon doctrine for cheap victory in Asia. But that is not to say that it will work.

I have seen a massive movement of Cambodians and ethnic Vietnamese, treking westward by night and sleeping in thatched huts by day, in the face of Allied bombing raids and advancing tank and infantry columns.

Instead of a narrow band of safe havens along the eastern frontier for Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops and their Cambodian allies, their zone of operations is spreading over much of rural Cambodia.

The geographic result of Mr. Nixon's strategy is one thing. More important is the political result, evident everywhere we have traveled in Cambodia's so-called liberated territory.

At each plantation or farmer's hut where Beth, Mike and I have been secluded for two or three days at a time, we have seen evidence of allegiance to Sihanouk and of its counterpoint—extreme hatred of the United States and President Nixon.

American shells and bombs mean to Cambodians that the U.S. is waging unprovoked, colonialist war against them. They see America as a would-be successor to the French, trying to turn back the clock of history in the face of a swelling spirit of Asia for Asians.

The war has built empathy among the Cambodians and Laotians for Communist North Vietnam and the Viet Cong.

Those are the notes I wrote that night in Cambodia. The date was May 22, just 15 days after our capture. I still feel as I did then.

There is a great danger of self-delusion by the U.S. in regard to Cambodia. American miliary leaders have long argued that enemy troops can't fight in the monsoon season. But the guerrillas accompanying us made it plain that this was a myth.

Anh Hai, the political leader of our band, told us that the rains, which were starting two weeks before our release on June 15, would mean a change in the pattern of guerrilla life. Few government officials or foreigners would remain with the soldiers, he said, adding, "The soldiers will no longer live with the people in their houses but will go out into the forest and countryside and will begin their rainy-season offensive." The guerrillas like the monsoons because they inhibit Allied aerial attacks.

There is danger, too, of the kind of self-deception we have practiced in connection with the Vietnamese conflict. Official U.S. descriptions of the guerrilla war there as a simple case of aggression from North Vietnam stood in the way of a sensible American approach, if one was possible at all.

The war was far more than it appeared. It contained important elements of a civil struggle. There was an indigenous movement, although, of course, with close ties to North Vietnam.

OVERSIMPLIFIED EXPLANATIONS

An explanation of what is happening in Cambodia may blind the U.S. to an understanding of the reality of the struggle there.

Despite denials by North Vietnam and the Viet Cong, it is clear that both have troops in Cambodia. Our captors made no effort to deny that this was the case. The presence of outside forces was even tacitly admitted in constant references to "solidarity among all the people in Indochina."

It was implied in other things they said. For example, Anh Tu, one of our guards, had been talking one day about the guerrillas' identification with the people of Cambodia. I told him, "I suppose you are familiar with Mao Tse-tung's analogy of fish swimming in the sea." The fish are the guerrillas and the sea, the sympathetic countryside providing information and shelter to the fighters.

"Yes," he replied. "The fish must have the sea, but without the fish the sea is useless."

Although we were convinced that one of our guards was from North Vietnam and another from South Vietnam, all five always described themselves as representatives of FUNK, the Cambodian National Front. On the basis of my experiences, it is difficult to tell how real an organization it is. I saw and heard many indications that it receives substantial military assistance from North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Viet Cong). We could not tell how much political influence or control Hanoi and the NFL exert over FUNK.

It is equally difficult to judge if Sihanouk is a puppet of Hanoi. I suspect he may be. The attitude of the villagers we saw indicated clearly that Sihanouk remains a highly popular leader in Cambodia.

The national front acknowledges that it is Communist-controlled. This came out in an interview that Beth, Mike and I had with the front's local Cambodian military commander on the day before we were set free. He described the front as being "under the direction of the Communist Party in Cambodia." This was a reference to the Khmer Rouge, the Communist faction that long has operated in Cambodia.

Of course, there has been leftist and Communist sentiment in Cambodia for many years, particularly in the "liberated" area in which we were held. But we felt it was being strengthened. The American invasion bolstered the Communists' argument that the U.S., not the guerrilla, is the aggressor that turned a peaceful country into a battleground.

As a result of the war, we saw poverty developing in a land of plenty. In what appeared to be rather frank discussions our guards told us that prices of many things were skyrocketing. They were worried because their rations were cut from 3 cents a day a man in April to one cent in June. The allowance covers the cost of everything but rice, which is provided free. They claimed that the reduction resulted from the increasing number of Cambodians who were joining the front.

Our team of guards was diverse in its makeup; but obviously handpicked for its assignment. Anh Hai, the political chief, was a 25-year veteran of the revolution, and his back bore the scars of bullet wounds from a hundred battles. I was convinced he was a North Vietnamese although he said he was from Hue in South Vietnam.

Anh Ba was a natty soldier with flashy silver-rimmed sunglasses. I believed him to be of delta stock from deep in South Vietnam.

He fought the French in Vietnam for six years, and then after a period in Phnom Penh as a student he rejoined the guerrilla movement in 1960. He was the military tactician, and responsible for our safety.

Anh Tu was a sensitive, rather shy man who left his family to join the revolutionary movement 11 years ago. He said his wife was killed in a bombing raid and that he has had no contact with a young daughter whom he left behind. I had the feeling that he was a member of the Viet Cong.

Anh Qui and Yogi were both Cambodians, although Qui was of Chinese stock. A student from a well-to-do-family, he knew something about Western music. He had joined the revolution only a few months before we were captured.

Yogi enlisted in the front as an ordinary soldier the day before Sihanouk was overthrown in March. He had been an officer in the Cambodian army in a unit guarding Lon Nol, who deposed Sihanouk. He was not a Communist but said he would remain in the front for the duration. He was a rugged, handsome man with curly hair and the deep bronze coloring characteristic of Cambodians. Six gold teeth added more color to his face.

All were in their early or mid-thirties except Anh Qui, who was about 26, and Anh Hai, who was 44. All carried copies of the famous little red book that contains Ho Chi Minh's philosophy of revolution, and they often quoted Uncle Ho.

Our five, who said they had never been assigned together before, became fast friends as they looked after us. On the whole, they seemed to live a happy and comfortable life and probably ate better than most South Vietnamese troops. The big house where we spent several days reminded me of a youth hostel more than a military billet.

FEARS UNJUSTIFIED

In the beginning we were afraid of them. We thought they might shoot us in the back. But all our fears proved to be unjustified. They treated us well and as far as we could tell, they were straightforward in their dealings with us.

They refused our request to be taken to Hanoi or into areas under attack by the Allies. They rejected our repeated requests for information about other Western correspondents captured in Cambodia and about American prisoners of war. At one point they told us that some letters and other things we had been permitted to write had been mailed to America. But it later turned out that nothing except perhaps the letters, had been sent.

They treated us well and looked after our safety, but except for minor matters like lending us a needle and thread, they granted none of the requests we made. They decided everything. We had very little freedom of action.

I saw them as representatives of a tough revolutionary force entirely confident of their success and determined and able to fight on indefinitely.

ORDERLY PROGRESS ON SAFEGUARD SYSTEM SHOULD NOT BE PLACED IN ESCROW

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently, I have noted some rather vague suggestions in various media apparently advocating that we place a key portion of our Nation's future strategic deterrent in something called escrow by postponing all orderly progress on the Safeguard defensive missile system. While "escrow" is a rather useful legal term which is of considerable value in real estate transactions, it has no place in any realistic defense policy. Consequently, I rather doubt that anyone would actually propose such a concept in the form of binding legislation. Nevertheless, I should like to take this opportunity to discuss the matter briefly.

Quite aside from the fact that this course of action would add costs and time, I find it inconceivable that anyone would seriously consider placing American national security in escrow.

Particularly, I cannot believe anybody really wants to deny the President the important SALT bargaining chip of Safeguard just at a time when all public reports tell us progress is being made at Vienna.

I ask those who would place American national security in escrow to take a careful look at Soviet strategic systems. I defy them to find for me a single system that the Soviets have placed in escrow.

The Soviets continue their buildup momentum in numbers of strategic land-based offensive missiles. That is not escrow.

The Soviets continue to test and to deploy ABM launchers and huge ABM radars. That is not escrow.

The Soviets have new bomber aircraft under construction. That is not escrow.

The Soviets are deploying new missile submarines at a steady, methodical pace and at the same time testing new types of submarine-launched missiles. That is now escrow.

The Soviet Navy is steadily increasing in size and is expanding its operations along America's coasts. That is not escrow.

Soviet military research and development costs and programs are increasing as they probe advanced scientific disciplines. That is not escrow.

In short, the Soviets are not approaching SALT by placing a single thing in escrow. Yet, the United States already has limited its numbers of ICBM launchers, retired scores of bombers, placed hundreds of ships in drydock, delayed and stretched out its ABM plans so that even a beginning Safeguard system is years away, and cut billions from the defense budget.

If it is "escrow" somebody wants, I say to them that the United States already is exercising the greatest restraint. We are walking the extra mile for success at SALT. But it would be worse than imprudent; it would be downright dangerous—both for SALT and for the American people—for us to match Soviet momentum with only an escrow Safeguard.

SALT is working. Orderly Safeguard progress is helping it work. Safeguard in total escrow could doom SALT and endanger American lives.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, during the past several months Senators and other concerned Americans have expressed a continuing concern over rising unemployment. As is always the case during times of economic stress, minority groups and young people are hit hardest because they often have less job skills and training than the population as a whole. For this reason, I was particularly disturbed by the Department of Labor's decision to make changes in the out-of-school segment of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. These changes will seriously hamper the program's recruitment efforts as well as its effectiveness in directing low-income high school dropouts toward permanent employment.

We cannot fill job opportunities that are created if we do not have qualified people to hold a job. We cannot talk about "opportunity" if people are not given the tools to realize their potential. The Neighborhood Youth Corps deals with young people who have serious social or emotional problems in getting and keeping jobs. It is vital that no changes be made in the out-of-school program which would prevent it from effectively pursuing this goal.

I have sent to the Secretary of Labor a telegram which outlines my specific objections to the changes to be implemented in the out-of-school program. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD. I urge Senators to join me in this appeal to the Department of Labor.

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

JUNE 26, 1970.

Hon. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

I am writing to urge you to cancel three counterproductive changes proposed for the out-of-school segment of the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) program.

Firstly, the new program design (NYC–2) is laudable for its increased emphasis on remedial education and training, and there certainly is a need to improve this aspect of the out-of-school program and encourage enrollees to return to school. However, by mandating that enrollees can spend no more than ⅓ of their time in work training and the remaining ⅔'s of their time in classrooms, the Labor Department has deprived program directors of the flexibility they need to meet the individual needs of the participants. Moreover, by permitting educational efforts to take precedence over on-the-job training, it would appear that NYC–2 contradicts the will of Congress as expressed in section 123(A)(2) of the Economic Opportunity Act as amended.

Given the nature of the individuals that NYC attempts to train, the approach employed by NYC–2 is unrealistic in that it seeks to return the high school drop-out to an educational environment that he has already rejected. It is unclear how the Labor Department intends to motivate low-income high school drop-outs to go back to school after our entire educational system has, for one reason or another, already failed them.

Secondly, the present program design pays enrollees the minimum hourly wage for the time they spend working and receiving remedial education, usually for a total of thirty hours per week. The new program design pays the enrollee the minimum hourly wage only for the time he is receiving work training, although he also will receive a small stipend for the time he spends in the classroom. In effect, NYC–2 reduces the enrollee's average wage to 97½ cents per hour while increasing the length of time he is required to participate to forty hours per week. This change can only serve to seriously diminish the program's economic incentives and discourage potential enrollees from joining.

The third objectionable aspect of NYC–2 is that it limits enrollment to persons six-

teen and seventeen years of age. As such, the program excludes many individuals who could profit from the type of approach employed by the out-of-school program. I realize that an attempt has been made to incorporate persons eighteen years of age and older into other programs. However, a survey of a number of NYC program directors conducted by my staff has revealed that manpower programs cited by the Labor Department as likely to absorb older youth were either nonexistent in many areas of New York State or already filled to capacity with long waiting lists. Also, the current rise in unemployment has seriously hampered manpower programs that cooperate with the private sector. Finally, almost all of the programs cited by the Labor Department in this regard lacked the vital supportive services that are provided by the out-of-school program.

I recognize that the percentage of youths succssfully directed towards permanent employment by the out-of-school program has not always been consistently high. In this instance, however, statistics can be deceiving. NYC deals with young people who have serious social, mental or emotional problems in getting and keeping jobs. Because these individuals would most likely join the ranks of the hard-core unemployed or underemployed, even a modest rate of success would indicate that the program is serving the purpose for which it was created.

The aspects of NYC–2 described above will have an adverse effect upon the goals and recruitment efforts of the out-of-school program. At a time when unemployment is on the rise, I feel it would be unwise to implement any changes in the NYC program which might reduce its effectiveness in rehabilitating people who would almost certainly be unemployable were it not for the out-of-school program. Accordingly, I urge you to rescind those sections of NYC–2 which exclude persons over eighteen years of age and preclude enrollees from devoting more than ⅓ of their time to work experience. In addition, I urge that out-of-school participants be paid the minimum hourly wage for the entire time they participate in the program.

CHARLES E. GOODELL,
U.S. Senate.

IMPORT CURBS VERSUS FREE TRADE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the millions of workers whose wages are tied directly or indirectly to the U.S. textile industry are grateful the Nixon administration has given its support to the Mills bill pending in the U.S. House of Representatives.

However, as this legislation moves through the Congress we will no doubt hear a lot about free trade and how it is imperiled by the Mills bill.

An excellent editorial in the Tuesday, June 30, 1970, issue of the State newspaper in Columbia, S.C., deals effectively with this issue. This is done by pointing to the recent remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) who said free trade is a two-way street, otherwise it is not free trade.

Mr. President, I will let the editorial speak for itself. The editors of the State newspaper are to be commended for such forceful and sensible words. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

IMPORT CURBS SHOULD NOT DAMAGE FOREIGN RELATIONS

At long last, the Nixon administration has flashed the green light for textile import curbs. It has come not a moment too soon. American textile jobs are being washed away every day by the flood of imports from the Far East.

It is therefore imperative that the House finish work on the bill, chiefly sponsored by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, and that the Senate, which seems to prefer debates of limited purpose to substantive action, give the legislation priority attention.

We can expect more speeches, of course, to the effect that this bill is protectionist, that it goes counter to America's long commitment to free trade. Perhaps it is, to an extent, but it must be remembered that the United States is about the only real free trader in the world today.

New Hampshire Sen. Norris Cotton made this point most forcefully in a major speech in support of the Mills bill two weeks ago.

"The free flow of goods—free trade—should be our goal. At present, we do not have a free flow of goods. Every nation with whom we trade has, in some form and to some extent, barriers against American goods—tariffs, quotas, import licenses and so on. We alone raise no such barriers . . . Free trade must be a two-way street; otherwise it is not free trade."

There has been a good, solid, historic reason for America's big-hearted view toward international trade. For decades, the United States has been the world's economic and industrial Goliath. After World War II, we set out to rebuild the shattered economies of Europe and Japan. We could afford to take a generous view and we repeatedly gave up more in trade negotiations than we received.

This attitude helped our friends and allies abroad to regain their economic strength. As strong foreign competitors appeared in virtually every industry, American Presidents were reluctant to risk damage to foreign relations by taking a stronger stand in trade negotiations, by administratively restraining imports undercutting U.S. industry, or by supporting legislation to do this.

But, as Senator Cotton has said, "the world of the 1970s is a very different world from the one we knew in the past. We can no longer afford to squander economic advantage for uncertain political or foreign relations gains."

The Japanese, who have raised the greatest hue and cry over the Mills bill, are in no position to charge the United States with protectionism. While Japan's own bustling industries have a well-protected corner on the rich home market, that nation has built up a $1.5 billion annual trade surplus with the United States, which of course poses a terrific strain on the dollar.

Furthermore, the Nixon administration, and its predecessors, have negotiated in good faith with the Japanese over a long period of time in an effort to gain voluntary controls over imports of woolens and man-made fibers (items covered by the Mills bill). The Japanese have been unyielding, even after it was all but certain that they were forcing Congress' hand. When the last round of talks collapsed last week, the Administration had only one responsible course of action left—support the Mills bill.

Senator Cotton believes this will impose no foreign relations risk. "Rather, I suspect we will gain further respect from them (the Japanese). They are able competitors and they are known to respect strength in those they deal with in business and government."

The Mills bill will not by any means shut Japan and other Far East exporters of cut-rate textiles out of the American market. It will merely limit imports to allow the severely damaged American textile industry to recover. Furthermore, the Mills bill has a handy clause which will exclude from its provisions any country which negotiates voluntary restraints. It will be, in effect, a lever, a bargaining tool.

We will be very surprised indeed if the Japanese or other nations attempt any serious reprisals as a result of this legislation. They need us and we need them. They must learn to sympathize with our problems as we sympathize with theirs. The relationship is too strong and the business too good to make a trade war likely.

"SPEED"

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, on June 21, the New York Times magazine published a disturbing article on the abuse of a category of drugs collectively known as "speed." Of late, Federal, State, and local efforts have concentrated on halting the spread of heroin and other hard narcotics. Marihuana has been widely used and more widely discussed, but little attention has been given to the effects of amphetamines and other soft drugs.

Often used as diet aides and pep pills, varieties of speed are manufactured by the billions in the United States. "Speed" users do not fit society's stereotype of the addict for they are most commonly middle-class mothers, professionals, truckdrivers, secretaries, students, and the like.

In the face of the threat of drug abuse, the optimal approach, it seems to me, is embodied in S. 2921, the Drug Abuse and Marihuana Services Act of 1969, which I have introduced. That measure aims at prevention of drug abuse, and provides for a comprehensive rehabilitation services program for the person whom society has been unable to aid prior to his addiction.

Mr. Jonathan Black's article, entitled "The 'Speed' That Kills—or Worse," is illuminating and terrifying. In the hope that it will alert more people to the menace posed by amphetamine abuse, I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE "SPEED" THAT KILLS—OR WORSE

(By Jonathan Black)

In his senior year at college, Norman found himself with an unfinished thesis and a deadline only two days away. No-Doz pried his eyes open, but his brain seemed to turn to rubber after hours of typing. So his slightly overweight girl friend came up with some little yellow diet pills, 10 milligrams apiece. With the first pill, Norman's mind clicked into gear and his fingers pattered over the keyboard as intricate insights streamed out of his head. After 10 hours he took a break and cleaned out all the drawers of his desk, arranged the pens and pencils in precise parallels, and stacked all his books so that the bottom corners were exactly even. Then he slid the pile so it coincided perfectly with the right angle at the corner of his desk. He stared at the pile for 20 minutes. Then he popped another pill, whistled through 10 more hours of typing and polished up the conclusion of his thesis with some more rather arcane insights. Norman drank half a quart of orange juice, emptied the icebox, and cleaned out all the shelves. Then he retyped some earlier pages which a dirty eraser had smudged, called up his girl and chattered gaily for 40 minutes. Then Norman passed out for 10 hours with dreams of an A in his head. He got a B-plus.

Norman was speeding, but well under the limit. "Speed" is the street name for amphetamines and amphetamine-related drugs, drugs which act as stimulants to the central nervous system. Norman's flirtation with speed, and his drug-induced reactions, are not at all unusual. Amphetamines are commonly used by students and housewives and G.I.'s and truck drivers and tax lawyers. Increasingly, however, speed is also being abused by students and housewives and G.I.'s and truck drivers and tax lawyers—not to mention members of the drug culture.

Unlike barbiturates, which are "downs," amphetamines are "ups." They are energizers that kill the desire to eat and sleep, speed up the heart, and deliver a neural charge to the cortex. Precisely how they work is uncertain. One theory holds that they act directly on nerve-circuit receptors; a more widely held view is that amphetamines act indirectly by releasing chemicals at the synapse—the juncture of two nerve ends that carries the impulse from one nerve to the other.

The most basic amphetamine compound—1-phenyl-2-aminopropane—is marketed Benzedrine. The *d* form* of that compound, dextroamphetamine sulphate, is known as Dexedrine; if a methyl group is added onto the final nitrogen atom, the molecule becomes *d*-desoxyn, or Methedrine. The two *d*-amphetamine compounds are more potent than Benzedrine, but there is no chemical evidence to support the widespread street myth that Methedrine is any more powerful than Dexedrine.

Cocaine, an alkaloid extracted from dried cocoa leaves, produces almost identical symptoms, though of shorter duration, when taken intravenously. The opiate derivatives like heroin and morphine, differ in that they produce drowsiness and lethargy. Marijuana can bring on an alert euphoria that approximates the effects of small doses of amphetamines.

Psychedelic or hallucinogenic drugs, like LSD and mescaline, are much more selective than amphetamines in their stimulation of the central nervous system. However, amphetamines may also produce hallucinations at certain stages of intoxication or withdrawal. And other drug confections, brewed up by underground "cooks" and labeled with such initials as D.O.M. and S.T.P., often mimic speed and bridge the gap between amphetamines and hallucinogens.

Amphetamines are a sprawling family, marketed by several large pharmaceutical companies under about 75 brand names for over-the-counter sales. With a prescription, amphetamines are completely legal and very cheap—about 5 cents per 5-milligram tablet. Besides selling as Methedrine, Desoxyn, Benzedrine and Dexedrine, they may be combined with barbiturates under such trade names as Desbutal and Dexamyl or, abroad, Preludin and Ritalin. On the street and in the black market, speed is "splash," "crank," "rhythm," "meth" or "crystal" (the last term referring to the pure powdered form of methamphetamine hydrochloride).

Thousands and probably millions use amphetamines without becoming wild-eyed "speed freaks." They drop pills to finish papers, wax floors, lose weight, write songs, sing songs, have conferences, sculpt, wake up and think more clearly. When amphetamines were first synthesized in 1927, they were intended solely as a decongestant in the treatment of bronchial asthma. They are now prescribed for a minimum of other uses: to treat obesity, mild depressions and rarer occurrences of narcolepsy, and to treat hyperkinetic brain-damaged children. As antidepressants, amphetamines are beneficial only for a matter of days. Then a tolerance builds, and larger doses only bring on the risk of dependence and deeper depression. As diet pills, amphetamines can produce a maximum weight loss of 5 to 10 pounds over several weeks, most studies report, although some doctors question even that figure, crediting it to a placebo effect. Any attempt to lose more weight by using speed can open the Pandora's box of amphetamine abuse.

The term "abuse" is more accurate than "addiction"; in fact, amphetamines appear not to be physically addictive. Because the body quickly builds up a tolerance to the drug, however, doses must be escalated to maintain the high. Eventually, a pill-popper may be drawn to snorting (sniffing amphetamine powder) or "shooting" (injecting speed into the veins). Speed freaks may experience the physical withdrawal cravings common to narcotics addicts, but for the most part it is the psychological vise of the drug that turns users into abusers and abusers into "addicts." Speed stretches the emotional sine curve; euphoric peaks are followed by troughs that are unbearable wells of despair and depression. The desire to duplicate the first and the need to avoid the second—the "crash"—leads to the amphetamine habit.

The speed epidemic blossomed about three years ago in San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district and quickly popped up in the nation's other hippie drug haven, New York's East Village. Quiet flower children became ravaged scarecrows. The cannibalism of speed was easy to spot: emaciated bodies cocked in twisted postures; caved-in jaws, grinding and grinding; pockmarked skin, torn and scratched and white, and a constant talking, talking, talking.

Amphetamine abuse has leveled off in the Haight and the East Village. Nationwide, however, speed abuse is increasing, and the amphetamine industry booms. Ten billion pills are produced annually, about 50 tablets for every man, woman and child in the United States. That is about three times the production of barbiturates. Amphetamine drugs account for about 8 per cent of all prescriptions filled in the United States, according to one estimate.

At least half of that production is diverted into illicit sales, via fake prescriptions, fake doctors and manufacturers who just want to unload their pills. A recent investigation by the House Select Committee on Crime revealed that a pharmaceutical firm had shipped 1.5 million amphetamines to a Mexican "wholesaler" whose address turned out to be the 11th hole of the Tijuana Country Club. "If it's that easy to fool a pharmaceutic firm," commented Representative Jerome R. Waldie, Democrat of California, "I fear even to hazard a guess as to how many millions of pills find their way into the black market."

The quantity of illegally manufactured speed rivals the amount that is produced legally and then diverted illicitly. On the "home factory" level, the Food and Drug Administration reports, "speed is the most popular drug of clandestine chemists." Of 36 underground drug labs raided since last July, the F.D.A. says the majority were involved in the manufacture of meth. In a year-end survey of 10 national districts, the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control of the F.D.A. reported illegal speed "readily available" in five major areas: New York, Chicago, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Dallas and Seattle. Only three areas reported any scarcity, and there were no statistics from California, the speed capital of the world. Dr. David Smith of the Haight-Ashbury Free Medical Clinic, a street-speed expert, says: "There isn't a place in the United States where speed doesn't exist."

Manufacturers range from the small street dealer with a "bathroom" lab, selling ounces to support a habit, to the large distributor with a weekly profit measured in the thousands of dollars. Predictably, the quality of underground speed varies. Police raided an East Village lab in New York recently and discovered a $500,000 operation churning out meth. "He was making Ajax," complained one former customer. "One shot and you turned into a raisin."

Death from an overdose of speed is rare. The record for injection of speed within a single 24-hour period goes to one young man who survived 15,000 milligrams or about 1,000 times any medically sanctioned dosage. It is possible to "overamp," of course, but there is only scattered evidence to support the caution "Speed kills" directly. Speed freaks do commit suicide (a celebrated Lower East Sider recently "fell" off the roof of a six-floor tenement), contract hepatitis and other deadly liver diseases, or occasionally OD (overdose) on heroin or barbiturates while attempting to "come down" from too much speed.

Speed maims and destroys, however. Large doses create extreme suspiciousness and hyperactivity, which often combine to produce a hostile, belligerent temper. "There are no gentle folk on speed," says one ex-user. "They all turn vicious." Dr. John Kramer of the California Rehabilitation Center in Corona reports that "most high-dose amphetamine users describe involvement in episodes in which murder or mayhem was avoided by the slimmest of margins." And a study in the Haight described the difficulties many users have in obtaining speed, and the necessity for "rip-offs" (thefts): "This kind of activity related to the marketplace, coupled with the paranoia induced by long runs on speed, accounts for the excessive amount of violence which prevails in a speed-using community."

In small doses amphetamines do enable greater concentration. But the line between "enough" and "too much" is fragile, and even a single pill can befuddle. "I recall taking one 5-milligram tablet of dextroamphetamine," says Dr. Sidney Cohen of the National Institute of Mental Health, "and I was high and jittery for eight hours." Often, speed produces a grotesque hyperconcentration. Dr. John Griffith, a leading amphetamine researcher, reports: "A graduate student hired as a temporary employe was discovered to be a chronic amphetamine user. This was first suspected when, after being asked to comment on a minor research project, he turned out a 453-page book which was largely unintelligible."

Even the increase in mechanical dexterity under amphetamines is more than offset by the bizarre perceptions that guide that dexterity. One speed freak, attempting to fix a radio, dismantled 12 other perfectly good radios and couldn't put any of them back together. Subjective "brilliance" is often warped by obsessive compulsions. For every apocryphal college student who memorized an astronomy book on speed while coasting to a Phi Beta Kappa, there is the sad story of his friend who wrote a stunning final exam, but all on the first line of his blue book. A speed freak in the quiescent phase may string beads interminably, pour out endless writings, empty a purse for hours, or sit curled in a chair and fill every corner of a piece of paper with tiny, intricate, repeating curlicues.

Speed becomes most dangerous when ingested by snorting or shooting. The size of intravenous doses is awesome: single injections of as much as 500 and 1,000 milligrams per syringe are often repeated every few hours. The advantage in shooting speed, besides the enormous amount of the drug that can be slammed through a needle, is the enveloping "rush" that comes as the drug wallops into the central nervous system. In his "Underground Journal," Herbert Huncke, guru to the early Beats, writes:

"I felt it almost instantly, and the rush to my head like a short circuit. My body began to pulsate or grow tiny antennae all quiver-

*A term used by organic chemists to distinguish between two molecules of identical atomic components but different structure.

ing in anticipation—and my aliveness took on new substance and was alerted to the waves of energetic forces sweeping around me. My personal force developed an awareness and it was as though I would receive communication at telepathic level. The surroundings were already capable of absorbing force, drive, spirit, and the flow of magic sensed, never seen. I was thoroughly elated."

Speed is a tempting siren. Unlike first experiences with many hard drugs, those with speed are almost always pleasurable. Many users step up the dosage simply to duplicate that first gorgeous rush. Then, as the body builds up tolerance, the dosage must be increased still more. On high doses, sleep becomes impossible, and the somewhat irregular life style of the casual amphetamine abuser is swallowed up into the splintered world of the speed freak in a debilitating series of "runs" and "crashes."

The crash can trigger a state of intense irritability or despair. To avoid it, the speeder may take some "downs" in an effort to sleep—or take more speed. This solution can lead to typical runs of from several days on up to one or two weeks. During that period it is impossible to sleep or eat—food literally cannot be swallowed—and speed's cannibalism of the body begins: "I knew I was dying," one speeder recalls. "My tongue was shredded, my lips were cracked, the whole inside of my mouth was eaten out. My skin was itching all over, my fingernails were flaking off, and my hair and teeth seemed to be falling out."

"Speed is a hundred times more dangerous than heroin," says one amphetamine researcher at Rockefeller University. "A lifetime intravenous drip of pure heroin would produce no medical damage." But speed knocks out the body's defenses by pushing it beyond the limits of endurance with hyperactivity while depriving it of rest and nourishment. Common speed damage includes colds, infections, muscle tremors, cardiac problems, nausea, cramps, respiratory difficulties and hepatitis—the last not only a frequent result of using unsterile needles but probably stemming in part from the toxicity of Methedrine itself. Malnutrition symptoms appear without exception, and there is a high incidence of minor accidents: cuts, scratches, sprains and bruises.

Besides the physical destruction, there is the psychic damage. Although amphetamines provide a brief glow of potency and confidence, the other end of the saw is nothingness:

"I make lots of plans, but I don't ever carry any of them out," says one speed freak. "I get into this megalomaniac bag about five hours into speed, and I'll build these mountainous castles in my mind, all the far-out things I'm going to do, and all the money I'm going to make. I'll be driving a Rolls-Royce and have two speed labs going at once, a heroin refining plant, my own private two-engine plane. I'll be running the Mafia. And when I start to come down I realize that none of it is going to exist and it's like someone pulled the bottom out of your brain. I feel empty and suicidal in about four or five hours."

Heavy speeding invariably produces two psychic nightmares: hallucinations and paranoia. The hallucinations go beyond gentle spiritual probes and sumptuous psychedelic distortion; they are bizarre and mystical and violent, mimicking the traits of a schizoid psychosis:

"I saw energy patterns in the air," a speeder said, "and eventually began to see people no one else saw. They'd walk into shadows of buildings and disappear. Two out of every three people I saw didn't exist. I'd see them come dancing down the street, out from cars. I refused to believe I was hallucinating—I never hallucinated on acid or D.M..T. or S.T.P., and I was dropping two and three tabs (amphetamine tablets) a day—so I started reading up on antimatter physics. I developed a theory of antimen, A-men, and I was in contact with them, I was their leader. I began building machines out of television sets so I could contact them on other planets and in other galaxies, but men with motorcycles would dive around my house and up the walls and order me to stop."

One common hallucination is that one's body is infested with sores and vermin. "When I was speeding," says one resident at Phoenix House, a therapeutic drug community on Manhattan's Upper West Side, "I'd look at my skin and it was all moving and crawling. There were millions of bugs and pimples and scars. I'd pick at them, tear at my skin, and later I'd look at my skin and I'd destroyed myself." More compulsive speed freaks commonly attack themselves with tweezers, and have been known to cut away pieces of flesh.

Paranoia seems to occur almost without exception. This is not the everyday paranoia about tapped wires and plainclothes policemen and the unhidden stash, but a full-blown terror of The Plot, of pursuit by criminals, gangs, the Mafia, assassins, the devil, friends and relatives. It is the terror of buildings falling, rooms and tunnels collapsing, the terror that everyone knows exactly what you are thinking all the time, that you are being watched and followed and discussed, that you are the center of attention of complete strangers. "Two guys would be walking toward me on the sidewalk," says one speed freak, "and one would say to the other, 'You better not do that,' but he was talking to me. And two more strangers would come by, and one would say, 'I don't think that's a very good idea,' and he was looking at me." Eventually the paranoia causes such eccentricity of behavior that the speed freak is likely to be carted off to Bellevue, as in the case of one terrified man who was recently found by police cowering in a truck under the West Side Highway, or another who was attempting to stop traffic on the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway under the delusion that he was being pursued by the Mafia and had to get help.

One of the most intriguing qualities of speed in large doses is its ability to trigger symptoms mirroring those of paranoid schizophrenia. It was in 1958 that Dr. P. H. Connell published a classic monograph, "Amphetamine Psychosis," reporting his study of 42 patients at five British hospitals. Connell's conclusion: "The clinical picture is primarily a paranoid psychosis with ideas of reference, delusions of persecution, auditory and visual hallucinations in a setting of clear consciousness. . . . The mental picture may be indistinguishable from acute or chronic paranoid schizophrenia."

Since then, scholarly debate has been quietly raging in medical journals over two questions: Is amphetamine psychosis actually created by the drug or does it only precipitate an undetected schizophrenia? Second, is the amphetamine psychosis a "true" psychosis, or are there differences, such as a lack of auditory hallucinations, or a lack of genuine thought disorders? Bellevue speeders between 1966 and 1968 tended to confirm Connell's findings. Hallucinations and thought disorders were correlated with urine tests, which can determine the amount of amphetamines in the blood; it appeared that hallucinations peaked in the most advanced states of toxicity.

Recently, experimenters have attempted to induce the psychosis in controlled hospital settings. At Bellevue, for example, four experienced amphetamine abusers, all judged nonschizophrenic, were given closely monitored doses of methamphetamine, and their reactions and behavior recorded. One subject was given 595 milligrams over a 46-hour period. Here are some descriptions of his reactions, as logged by the experimenters:

"Slight headache. Talking about manliness and Thomas Wolfe. 'He had being a man in the palm of his hand.' 'That book was his guts,' etc.

"Tearfully discusses mother's promiscuity, abandonment by parents and grandfather, wife's infidelity, and homosexual attacks by relatives.

"Hostile to nursing staff, and feels that their attitude is disparaging. Unaware of his own provocativeness.

"Agitated philosophic diatribe with riddles that make little sense.

"Returns from patients' movie after a half-hour, frightened. Feels he can judge at a glance which patients are dangerous and 'sensed the presence of danger' at the movie.

"Speaking of revelations but is unable to explain what has been revealed.

"Writing and talking excitedly, constantly.

"Preaching loud and constantly. Content as above.

"Preaching at maximum volume. Unable to cooperate with interviews or psychological testing. Amphetamine cut."

Not all speed freaks manifest the acute dislocations of amphetamine psychosis. A few have worked out weekend "binges," and hold down 9-to-5 jobs in between. Others simply resist the temptation of massive doses, or of upping the ante by snorting or shooting—happily protected by their middle-class squeamishness about needles. That inhibition, however, is beginning to disappear with the enveloping drug promiscuity, and it is also possible to become quite adequately freaked out by dropping a handful of mother's little diet pills.

In addition, speed encourages the use of other drugs, not just out of a desire for further experimentation, but specifically to come down from over-amping. Barbiturates are widely used, but frequently orally taken doses may not act strongly enough, and the speeder turns to shooting heroin or barbiturates. When injected, barbiturates are peculiarly dangerous because they can collapse veins and, if veins are missed, can produce dangerous abscesses.

When the ups and downs, the physical deterioration and the paranoia become too overwhelming, many speed freaks try to stop. For some, it can be surprisingly easy. For others, it is impossible; even the worsening trip is not enough to offset the psychological dependence induced by the drug.

Those who can stop usually recover remarkably, although it may take months. There are some, however, who feel that something in their heads has been permanently affected, and they usually say it is the memory. There has been experimental evidence that animals have suffered permanent brain damage from heavy amphetamine doses, and studies following a "speed epidemic" in Japan several years ago point to possibility of similar brain-cell changes in man. Any number of speed freaks feel a vague emotional certainty that they are branded for life, such as one girl at Phoenix House who described her unresolved drug odyssey:

"I've done everything, shot everything, but I flipped out on speed. I would do three days of speed, and then shoot heroin to come down, and then do more speed to get up. But even when you're clean, you still carry around the habit. My nerves are so shot, sometimes in encounter [group therapy] all I can do is shake."

It becomes more and more difficult to characterize the typical amphetamine abuser, though certain occupational groups stand out. One study found widespread amphetamine abuse highest among medical personnel, with housewives and "nocturnal workers" ranking second and third. The study also found amphetamine abuse high in various underworld callings—among petty thieves, convicts, and prostitutes. "Successful" criminals, however, were reported unlikely to be involved with speed. At Bellevue, the mean

age in a survey of 60 amphetamine abusers was 25. Most had police records, and about one-third had heavy drinking histories. "They're sure as hell not flower children," says Bellevue's speed expert, Dr. Burton Angrust. "They're tough and psychotic. Delinquents. What we used to call hoods."

A soon-to-be published report on the Interstate Commerce Commission by Ralph Nader and his Raiders finds an alarming dependence on habit-forming drugs (mostly Bennies) among truckers: "Almost 80 per cent of the drivers in our survey described the use of such drugs as 'widespread.' They disclosed that 'Hey, you got a pill?' is now a most common question among drivers at truck stops and terminals. Occasionally, drivers have prescriptions; more often, they get the pills from the black market, from truck stops, and from other drivers. Some use their wives' reducing pills. . . . After getting hopped up on pills, some drivers often need liquor to relax in order to sleep."

Although it is difficult to document, one subgroup, homosexuals, appear to be overrepresented among speedsters. The Bellevue survey noted an abnormally high ratio of homosexuals among amphetamine-abuse patients. It seems more likely that speed appeals to the gay world, rather than that the drug has any power of sexual conversion. Any harassed "outcast" group might turn to speed, with its promise of confidence and power. The psychotic drug paranoia of speed may replicate the paranoia inflicted on homosexuals by straight society; perhaps it is easier to live with the paranoia induced by drugs than that induced by sex. And in the freaked-out world of heavy speed use, being gay is at worst a sprout of eccentricity in a riotous garden of psychosis.

Speed is still not a ghetto drug, however, and probably will never be. Heroin makes the junkie oblivious to rats and roaches and garbage; speed only makes him acutely aware of his surroundings. Financial considerations, too, prevent speed from becoming popular in the ghetto. Like the heroin addict, the speed freak often works up a costly habit, and the poor must hustle to pay for drugs. Although speed and junk are in the same street price range, the junkie is relatively cool between hits. But the speed freak is generally so completely disorientated and trapped on his private, paranoiac 24-hour treadmill that hustling is out of the question.

While some speed freaks get high alone, many are part of groups. One reason is that the life style of the heavy speed user does not exactly coincide with that of the nonspeed world. Speeders have their own language, their own rituals, their own disjointed schedule. Also, speed for many is a social drug; the changes it induces often demand an audience. Finally, the dedicated speed freak inevitably reaches a state of such acute psychic dislocation that he becomes incoherent and intolerable to anyone but another incoherent, intolerable speed freak.

New York City probably has had more than its share of off-beat amphetamine sets in the "cultural underground." One, the Theater of the Ridiculous, paid in-group tribute to the speed legacy with a recent production "from the Crystal Amphetamine Room of the Heroin Hilton." There is also the Warhol set, with its coterie of superstars, its tapes, movies, performances, and, most recently, the book "a."

And for jet-set exotica, there was the group of celebrated actors, writers, musicians and public figures who poured in and out of the Frankenstein lab of "Dr. Feelgood," one of New York's fabled Park Avenue "vitamin doctors." There speed and any number of novel concoctions were injected by the glassful. Ultimately, the bizarre activities reached such a level that even Dr. Feelgood's most obsessive patients were forced to drop out. "My last shot," recalls a survivor of one of those final sessions, "was a blood-red thing about a foot long. I went blind for two days, and when my eyesight finally came back, I threw away all my speed and hung up my works on the livingroom lampshade."

Two years ago, Dr. Donald Louria, author of "The Drug Scene," predicted it was only a matter of years before speed became America's No. 1 drug problem. He now says he has had to qualify that ominous prophecy because of the unforeseen phenomenon of multidrug abuse. The most surprising development over the last few years has been the "give-me-Librium-or-give-me-meth" syndrome within the drug culture, the supermarket spree from drug to drug.

Drugs are being brewed together in unholy combinations and cut with virtually anything that comes to hand; more and more new drugs, especially psychedelics, are being churned out in labs. And certain drugs—once untouchable—are becoming fashionable. "The social stigma of the junkie is gone," said one staff member at Phoenix House. "A year ago, heroin was a dumb thing. Now junk's cool."

Nevertheless, despite the multidrug spree, the Louria prediction about speed's growing popularity was not far wrong. "I emphasize that there has been a major and substantial increase in amphetamine use and abuse in the drug subculture, on college campuses and on Wall Street," testified the Haight-Ashbury Clinic's David Smith before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics. "And if you had to pick out a drug with which you should be most concerned, it should be amphetamine, because this is a drug that is completely out of control in our society."

Speed is every bit as lethal as heroin, although its toll may not show up as directly as in the weekend body counts of heroin overdoses. But, because amphetamines have a twilight medical legitimacy, most drug laws are lenient about speed. In New York City, for instance, the possession of any amount of speed—even with acknowledged intent to sell—is punishable only as a misdemeanor with a maximum of one year in jail. With heroin, possession of one-eighth of an ounce is a felony, and possession of more than one pound can mean a life sentence. For the year 1969, 77.8 per cent of all drug arrests made by the New York City Narcotics Bureau were for heroin, and only 0.2 per cent for amphetamines and hallucinogens.

The United States is not the only country to endure the amphetamine carnage. Japan's troubles have been mentioned; England has had a seesawing heroin/speed problem and in Canada the use of amphetamines is growing. Sweden's troubles with speed have reached crisis proportions in recent years. In 1965, Sweden attempted to halt the growing illegal use of speed by making Preludin available to everyone, free and without a prescription. Instead of stemming the tide of amphetamine abuse, legalization doubled the number of addicts in two years. Cases of hepatitis increased more than twofold. In 1967, the experiment was ended, but Sweden's speed problem remained, and there is no end in sight.

Right now the United States seems to be on a heroin binge. But drug use is faddish and cyclical, and speed is probably more popular now than ever. "In the winter," explained one East Villager, "I switch to heroin so I won't catch pneumonia. In the spring I go back to speed."

INCREASED FEDERAL FUNDING NEEDED FOR HEALTH RESEARCH

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I submitted to a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations presided over by the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) on the need for increased Federal funding for health research.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HATFIELD

Mr. Chairman, I hope this subcommittee will change the apparent future course of medical history.

In a move to fight inflation caused by a war-heated economy the Federal Government has cut back support for medical research. The rationale employed for this affront to medical science is that we now need to concentrate our efforts and funds on the *delivery* of health care and forego initiating research projects. Medical scientists in Oregon have assured me that this national goal of securing the delivery of health services is long overdue and is heralded by the medical field.

However, these same Oregon scientists hasten to add that it is our great misfortune to curtail funding of basic research at instiutions of learning to release funds for delivery. We need both research and delivery. We need an emphasis on both. We need a commensurate financial commitment.

It is the research carried out at centers of learning that has provided the latest clinical techniques, methods of detection, treatment, and preventives which have enabled universities to take the lead in creating community health centers, training more health personnel, and extending good medical care into the ghetto and general community.

Dr. Philip Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences, in his excellent summary of the plight of science today and the erosion and disaffection it has suffered in the public eye, has noted that delivery of health care cannot be carried out at the expense of curtailing research and investigation: "Even if the $1 billion Federal contribution to biomedical research and education were diverted to improvement of health care, it could have but trivial impact thereon, while a vital national resource, our biomedical research capability, would be destroyed."

The losses medical research and society have suffered already at this point in time are staggering. For the last four fiscal years the reduction in effort or capability in our research institutions has been of the order of 25%. We must see to it that the pendulum will swing back this year and favor medical research, restoring it to the priority position it deserves.

Today I wish to address my remarks to the damage done by cutbacks in medical research in Oregon and elsewhere, with particular emphasis to the field of cancer.

What has this federal cutback in research funds meant in Oregon? Dr. William K. Riker, Professor and Chairman, Department of Pharmacology, from the University of Oregon Medical School, tells me that the federal cutback in research support has reduced the indirect cost income of the University of Oregon Medical School by more than $100,000 this year. At the same time, Oregon is a small population state, with a small budget that has had to trim its support of the Medical School by 1½% in order to combat inflation. In Dr. Riker's Department a training grant renewal application was "approved" but not funded, adversely affecting three graduate students. Four of seven staff members find themselves without research grant support. The heavy burden falls on the school itself to somehow come up with these funds—and this will only occur at the expense of other desirable goals and programs.

Dr. Riker points out the high irony of the Administration fighting inflation by ham-

pering the interwoven complex of teaching and research in medicine whose goals are to train more doctors and find better treatments and preventives, which will in turn save us billions in the delivery of health services.

At this point I include excerpts of Dr. Riker's letter, which eloquently describes the plight of biomedicine at the hands of a Federal Government bent on treating health crisis problems by fiscal blood-letting:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., June 19, 1970.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Your telegram arrived shortly before a scheduled UOMS Executive Faculty meeting, at which we learned that the cutback in research support by the Federal government has reduced the indirect cost income of this school by more than $100,000 this year. This significant loss and the State's budget reduction of 1½%, coupled with the increasing inflationary spiral, leads all of us to believe that the New York Times article of June 9, 1970, "Medical Schools Reported in Trouble", is the understatement of the year.

Biomedicine, the interwoven complex of teaching and research in medicine and its allied fields, is on the verge of a terminal illness which the Federal physician seems bent on treating by fiscal blood-letting. The wounds in our department alone may not heal. A training grant renewal application was "approved" but not funded, abruptly cutting off support for three graduate students in the middle of their careers. Fortunately, this school's humanism will assure their continued support, though obviously at the expense of other desirable goals and programs. Four of our seven staff members are without research grant support; prospects of their obtaining support in the future are remote indeed!

This vignette of one department's problems is multiplied and magnified many times in all American medical schools today. The serious cuts in Federal support of research and training are now having their impact on the educational objectives of medical schools. The need for more faculty, to meet the demands that we train more physicians, is not going to be realized, simply because the medical schools do not have the money. Moreover, it is inevitable that schools will also *lose* faculty, as some have already done, because of salary cutbacks. The University of Pennsylvania has imposed an 8% cut in faculty salaries, and the University of California will have no salary increases this year. The latter, because of inflation, obviously represents a real salary cut. Oregon, at the moment, is not at this desperate stage, but I am certain our relative good fortune is only temporary.

The reasons for this Federal schizophrenia, in which the government demands more physicians and greater delivery of health care while fiscally emasculating the training and health care centers, are admittedly complex. They are, I believe, most lucidly stated by Dr. Phillip Handler in his article "Science and the Federal government: which way to go" (Federation Proceedings, 29:1089–1097 (Copy enclosed)). Essentially, he states that there is some disenchantment because of strident voices, within the scientific community, which have reached the public and legislative ear with a denouncement of technology, and without any recognition of man's beneficial and noble scientific achievements.

Some disenchantment also stems from the fact that some "spokesmen" for science, self-appointed or real, have made unwise promises to the Federal government about *imminent* practical applications of scientific research; promises which could not be kept. I doubt that many of these men really understood biomedicine. The simple facts are these: (1) Fundamental research is the cornerstone of practical technology, and the development of the latter from the former is inevitable. No one can possibly predict, however, whether that development will take one year or a millenium. (2) Scientific research, training, and teaching are inseparable, interdependent components of excellent medical education. If one of these three legs is cut off, the entire structure topples. The current preeminence of American biomedicine stems directly from our recognition, heretofore, of the need for all three legs.

Though this is a letter from a single individual, I am confident that I speak also for a constituency in urging you to salvage American medical education at this critical time by pressing for healthy levels of Federal support for research, training, and teaching.

On behalf of all members of this department, I extend also an appreciation for your awareness of the problems, and your communication with us. If we can be of any consultative aid to you, in regard to health, education, drug and drug control legislation, we are at your service.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,
WILLIAM K. RIKER, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman.

The Government is out of touch with reality when on the one hand it demands more physicians and greater delivery of health care and on the other hand cuts off support to these training and health care centers.

Dr. Robert Campbell, Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Director of the Renal Metabolic Research Laboratory at the University of Oregon Medical School also pleads the case for basic research funding when he discusses the personnel needs of universities. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the Administration to train more doctors, and to concentrate on quantity because it's cheaper cannot be done at the expense of quality training. Our physicians today need to know a great deal more than they formerly did, and they need quality teachers at the forefront of their fields to train them adequately. In the past medical scientists with inquisitive minds whose interest was research were attracted to universities where they took lower pay in order to have available the pursuit of investigation. The excitement of academic environment lay with the availability of research grants to pursue projects.

We simply are not going to be able to retain top men to man the posts at medical schools if we don't provide the research grants that attract them. They will leave, and in too many cases they will have to leave for lack of support (half of all medical school faculty members are supported in part by research grants). They will leave in spite of the fact that we have 1600 vacancies in academic medicine and 600 vacancies in academic dentistry in this country.

Dr. Campbell states that in spite of these personnel needs and the requirements of expanding medical class sizes, the University of Oregon's medical facilities, graduate training programs, postdoctoral medical fellowship stipends and the medical research grants to sustain the institution are being withdrawn.

At this point I include in full Dr. Campbell's letter:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., June 23, 1970.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Along with many of my colleagues in medicine and medical science, I am increasingly perplexed by the paradoxical and erratic federal policies governing the course and development of our health resources.

It is abundantly clear to most everyone who has pondered our health problem that a sustained, balanced building and staffing program is essential. Increased above our present rate of growth, more new medical schools are an absolute necessity if we are ever to catch up with our expanding population. Moreover, if we are to significantly improve the quality of the care as well, a further bulge and another growth slope must be introduced. In addition our presently established schools need expanded facilities to train additional physicians, medical scientists, nurses, and other professional people in related paramedical specialties.

When we contemplate the above needs in the light of the fact that we currently have 1600 vacancies in academic medicine and 600 vacancies in academic dentistry, it is obvious that our first and foremost effort must be directed to an increase in our life blood, capital goods, namely our training facilities and trained people to man them. Not only are we badly in need of this added intellectual capital, but we must have progressively better capital, consistent with an increasing technologic, diagnostic and therapeutic complexities of our time. The doctor product we send out to the community must not be poorly informed, thus, in the face of the present information explosion in medicine, there is a greater necessity to have faculty who can understand, collate, integrate and disseminate the kinds of information, and provide the training experience necessary to make the physician of tomorrow. Most people would agree that an improperly trained physician is almost as bad as no physician at all.

Despite the above considerations and the need to expand our medical facilities, graduate training programs, post-doctoral medical fellowship stipends and the medical research grants to sustain our institution are being withdrawn. Several federally supported training programs for graduate students at our medical school are in jeopardy and will be amputated unless a transfusion of some kind is soon undertaken. The present outlook would lead one to believe that the present graduate student program, which is the life blood of the basic biomedical atmosphere at the University of Oregon Medical School, will be cut to about one-half or one-third in a year or two. This will mean that support for some faculty salaries made possible by these training grants will no longer be available. This will mean that much basic biomedical research will perforce grind to a stop. Therefore we will not be turning out many professional leaders and scholars in the fields of bacteriology, physiology, biochemistry, anatomy or pharmacology. I am reminded of our physiological laboratory experiments, the object of which was to determine how much blood loss our dogs could tolerate before they went into shock.

Curtailment of medical research grants continue and the burners and lights are going out in the laboratories. Loyal and experienced workers of long standing are being let go for lack of funds. The principle investigator, losing a grant, frequently loses part of his salary support as well. Where does this teacher-researcher-scholar get his support? Hard-earned tenure is no protection if the state legislature, unwilling to go into debt, is unable to provide a salary floor. Curtailment of medical research grants has another adverse effect. Overhead, which is a part of every biomedical research grant, is being lost. These overhead funds often provide salary support for the members of the teaching faculty of our biomedical institutions. It can be seen that teaching and training are intimately related to research programs. Thus they both are damaged further. These mechanisms are at work in Oregon.

Now let us take up the postdoctoral clinical fellowships. These serve a multiple function. Most importantly, the fellow of today is the academician of tomorrow. Further, they allow the clinician, with his fellows, to organize and properly analyze the body of information about problem patients being treated so that better approaches can be developed. It allows the director of the program to devise and develop new tests clinically not yet available, thus better serving the patients with serious and difficult management problems. These programs are a remarkable stimulus to thinking, for the faculty member in charge, but as well for the fellows, residents, interns and students with whom they are in continuous contact. If these post-doctoral fellowship programs are not maintained, it is very likely that some of the faculty will have to leave this institution. Why? Because, while faculty members must give direct service to the ill patients on the wards and in the clinics, his function primarily is to be a teacher of fellows, residents, interns and students in amplifying and enriching their professional experiences. If the fellows are not available, some faculty would be so barraged with day to day patient care problems they could neither teach, study, write or do clinical research.

With declining tax receipts in Oregon, and Oregon being a relatively poor state, even tenured professors are in no position to feel secure. Oregon is a "soft-money school," that is to say much of our money comes from the outside, and many faculty members' salaries are derived from these sources. Oregon's vigorous faculty has constantly generated income from outside the state through hard work in maintaining its competitive position.

As money contracts, and the work-load expands with our increasing population, each faculty member must do more and more. If clinical faculty members leave because they are "under the stretch," and their research programs are cut, this just makes it increasingly difficult for those remaining behind to have "esprit de corps" and a reasonable morale.

This hits the faculty in many other ways. Travel to national scientific meetings is abrogated. Some of our faculty members were unable to attend medical meetings in the field of their interest this year. Our summer research college and medical student programs are contracting. In the past these programs have helped get the students through and broadened their experience. Student loans have been curtailed.

Direct financial transfusions to our medical and dental schools are needed now. We have talented administrative and faculty people who know their schools, their state, local and intramural biomedical problems well. They know how, where and when assistance can best be directed during these difficult times. Prolonged "study" or the setting up of commissions "to review the problem" or setting up of new bureaucratic programs to treat the symptoms rather than the cause will only cause further delay, dislocation and deterioration. In my opinion, the Deans of our medical and dental institutions should be provided with *direct emergency funds* to maintain viability of these cherished resources. In truth, only they know the minimum required to prevent a major health catastrophe in the next two years.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. CAMPBELL, M.D.,
Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Director, Renal Metabolic Research Laboratory.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include at this point a letter received from Dr. Ralph D. Tanz, associate professor, Department of Pharmacology, University of Oregon Medical School. Dr. Tanz is a cardiovascular pharmacologist who took a reduction in salary to return to the university setting after working in private industry because he believed he could contribute more to society in doing so. Lack of research funds has prevented Dr. Tanz from taking on post-doctoral fellows who desire further training and has curtailed his program:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., June 22, 1970.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Your recent inquiry for substantiative information regarding the effect of federal cutbacks in biomedical support prompts me to write this letter.

I am a cardiovascular pharmacologist, having been employed both in academic and industrial positions. In the latter I headed the cardiovascular research conducted throughout the world by one of the largest pharmaceutical firms. A year ago I accepted Dr. Riker's offer to return to academic medicine because I was convinced that the type of research conducted in private industry is of little long range value to our society. In so doing, I accepted an immediate 25% reduction in income! In the belief that I could better serve society by assisting in the education of future physicians, nurses and research workers (graduate students), I was willing to make this financial sacrifice. This year my salary will be less than last year's because of inflation, increased taxes and a minor salary raise.

Lack of research funds has prevented my taking on post-doctoral students who desire further training. Sources of private funds are drying up. In cardiovascular research one can apply for funds from the National Heart Institute (NIH), the American Heart Association, and local heart associations. Formerly, one could also apply to pharmaceutical firms and the Life Insurance Medical Research Foundation. Recently I received an announcement that the Life Insurance Medical Research Foundation is discontinuing its research grants program. Accordingly, when one gets turned down (as happens so often these days) by the NIH, you apply to the other agencies. And in desperation you write letters to pharmaceutical firms. But so does everyone else! And without funds to operate a laboratory, my ability to serve this school is severely limited. Recently I have received two very financially attractive inquiries to return to industry. My family would be better off, but would society?

Indeed, if this Administration is sincerely interested in returning the economy of this nation to a peacetime economy, what better way is there than supporting biomedical research? Funds would spur peace-minded industries to produce items such as computers, microscopes, multi-channeled recorders, and interesting chemicals (some of which might be useful as drugs); to say nothing of giving employment to people who have trained themselves for biomedical research. (I would like to hire two technicians—I've got the space and the work—but not the funds.)

Sincerely yours,

RALPH D. TANZ, Ph. D.,
Associate Professor.

The plight of Dr. Tanz is not atypical. I know that his plight is replicated in many institutions in many States. I know that the damage in loss of personnel and in loss of training new investigators besides the loss of the fruits of the research itself is not found only at the University of Oregon Medical School, but exists elsewhere across the country.

There have been many studies nationwide to indicate the range and nature of hardships already caused by cutbacks.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include at this point an article from the Wall Street Journal of Nov. 10, 1969, which well describes the hardships incurred by medical scientists throughout the country:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 10, 1969]

RESEARCH PINCH: CUTS IN FEDERAL FUNDS CURTAIL INVESTIGATIONS OF MEDICAL SCIENTISTS

(By Jonathan Spivak)

BUFFALO.—Dr. George E. Moore, director of research for the New York State Health Department, spends some of his time washing laboratory glassware these days at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, a noted cancer research center here.

Dr. James Grace, who heads the institute, has abandoned his efforts to determine whether certain common respiratory germs, known as adenoviruses, cause cancer in humans as they do in test animals.

Roswell Park's tobacco researchers, who seek to develop safer cigarets, are cutting corners by using fewer test animals to assess their findings. "If I get red-hot positive results, I'm home free, but if I get wishy-washy results, I'm dead," frets Fred Bock, who directs the program.

In such ways is the current cutback in Federal research funds coming home to Roswell Park, a New York state institution. In the fiscal year ended last June, the institute lost $750,000 of its $6 million in Federal support, and officials fear further reductions of 10% to 15% in the current year. The institute has already lost 15 young researchers out of a staff of 300, postponed clinical trials of several promising anticancer drugs and curtailed by 30% its work on a vaccine against infectious mononucleosis, a debilitating blood disease that may cause one form of cancer, leukemia.

LEANER RATIONS

Roswell Park's plight mirrors the current pinch at many of the nation's medical schools and research centers, which are being forced to adjust, at times abruptly, to leaner rations from Washington after years of favored treatment.

Nixon Administration officials insist the science budget-cutting is no more severe than other spending retrenchments being made in the effort to fight inflation. But they are deliberately trying to put more emphasis on actual medical care rather than on research, contending the greater need now is for better care. In any case, the squeeze on health research programs actually began with budget cuts imposed in the last two years of the Johnson Administration; Mr. Nixon has merely stepped up the process.

Until the pinch came, some officials privately say, a plethora of Federal funds led to indiscriminate support of science research projects, without due assessment of their value. Hence the squeeze is having some salutary effects, forcing researchers to pick their priorities carefully, dispense with unproductive work and justify their once-unquestioned endeavors to the public and the politicians. The change has also impelled some institutions to seek more private financial help, though without notable success so far.

On the minus side, medical researchers say, promising projects are being dropped or delayed, trained personnel are drifting away and expensive research facilities, mainly built with Federal funds, are being employed ineffectively. So far no one can accurately assess the final consequences. "You really can't predict how much it will set you back; you don't know what insights you have lost," says Dr. Grace, the Roswell Park head.

HURTING IN ALL AREAS

The austerity pains are widespread. M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Clinic in Houston is bracing for a loss of $1.5 million of its $8 million a year in Federal research funds; a drug-testing program has already

been reduced from $1 million to $700,000 a year. The hospital is able to staff only part of a large new clinical research facility that was five years in preparation, says Dr. R. Lee Clark, president.

"We are just hurting in about all areas of operation—increased costs and decreased funding," complains Dr. Douglas Walker, associate dean of Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine in Baltimore, which ordinarily derives 80% of its budget from Federal funds. The school expects this year to run a deficit of about $1.5 million—its first—and will draw on endowment principal to make up the difference.

In New York City, the New York University Medical Center anticipates a reduction of $1.5 million in Federal research grants this year; among projects to be shelved will be the field trial of a new blood test aimed at reducing the danger of transmitting hepatitis through blood transfusions. "We were getting ready for the payoff in terms of patient care," complains Dr. Ivan Bennett, vice president for medical affairs.

Similar problems prevail at Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, Sloan-Kettering Memorial Institute and Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York City, at the University of California's San Francisco Medical Center and at Northwestern University Medical School in Chicago, among other institutions.

CUTS IN NIH OUTLAYS

Until 1968, the budgets of Uncle Sam's National Institutes of Health, the mainstay of the nation's biomedical research effort through its grants, had been rising at least 10% a year, and about the last thing a medical scientist worried about was money. Costly, large-scale projects were undertaken in the expectation of an ever-increasing flow of Federal cash, and young researchers were attracted to the field by prospects of steady financial support.

But now all that has changed. NIH outlays for research by other institutions, still running more than $600 million annually, will probably be trimmed 7% below the Nixon budget plan made last spring for this fiscal year; the sum then proposed was a bit above last year's actual spending. Certain projects will be shut down entirely. Some researchers are getting only part of the Federal dollars originally earmarked for their work. And only 60% of the projects approved by NIH are actually receiving funds, compared with 75% in the past. "It's just a matter of luck," says one scientist.

Moreover, the general budget squeeze is also holding down Federal grants for nonmedical scientific research—money dispensed by the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies. "The pyramid of science is being reduced," warns William McElroy, director of the National Science Foundation.

"A renewed period of real growth in the nation's investment in basic science is a high-priority item as soon as the fiscal situation permits," comments Lee DuBridge, White House science adviser.

But the situation seems particularly severe for the medical researchers. Federal money has been furnishing more than half the operating costs of many medical research centers. Inflation has been escalating research costs by 6% or more annually. Medical schools, which do much of the NIH-backed research, have taken on added financial burdens in training more needy students requiring scholarship aid.

These pressures have caused medical men to mount an impassioned lobbying campaign for Federal funds. The effort is being coordinated by a loose alliance known as the "Ad Hoc Committee on the Nation's Health Crisis," which includes the AFL-CIO, the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society and other medical groups.

A FLOOD OF REQUESTS

For lack of more Federal dollars, many of Roswell Park's senior researchers are now spending substantial time seeking funds from foundations, drug companies or grateful patients. "Everyone is scratching like hell to find additional money," observed Dr. Joseph Sokal, who heads one of the main research operations in Roswell's 313-bed hospital. "It's not what I entered medical research for." The major private givers of medical funds, such as the American Cancer Society and the Hartford Foundation, have been inundated and are able to fill few of the researchers' requests.

Roswell Park's problems illustrate the sensitivity of medical research to fluctuation in Federal funds. The institution's main goal is cancer research, but its basic biological studies have implications for treatment of many diseases, including diabetes and bacterial infections, and for successful organ transplants.

Even though New York state furnishes $14 million a year, or about two-thirds of Roswell's budget, the Federal aid cutbacks have had a major impact on productivity here, according to the administrators. A freeze has been imposed on most hiring, and researchers are struggling to make do with less help.

Dr. Julian Ambrus, who heads the Springville Laboratories, a unit of Roswell Park, faces a specific problem: He has the funds to test on animals a possible protective substance against certain bacteria but lacks the money to go ahead with trials on human beings. The bacteria are called "gram negative," and they include the salmonella that causes food poisoning; they are common, highly resistant to drugs and pose special problems to cancer patients.

OTHER TESTS DELAYED

Dr. Ralph Jones Jr. has a similar problem. He lacks funds to begin trials on human beings of a group of substances that could have valuable anticancer effects. The substances, derived from the spleen and liver, might regulate the wild reproduction of cancer cells without harming their healthy neighbors.

Roswell Park also serves as headquarters for a group of 20 hospitals collaborating in NIH-sponsored trials of more established anti-cancer drugs. Their aim is to develop more effective methods of employing the drugs, in massive doses and sustained sequence, to eradicate every single cancer cell and thus prevent spread of the disease. Directed by Dr. James Holland, the work has helped lead to longer survival for youthful victims of leukemia and to the hope of curing some eventually.

But the gains are not being extended rapidly enough to other types of cancer, complains Dr. Holland. NIH funds for the hospital members of the group have been cut by 5% to 30%, and he fears he can't hire enough staff to decipher and disseminate to other physicians the data already acquired. "It's a national tragedy," he contends.

Time magazine of February 16, 1970, very clearly states the crisis created by the cutting off of these medical research grants throughout the country. I include this article in full at this point:

RESEARCH CRISIS: CUTTING OFF THE PLANT AT THE ROOTS

Richard M. Nixon—"Scientific activity cannot be turned on and off like a faucet."

It was a campaign statement, delivered in a speech on Oct. 5, 1968, and made a point that is no less true today. Yet now, in the near-unanimous opinion of U.S. scientists, President Nixon is ignoring what Candidate Nixon said. At a time when drastic, all-around budget trimming is obviously necessary—confronting the Administration with some painful choices—sensible scientists do not expect research appropriations to keep growing at the beanstalk rate of the early 1960s, but they have hoped to maintain reasonable, normal growth. Instead, they have suffered cutbacks and hold-downs for two years, and now the Administration has submitted a budget that, despite rising costs, will keep the level of federal spending for research virtually unchanged through June 1971. As a result, some important programs will be cut down severely or actually eliminated. The net effect, says Physicist Philip H. Abelson, editor of *Science*, has been harshly called a "mindless dismantling of American science."

According to Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, the President's science adviser, the overall effect of the new budget, after allowing for inflation, will be to reduce net buying power for research by about 3%. Others think the reduction will be much greater—in some cases as much as 20% in areas of fundamental scientific research that offer no immediate, practical payoffs. This is generally called "basic research," a favorite target of administrators and legislators with little patience and less vision. Out of apparently aimless inquiries have come antibiotics and transistors, vaccines and computers, transplants and spaceships. Government budget makers who try to judge a program's worth by the crude criterion "How soon will it pay off?" are bound to be wrong much of the time.

So-called basic research in the U.S. mushroomed after the Soviets' first Sputnik in 1957. From 1958 through 1965, federal expenditures for basic research increased at an annual rate of 19%, climbing from $1 billion to $3 billion. For the next five years, however, the average increase was only 5.5% boosting the annual sum to its present $4 billion—and that has been barely enough to keep up with inflation. For the coming fiscal year the percentage increase is near zero—hence the net loss after inflation. Some institutions hope to keep their key programs coasting on tighter budgets. Others will simply be shut down.

BREEDER REACTOR

One casualty is the Princeton-Pennsylvania proton synchrotron on the Princeton campus, which is used for basic particle research by 14 universities. From a recent budget of $5,000,000 annually, the synchrotron funds have now been cut to $3.5 million, and will be down to $2,000,000 next year. Beyond that the Atomic Energy Commission is cutting off funds completely—after a total investment of $30 million on a project that, according to Director Milton White, has not yet had a chance to reach its peak efficiency. Another important tool for probing the secrets of the atom, the Cambridge Electron Accelerator at Harvard University, is in jeopardy; its budget has been cut 25%. "This," says M.I.T. Professor Victor Weisskopf, "essentially means that it will go out of business." Budget cuts have already paralyzed a less costly but still formidable piece of hardware: a $35,000 electron microscope given by New York City to New York University's department of medicine. It is lying idle because operating funds expected from the National Institutes of Health will not, after all, be supplied.

At the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, Dr. Herbert Friedman, one of the world's foremost X-ray astronomers, estimates that budget cuts combined with inflation have reduced the effective level of his support by 40% in three years. Able to afford only half as many trainees as he had expected and with no new equipment, Friedman has drastically curtailed his studies of X-ray galaxies. He has also reduced his work on quasars and pulsars, those mysterious sources of energy in outer space that promise not only a clearer understanding of the nature of the universe and of basic physical laws but also might provide clues for developing new energy sources on earth.

Although scientists complain that the Atomic Energy Commission, along with the Department of Defense and NASA, gets a disproportionate share of federal research funds, the AEC itself has had to shut down its molten-salt breeder reactor at Oak Ridge. The Bureau of the Budget simply did not release $3,000,000 authorized for it by Congress. This was especially dismaying to environmentalists, because the breeder reactor promises, eventually, to be the cleanest and most efficient fuel source for electric power.

BARNACLES AND TEETH

Until recently, the Department of Defense generously funded research projects that had no foreseeable military applications. That will no longer be possible. An amendment attached to a military procurement bill by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield requires that research must be "mission-oriented" if it is to win DOD support. Mansfield learned 1) that researchers were trying to ferret out the magically strong adhesive produced by barnacles, in the hope of using it to secure fillings in teeth, and 2) that the Navy was backing barnacle research. Actually, barnacle-tooth research at the University of Akron has been funded, at a mere $40,000 a year, not by DOD but by the National Institutes of Health. The Navy has spent probably twice as much on its own barnacle research, and with good reason: scraping the adhesive crustaceans from hulls and buoys costs the Navy, Coast Guard and private shipping interests $700 million a year.

Mansfield's action points up the interlocking of many facets of research. Advances in the design of nuclear reactors and of private accelerators have brought progress in the treatment of cancer. Vitallium alloy, developed in the 1930s for dentures, later proved valuable for its heat resistance in jet engines. Immunology depends ultimately upon the study of reactions among protein molecules. Its applications extend from the obvious field of infectious diseases and vaccination to allergies, autoimmune disorders like some forms of arthritis, to cancer, heart and kidney disease, and most dramatically, to organ transplants.

CUTS AND NIBBLES

Within medicine, research cannot be separated from teaching and treatment. Cuts in federal grants to medical institutions mean not only that research will be slowed down but also that fewer doctors will receive the specialized training that will enable them to give better care in the future. No fewer than 19 clinical research centers affiliated with major universities are due to be shut down. Among them: a small and always overtaxed unit at Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago, for children with severe digestive and metabolic problems; a twelve-bed center for acutely ill patients (including many suffering from burns) at Albert Einstein Medical Center in New York; a research institute at Indiana University, studying and treating patients (including children) with brain tumors and disorders of bone metabolism such as osteoporosis.

Prestige is no protection against the budgeteers' knives. Recent Nobel laureates in medicine, chemistry and physics have had their funds cut. So have most of the nation's great medical centers. Programs at Massachusetts General Hospital are "only being nibbled at" now, admits its tart-tongued director, Dr. John Knowles. "But," he adds, "we'll really feel it in a year if the cutbacks continue, and if they go on too long you are going to wing the country for ten years." One of the affected M.G.H. programs turned out technicians trained to read electroencephalograms (brain-wave recordings). These specialists are in short supply at many hospitals. "When there's a shortage," says Dr. Robert Schwab, who runs M.G.H's program, "it doesn't mean that the EEGs are not read. It simply means that they are read by somebody who's no good. This is scandalous and dangerous." Another nibble victim, down corridor, is Dr. Paul S. Russell, a top surgeon at M.G.H., whose research on antilymphocyte globulin (used to suppress the rejection reaction after heart, kidney and liver transplants) has been curtailed. Under current limitations, his staff can produce only 20% of the ALG it needs.

A lower budget forced Children's Hospital in Los Angeles to reduce the number of research beds from six to three in its genetic-disease unit, setting off a howl of community protests, including a petition to President Nixon with 20,000 signatures. (The cut has not yet been rescinded.) In many cases the drying-up of funds means not only that progress will be slowed but that money already spent will be wasted. M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute in Houston, which lost $1.5 million of its $8 million in federal funds, cannot add a needed and long-planned 350-bed unit. After spending years and $1,752,000 of N.I.H. money raising monkeys in an almost germ-free environment and injecting them with cancer material and viruses, Bionetics Research Labs at Bethesda, Md., expected some to start developing tumors. Then the budget ax fell. At first it was thought that the 320 monkeys would have to be destroyed, because each costs $3 a day in upkeep. Then the monkeys were reprieved and shipped out in batches to other primate centers. Whether the experiment has been ruined because of changes in their environment is not yet known.

Heart-artery diseases are America's No. 1 killer, and the No. 1 research project on their cause has been the Framingham Study. Since 1947, more than 5,000 residents of the Massachusetts town have been given regular examinations. The results, almost but not yet quite conclusive, indicate that smoking and high blood pressure and cholesterol are the most important factors in increasing the risk of early death from heart disease. The study is to be terminated June 30—to the despair of heart researchers all over the U.S.

RADICAL SURGERY

Manhattan's Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research proclaims in its very name that it meets the Government jargon specification of being "mission-oriented." That has not saved it from radical budget surgery. Five years ago, says Director Frank L. Horsfall Jr., the Government supplied 51% of S.K.I.'s income. In 1968, with a federal cut and inflation, S.K.I. went $1.2 million in the red. Next year the deficit was $1.8 million, and was met by dipping into capital. Faced with still deeper federal cuts and a probable deficit of $2.6 million for 1970, the trustees have set a deficit ceiling of $1.6 million and required expenditures to be cut by $1,000,000. As a result, seven out of 69 laboratories have had to be closed, while nine others have taken cuts of 20% to 30%. Both professional and technical staffs have been reduced and further curtailment next year is inevitable.

In Buffalo, Roswell Park Memorial Institute's director, Dr. James T. Grace, has had to abandon a five-year study designed to show whether adenoviruses are a cause of cancer in man as they can be in animals.

Cancer may eventually be conquered only by a crash program along the lines of the Manhattan Project. It is equally possible that vital cancer clues will come from some seemingly unrelated "basic" research in biology. Yet the likelihood of this discovery is reduced by the decrease in the number of investigators in all the life sciences. That is where the budget cuts are hurting, and inflicting wounds that will not heal for years. The National Institutes of Health are losing valuable experienced investigators, as are the complexes of hospitals, medical schools and research institutes.

By the late 1970's, the effect on medical research could be disastrous. It is the younger men who are being dropped in the economy wave and there are no funds for replacing them next year or the year after. Says Dr. Russel V. Lee, founder of the Palo Alto Clinic: "The principal loss, to my mind, will be the great discouragement in recruitment of young men for medical research. We are cutting off the plant at the roots." Virtually all the men responsible for directing research in both the life sciences and the physical sciences share that view.

Thus there is a crisis in research that today imparts even more urgency to words spoken only 16 months ago: "In the name of economy, the current Administration cut into muscle. The U.S. must end this depreciation of research and development in its order of national priorities." That demand was made by Richard Nixon.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken about the dangers incurred in Oregon and elsewhere by medical research cutbacks in general. I wish now to address my remarks to the area of cancer research, where assuredly there is a clear-cut need for more research, and where the University of Oregon Medical School has been hit severely. At this point I include a letter from Dr. Adam Lis of the University of Oregon Medical School who provides the statistics to indicate the shocking reductions of support for medical research at our Oregon Medical school as well as the withdrawal of support for his long-standing cancer project:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., June 23, 1970.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is a follow-up of the telegram sent to you on June 20, pertaining to the cutbacks our school is experiencing at this time.

Due to natural demands and expansion of services, we are increasing enrollment in medicine by 22%. At the same time our research and research training budget is reduced from six to four million with accompanying inflationary depreciation.

In the period extending from October 1969 to April 1970 we submitted 56 research grant applications. Out of this number there were:

Approved and funded	28
Disapproved	12
Approved but not funded	16

That represents 28% of approved, but not funded projects. Some of these projects have to be abandoned entirely, postponed, or submitted for competitive reapplication which in itself is costly in time, effort and expense.

The University of Oregon Medical School expended approximately $6,115,000 for research and research training in the fiscal year 1968–1969. We estimate that comparable expenditures for 1969–1970 will equal $5,823,000, a reduction of $292,000. In addition, we project expenditures for 1970–1971 at a $5,122,000 level and for 1971–1972 at a $4,056,000 level.

These reductions will take our federal program expenditures from the $6,000,000 level to a $4,000,000 level in a matter of only 3 years. This one-third reduction cannot be offset with other funds and most assuredly will reduce the amount of research and training the institution is able to perform. We are concerned about a loss of both professional and non-professional personnel because of this reduction. It will necessitate a substantial decrease in our basic science training program with a considerable reduction in the number of people being trained for careers in research and academic medicine.

The projected reduction in total expendi-

tures has been made after discussion with staff members who are intimately involved in the National Institutes of Health funding activities. We understand that graduate training grant, i.e. pre-doctoral levels, will be severely cut and that the basic type of research the Medical School has performed will meet with further cuts in the years to come including a reduction in the institutional general research support grant.

It is noteworthy that many University of Oregon Medical School faculty are paid from so-called institutional research support, but that too is being reduced or eliminated. What seems to be most devastating and demoralizing is the futility and hopelessness of the direction research is taking.

Since research at U.O.M.S. is almost entirely supported by individual or departmental grants from the Federal government, money from other sources is not, and has never been, earmarked for this purpose. Now that this method of financing is being drastically reduced, there is little opportunity for other avenues of support.

I appreciate your great interest in education and training and hope I have given you some information that you can take before the committee.

Yours respectfully,

ADAM W. LIS, Ph. D.,
Associate Professor and Training Program Director.

An indication that much good and highly recommended cancer research is not being funded can be seen from Dr. Lis' application and correspondence received by me regarding the cancellation of his funds, which letters I include at this point:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., April 16, 1970.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Because of your great interest in education and training, I am writing this letter to ask for your assistance. As you know, drastic cuts in research funds have been carried out for the last two years by NIH and NSF. It is therefore essential at this time, that you contact and intervene with appropriate government agencies on our behalf.

Our project which has been terminated as of 1 July 1970, is a training program in experimental and clinical oncology for trainees with M.D. and Ph.D. degrees. This is a joint program which includes the various departments of the University of Oregon Medical School.

Our Training Program attracted dedicated physicians and postdoctoral fellows. One typical example is Dr. Ernest Lane, who abandoned his private medical practice of 15 years to join the program in order to obtain a Ph.D. degree in Biochemistry of cancer. This would enable him to enter into the field of academic research in obstetrics and gynecology and other related fields—an area in great need of research trained clinicians. As you well know, our State resources are very limited and we depend in great measure on Federal support. Because of this, it has become increasingly difficult to retain even key staff personnel when many other projects are being discontinued.

It is quite clear that in many instances, federal granting agencies have been more concerned with getting new programs started than with seeing that established programs are able to improve their quality and continue to develop their potential. Definitely a stimulation of new programs is highly desirable; however, to allow well established training programs to be terminated in order to establish new ones should be done with extreme caution.

The loss of personnel, such as Dr. Lane, of research programs half completed, the use of expensive equipment halted due to lack of personnel is nothing short of criminal at the time when more highly trained individuals are needed to solve pressing problems of the effects of malnutrition, drugs, disease, infection, as well as "the pill" on pregnant women and newly born generations.

Our laboratories have excellent equipment and facilities, all of which will soon sit idle due to termination of funds for personnel. The public is informed about reductions whereas we are experiencing complete terminations of support.

These cuts affect small states very deeply due to lack of other resources. The unemployment has risen to 5.6% in Oregon while the nation was at 4.5% level. We believe that all foreign research support should be terminated before domestic research is reduced. However, as our laboratories are closing and graduate students forced to surrender higher degrees requiring only a year or less for completion, the country still retains very generous research agencies in various foreign capitals. On the other hand, all of the various news media are crying out for more individuals to enter into technical fields, more students to continue their education to obtain higher degrees, more need for research in medicine, biochemistry, psychology, etc. Yet, no one is willing to support the individuals already half-way or nearer to such drastically needed fields. This can hardly encourage anyone considering a graduate career.

We should therefore like to request strong consideration by you and other members of Congress to make the following recommendations—not for the 1980's but as emergency measures *now*.

(1) Cancel all support of foreign research until such time as all worthy American research and training programs are adequately financed.

(2) Investigate and reduce wherever possible, wasteful duplication of administration of public health projects in Washington in order to free funds for research and training.

There is far more money spent for administration of funds for research than spent on actual laboratory research and student training (administrating overhead exceeds 40%). One branch of Public Health Service (Welfare) spends 78% of their funds on administration and only 22% on the service itself.

(3) Any project funded should not be terminated until all students already in training have been allowed to complete their training.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter we recently received as an example of the tragedy of the plight of hundreds of scientists throughout the country. For a project to be approved but not funded is a contradiction of absurd proportion. With the elimination of similar projects all over the country, these people have no place to apply for similar positions.

Any assistance you can give or suggestions you may have as to a solution of this problem will be most appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

ADAM W. LIS, Ph.D.,
Association Professor and Program Director.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Bethesda, Md., March 26, 1970.

Our Reference: T01 CA–05081–09 CAN
Dr. ADAM W. LIS,
Associate Professor, Department, Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Oregon Medical School, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR DOCTOR LIS: This is to inform you that the National Advisory Cancer Council, at its meeting on March 16–17, 1970, recommended approval of support for the training program described in application T01 CA–05081–09, however, for a reduced period of one year and in the reduced amount of $38,868.

The action taken by the Council represents a recommendation for a year of terminal support. As a consequence of existing fiscal constraints the National Cancer Institute will not be in a position to award any portion of the amount recommended and we are, therefore, administratively withdrawing the application. If you anticipate an unexpended balance remaining in the grant as of June 30, 1970, an extension of the grant period, without additional funds, may be requested in a letter from an official of the University of Oregon Medical School.

We regret very much that the National Cancer Institute is unable to fund a number of the approved programs and that support for your program will not be continued.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR L. SCHIPPER, PH.D.,
Awards and Training Officer, Special Programs Branch, Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Bethesda, Md., May 14, 1970.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Your letter to The Honorable Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been sent to the National Cancer Institute for reply. Your inquiry concerned the cutback in funding of cancer research, especially as it has affected the training program in experimental and clinical oncology, directed by Dr. Adam W. Lis of the University of Oregon Medical School.

The National Cancer Institute supported Dr. Lis' training program for the past nine years, but now finds it necessary to terminate this grant (T01 CA 05081) because of insufficient funds.

As you know, the research and training supported by the National Cancer Institute is financed through Congressional appropriations which while rising steadily in past years, have now begun to decline. The Institute's fiscal year 1969 operating budget was approximately $182 million, compared with a fiscal 1970 operating budget of approximately $181 million. By necessity, the lowered amount means that almost all programs must be reduced. Additional reductions in programs may be required since we also have to take into account continuing inflationary trends which even further erode the capacity to do research.

Dr. Lis' letter refers to a number of recommendations concerning Federal funding; the issues raised by Dr. Lis are important and timely and for this reason we have made every attempt to answer them completely and forthrightly.

The recommendation that all foreign support be terminated until all worthy American support receives financing needs clarification. The National Cancer Institute foreign research program is an important one because these studies by necessity, must be unique. They are unique because these investigations meet the criteria that they cannot or will not be accomplished in this country; other stringent criteria must also be met. Additionally, the National Cancer Institute supports, on a dollar basis, an extremely small foreign program since the total dollar amount is less than $200 thousand out of a possible $98.5 million (less than 0.2%). This amounts to only 11 foreign grants out of a total of 1,250 awarded. Also, the National Cancer Institute has never awarded a training grant to a foreign institution nor has it permitted foreign nationals to receive stipendary support from National Cancer Institute training programs for the past five years.

The recommendation concerning administrative expenses as it relates to management of the grants and training program needs explaining. I don't know if Dr. Lis is referring to the National Cancer Institute when he states that "administrating overhead exceeds 40% . . .", since FY 1969 total dollars appropriated NCI amounted to $98,546,000 for Extramural Activities with an appropriation of $2,508,000 provided for administration of the program, including review and approval. Administrative costs amount to approximately 2.5% of the total dollar amount awarded for research projects, training projects and fellowships. This is indeed a small part of the total investment, considering the number of professionals needed to administer a program as large and as important as the extramural program of the National Cancer Institute. However, it should be pointed out that an average of 33% of the total funds awarded an institution go for overhead costs, this money is used to reimburse the institution for expenses incurred while doing research.

We are in complete agreement with the third recommendation ". . . project funded should not be terminated until all students . . . have been allowed to complete their training," and only wish that we could honor this principle. It was not until this year that the National Cancer Institute did not honor its commitment to trainees. Unfortunately the funds available to us for support of graduate research training does not permit us at this time to honor that which was policy in the past. In order to cushion somewhat the impact of termination of training programs, the Institute has permitted the use of unexpended balances to be used over extended project periods, without awarding additional funds. The institute is short approximately $22.5 million for FY 1970 where it concerns awards for approved, but unfunded research and training projects. It can be seen that the money gained from extramural administration ($2.5 million) and the foreign program ($200 thousand) would be a mere pittance compared to what is needed to pay all of the approved applications which have gone unfunded.

In general, the cutbacks have reduced the number of approved grants that can be funded and make it necessary to reduce the amounts committed to support of all ongoing grants. In fiscal year 1969 all funded grants were reduced an average of 5.7 percent. In fiscal year 1970, the average reduction in grants will be more than twice this amount. Only with extreme reluctance have these reductions been effected, and this must be done if we are to maintain a balanced research program. Particularly hard hit are the young investigators just entering the research field, for they are the ones whose grants are found in the "new grant" category. Despite a 15 percent cutback in all grants the number of new grants funded, *even after approval* amounts to only 20 percent. In the case of competing renewal grants, the NCI hopefully expects to pay 50 percent of the approved applications. As far as this fiscal year is concerned, it appears that the NCI will not be able to make any new training grant awards, especially since less than 50 percent of approved competing renewals will be funded. One should be mindful of the fact that initial review groups continue to evaluate grants mainly on a scientific basis, and not on a monetary or other basis even though we are living in a period of budgetary constraints.

We are in complete sympathy with Dr. Lis on many of the issues he has raised, but in times like the present, when competing demands must be carefully weighed by the Administration and Congress, the judicious distribution of available funds requires making some painful decisions. There is no question that increased funding of cancer research and training efforts could be utilized to advantage in making continued progress toward conquering this dread disease.

Your interest in Federal funding of medical research is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CARL G. BAKER, M.D.,
Acting Director, National Cancer Institute.

To receive approval of a program and favorable recommendation and at the same time, to lose government funds and support, is surely a cruel irony. It is unconscionable that in the wealthiest country in the world good research projects in cancer, like that of Dr. Lis, go unfunded in spite of the recommendation of leading scientists.

What could deserve the national spending priority in the area of research if not cancer research? During this year alone 330,000 will die of cancer; over 52 million Americans now living will eventually be stricken with the disease. Along with immeasureable suffering and grief, cancer costs Americans an estimated 15 million dollars annually.

Dr. Jonathan E. Rhoads, representing the American Cancer Society, said in his testimony before this subcommittee June 9: "It is reasonable to believe that if financial impediments were removed, enough progress could be made to save the expenditures several times over in the costs of medical care now financed through the federal government."

The results of cancer research in the past are good evidence that future gains can be achieved by a financial commitment to cancer research. The money poured into cancer research since the Second World War has paid off high dividends. Today there are 1,500,000 Americans alive who have been cured of cancer. Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy have been improved so that many more patients are being cured while others have their lives prolonged considerably.

As Dr. James T. Grace, Director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, said to the American Cancer Society in January of this year, "Our only hope of really controlling devastating diseases and their enormous costs is through research. A cure for cancer would do more for our citizens than a thousand Regional Medical Programs—at a fraction of the cost—and it can only come through research."

Still, the National Cancer Institute, with its over 6% inflationary rise, has had several million dollars less to spend than Congress authorized. At this point I wish to include a letter written by Dr. John Kalberer, Jr., of the National Cancer Institute, explaining what cutbacks to the Institute have meant in terms of reduction of support to researchers throughout the country:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Bethesda, Md., December 5, 1969.

MR. ALAN DAVIS,
Science Editor, American Cancer Society, Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: This letter is in response to your telephone conversation of December 4, 1969 with Dr. J. Palmer Saunders, concerning cutbacks in Federal funding. Dr. Saunders has asked me to give you a brief sketch of what the impact of financial restraints has been on research in cancer.

In general, the cutbacks have reduced new project starts and expansion of ongoing intramural research; reduced the numbers of approved grants that could be funded and made it necessary to reduce the amounts on all grants. In fiscal year 1969 all funded grants were reduced an average of 5.7 percent. In fiscal year 1970 the average reduction in grants will be about 15 percent, even greater.

Because biomedical research rarely produces a quantifiable product within any measureable time, it has not been possible to measure what these cutbacks mean in terms of output. We cut back contracts and do not start new ones against a background of constantly changing endeavors. Grants are individually reduced across the board and only about one-half of approved new grants are awarded. Only about one-half of ongoing grants up for renewal are approved after competitive merit review each year. Many of the ongoing organized research teams therefore may be disbanded or must find support elsewhere, and this is becoming more difficult because of Government-wide cutbacks. Particularly hard hit are young investigators entering the field for they are the ones whose grants are found in the "new grant" category whose funding rate even after approval is about 40 percent.

The largest part of the NCI appropriation (in fiscal year 1969, $146 million out of a total of $185 million) is spent to support research conducted outside the walls of the Institute. This support takes the form either of grants for research projects initiated by scientists in universities, medical schools, and other non-profit organizations for training cancer researchers or physicians, and for support of cancer research institutions (over $96 million); or of contracts, which are initiated by NCI staff (approximately $50 million). Contractors may come from the same groups as grantees, and also from the commercial or "for-profit" sector of the economy.

Grantee research covers the entire range of biomedical sciences as well as clinical problems peculiar to that group of diseases we call cancer. Reduction of support for grantees therefore reduces the chances of making new discoveries or developing fruitful leads in any aspect of cancer.

One large research institution (Sloan-Kettering) receiving about 40 percent of its support from NCI has already had to make the following retrenchments: 20 staff members have been dismissed with further dismissals anticipated; seven research sections will be phased out by January 1, 1970, and ten more sections will be cut back by up to 30 percent; $729,000 has to be cut out of a budget of $10.5 million (for 1970). For the past two years this institution has been running at an annual deficit of a million dollars, drawing on its endowment capital, which is obviously not inexhaustible.

Other cancer research organizations dependent for much of their support on the NCI are having to reduce the number of cancer beds and, in several cases, to postpone indefinitely the activation of new facilities because funds have run out before they were constructed, or, if construction was completed, before they were equipped or staffed. It should be noted that some cancer research equipment is costly; plans to install a prototype radiation therapy device in a West Coast medical school have had to be suspended for want of the $500,000 required.

I hope this information proves useful, and if you should have further questions please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. KALBERER, JR., Ph.D.,
Special Assistant to Associate Director for Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute.

In spite of the $20 million projected increase over the previous year, the 1970–71 budget for the National Cancer Institute is not sufficient to reverse the downtrend which has occurred throughout the country, because of cutbacks in the last few years. I concur in the American Cancer Society's belief that Congress should increase the President's recommended budget for the National Cancer Institute by no less than $50 million in the coming year and probably by a larger amount in the succeeding because while the delivery system must be improved, in the cancer field we need most of all to improve the care available to be delivered. In view of Administration restraints on the

budget, however, I ask that this subcommittee raise the 1971 budget substantially over the $200 million request to what the subcommittee deems a reasonable amount at this time.

We must remember that each American's share of the Vietnam war is $125. Each American's share of the national defense outlay is $395. Each American's share of the cancer research is only 91 cents. One billion was poured into an atomic-powered airplane program—to build an airplane that will never fly. This is seven times the National Cancer Institute budget. It was estimated that a minimum of $350 million was spent last year for chemical and biological warfare research. This was almost double the amount spent for cancer research.

Besides cancer research, there are other areas of health funding of concern to Oregonians that are suffering the loss of government support.

The Oregon Kidney Association and the Good Samaritan Hospital in Portland have urged me to secure funds for research into kidney disease, funded through the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

Mr. President, testimony has made abundantly clear that due to the enormous costs to the nation in loss of lives and in treatment of the disease, the ultimate solution to kidney disease is its prevention. Senator Hartke pointed out in his testimony that kidney disease is the fifth most costly in the Nation. Because kidney diseases are likely to cause death of patients in their most productive years, they make a great economic impact and cost this country around $1.4 billion annually in lost future income. These terrific costs point out clearly the need for constructive, long range action now. Yet the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases has not received the support it deserves during the last few years. Over half the requests for research fellowship grants by young capable physicians and scientists wishing to specialize in kidney disease were turned away in 1969. I ask this subcommittee to consider raising the amount spent for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

Discussions have been underway within the Administration on Aging on the possibility of shifting funds away from educational institutions to a more heavy emphasis on organizations and units within the private sector for research, demonstration and training programs as authorized under Title IV and V of the Older Americans Act.

The State of Oregon has one of the largest Title V Administration on Aging Grants in the nation. The training program in gerontology supported largely by this grant involves three campuses and soon a fourth. Graduates from the training program have been placed in important positions in the field of aging, and 20 or so professors in the program are carrying on research in the field of aging on these campuses.

In considering the new budget for 1971, I would urge this subcommittee to note we need more university-based training, not less, if we are to begin producing professionals in sufficient quantity and quality to meet the demands of our aged citizens. Mrs. Frances G. Scott, Director of the Oregon Center for Gerontology, in her letters sent to this committee and to me has assured us that while there is an obvious role to be played by training sources within the private sector, to promote this approach at the risk of a setback to university-based training and research would be most unwise. I urge you to insure that the intent of Congress when it constructed Title IV and V of the Older Americans Act is not abbrogated and that the system of research in gerontology developed in Oregon's universities will not lose support for its worthy research and education programs.

At this point I wish to include in the record a letter received from the Bi-State Mental Health Planning Committee regarding appropriations to the National Institute of Mental Health, which is also experiencing cutbacks in center establishments and staffing:

JUNE 1, 1970.

Memo to: Senator Frank Church, Senator Len B. Jordan, Senator Mark O. Hatfield, Senator Robert Packwood, Representative Al Ullman, and Representative James McClure.

From: Bi-State Mental Health Planning Committee.

Subject: Budget level for staffing of the Comprehensive Mental Health Centers Act.

In January, 1970, the advisory boards of three separate outpatient mental health services serving four counties in southwestern Idaho and Malheur County in Oregon met to organize a 20-member Planning Committee and to formulate plans for a comprehensive mental health service for this bi-state region. Mrs. James Donart, Weiser, was elected chairman and Mr. Ace Lloyd, Ontario, was elected vice chairman.

Under the Community Mental Health Centers program of the National Institute of Mental Health and the existing state and county mental health programs within the region, an enlarged comprehensive mental health service could be available to this region through joint county-state-federal cooperation by January, 1971.

The Bi-State Planning Committee was encouraged that the Renewal and Amendments of 1970 to the Community Mental Health Centers Act was passed by Congress earlier this year. Since this bi-state area is a "rural poverty" region, the Committee noted that the new level of financial support to such regions, as provided in the 1970 Renewal and Amendments, would greatly benefit our plans for initiating mental health services.

Although the participating counties will continue their financial support of mental health within the comprehensive service, and although the states have increased their funding for such regional mental health services, the financial aid and standards-of-care provided by NIMH are essential to assure the quality and quantity of mental health services developed within our region.

Such a comprehensive mental health service has been a long-time goal of many agencies and individuals within this region of Idaho and Oregon since it will provide the early counseling and treatment for the prevention of serious long-term mental illness. You can understand how particularly valuable this regionally-based preventive service would be to children and to young couples in need of such help for whom the services of the distant state mental hospitals are both undesired and inappropriate. Since mental illness takes a tremendous toll in both human and economic terms, support of accessible preventive services is a judicious use of funds and of professional skills.

We are, therefore, gravely concerned at the figures presented in The President's Fiscal-1971 Budget. The proposed amount for staffing of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is $60.1 million. This amount will not cover the continuation of existing staffing grants and the funding of 1970-approved grants . . . much less meet the new requests for 1971, such as our bi-state comprehensive mental health service!

We strongly urge you to support a Budget Request of $100 million for staffing of Community Mental Health Centers for fiscal 1971.

Our national resources spent in this manner will provide far greater human and financial returns to our people and to our nation than many other proposed federal expenditures, including those weapons-systems of questionable value. Without additional funds for staffing these mental health programs, this bi-state project will not be possible. Therefore, your active support of this higher-level budget request will greatly aid the quality of life for many of the 100,000 people living within our bi-state region.

Mrs. JAMES DONART,
Chairman.

Mr. ACE LLOYD,
Vice Chairman.

A bi-state project benefiting a region of 100,000 people will not be possible without additional funds for staffing, and I urge a substantial increase for the staffing of Community Health Centers for fiscal 1971.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest that the Committee give some consideration to raising the 1971 budget request for migrant health funds under the Public Health Service Act from $15 million to the authorized figure of $20 million.

My own State of Oregon is suffering from lack of sufficient Federal or State money to care for the influx of up to 50,000 migrants a season. An additional $5 million is insufficient in the face of the staggering health problems of these people, but it would provide some additional sources of health care which they do not have at present.

The average life span of a migrant laborer is 49 years; the tuberculosis rate is 17 times that of the average American; the venereal disease rate is 18 times more than average; the infestation of worms is 35 times that of average, which is an indictment of our health care for these workers who are so vitally needed in our agricultural fields.

Still another area of concern to Oregonians, which is funded through this subcommittee and is suffering as a result of federal cutbacks, is nursing education.

While there has been an increasing demand on schools to turn out more physicians, nurses, and paramedical personnel, in Good Samaritan Hospital and Medical Center in Portland federal aid in 1969, including grants, loans, scholarships, decreased by 20% from the previous year. At this point I wish to include a letter received from Administrator Chester L. Stocks who provides information concerning the urgent need for greater federal assistance to hospital schools of nursing:

JUNE 18, 1970.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: My urgent concern regarding the welfare of diploma schools of nursing in Oregon prompts my writing this letter to you. Regarding the funding of Title II of the Health Manpower Act of 1968, I would like to encourage your support for full funding for nursing education student loan and scholarship programs.

Since 1967 our School has experienced a marked growth in both educational facilities and student enrollment. The increased student enrollment, in fact, is a direct result of a planned expansion program. By September of 1968 a new nine story student dormitory and a new Nursing Education Building allowed for the expansion of enrollment to 300 students. In this year the School enrolled its largest freshman class totaling 125 students. It was hoped that this phased growth would be met by proportionately more Federal funds (scholarships, loans, and grants) to lend financial assistance to an expanding student enrollment. Quite the opposite occurred as the figures presented below indicate:

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

		Increase (percent)	Federal aid (includes grants, loans, scholarships)	Increase or decrease (percent)
1967	189	----------	$66,000	----------
1968	239	26	88,520	+33
1969	266	11	69,966	−20

In September of 1969, with a freshman class of 121 and total enrollment of 266, loans were made possible to only 74 students. Tuition for our School of Nursing at present is $3,900 for a total of 33 months' schooling (this figure includes use of dormitory facilities).

It is evident that while our student enrollment has increased substantially, Federal assistance to nursing students (which is minimal support in terms of total student enrollment) has been drastically cut back this past year. Inadequate Federal funding will further compound the problem as we expect our student enrollment to approximate 300 in September of 1970.

All of this means that a greater financial burden for the operation of the School at a substantial deficit each year. This must be done in order to charge tuition which will be competitive with State supported educational institutions and attract high school students to careers in nursing.

Current critical interest in cost of hospital care may jeopardize minimum funding of hospital supported schools of nursing.

According to recent statistics taken from the Oregon State System of Higher Education "Nursing Education in Oregon", in 1969, professional nurses graduated in Oregon numbered 120 from baccalaureate programs, 185 from diploma programs, and 53 from associate degree schools. More than half of all graduates were from the only two existing diploma programs in the state.

Our future supply of hospital based school of nursing graduates (who bring immediate work capability) to staff hospitals throughout the state of Oregon are vital for the provision of quality nursing care.

I hope that this letter will provide you with some facts and information concerning the urgent need for greater Federal assistance for hospital schools of nursing—indeed, all nursing education programs.

Cordially yours,

CHESTER L. STOCKS,
Administrator.

In conclusion, in my study of materials made available to me by leading Oregon medical scientists, I have been convinced that research funds and the training of medical personnel are intimately bound to the delivery of health service in this country. In cutting back research funds in the field of cancer, kidney disease, etc., we have only succeeded in placing a heavy load on our centers of learning and care which have been forced to foreclose projects and reduce research and teaching.

When disease costs so much to this nation, in suffering and death, and in dollars (heart disease and stroke alone cost between $20–$30 billion annually), it seems incredible that in the last few years we have considered funds for the health care needs of our people expendable when the going gets rough. How did we let this happen when in this decade we have spent $100 billion on the war and $25 billion on space?

Ironically, at the same time as we pursue the false economy of cutting back funds to medical research, we tell ourselves that we have arrived at a point in civilization where we can talk about the right to health and the right to adequate medical care. I contend that we shall be a Congress of a false spurious rhetoric if these setbacks to health research are not reversed. It is my earnest wish that this subcommittee attempt to remedy the situation as expediently as possible.

GEORGE SURGEON: AN OUTSTANDING EDUCATOR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senators to the outstanding contributions of a fine Marylander in the field of education.

In today's complex world, the ability to reason clearly and precisely is essential, and tomorrow's leaders will be determined by the competence of today's educators. To be a great teacher is not only to relay fact; but to train young people to think for themselves.

Such an educator is George Surgeon, 16 years principal of Brooklyn Park Elementary School in Anne Arundel County. The basis of his method is a simple one—direct and vigorous communication with his students.

In addition, Mr. Surgeon is a leader in his community as a whole as president of the Brooklyn Park Community Council and chairman of the Brooklyn Park Protection Association.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Anne Arundel Times of June 7, 1970, which deservedly recognizes Mr. Surgeon's impressive achievements be printed in the RECORD.

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

PORTRAIT OF A PRINCIPAL

George E. Surgeon gets to his office every day at 6:30 in the morning. He seldom leaves before 5 p.m. It's usually closer to 6.

Surgeon spends his day communicating ideas and exchanging thoughts with a wide variety of people. The door to his office always open, as is his mind to new ideas and new concepts. Thus, Surgeon has turned the institution which he heads into one of the most dynamic and successful of its kind.

Surgeon is not the director of a multi-million dollar industrial complex, a brilliant stock market specialist or the head of an important scientific study team. Yet his job is no less important to the progress of this county, to the success of its Democratic system and to the happiness of its people.

George Surgeon is an elementary school principal.

Specifically, he is principal of the Brooklyn Park Elementary School in Anne Arundel County. (There as those on his staff and those in the county school system who say he is about as fine a principal as one would ever hope to find. A model upon which others might build.)

Surgeon's reputation has spread far and wide, and the scope of his accomplishments increases with each passing day.

What makes a good school principal?

At a time when technology is playing an ever increasing role in today's society and in today's educational programming, Surgeon still thinks the answer is personal and individual attention. To pupils. To parents. To teachers. To all manner of problems. Thus, Surgeon's school is highly personalized.

Surgeon knows everyone of his 550 students on a first name basis. He knows their parents just as well.

Concerned with the quality of education offered the students at his school and with the progress that each of the children under his guidance makes, Surgeon relates well to whatever situation arises at the school, throws himself into the center of activity and makes things happen.

Teachers at the school bring Surgeon their problems and Surgeon works with the teachers to solve them. Students, too, regularly are in the office, chatting with their principal, bringing him ideas—ideas which he encourages.

What Surgeon is doing at Brooklyn Park Elementary is what education experts across the country say must be done if the educational system is to remain relevant to today's world.

He is moving into the community, making the school more and more a part of that community, and making the community more and more a part of the school.

The daily newspaper, Surgeon says, provides an excellent basis to bridge the gap—to bring the outside world into the classroom and extend the classroom into the outside world in a very real way.

"We use the newspapers all the time," he says, "to make the children aware of what is happening around them.

"We use them as a springboard for discussion, for examination, for careful study of the issues which concern their parents. It's entirely possible for a day's total curriculum to be based on the newspaper."

Teachers are encouraged to relate daily events to concepts and ideas which pupils might find difficult to grasp in intangible terms. Concepts such as honesty, integrity, courage.

A story on the front page about a taxi driver who discovered a passenger had left $3,000 in the back seat of his cab and who found the passenger and returned the money might make a practical tool for pushing home the principles of honesty and integrity, for instance, Surgeon says.

But this is just one of the ways in which Surgeon makes his school come alive as few elementary schools do on a day-to-day basis.

The principal has encouraged the publication, by the students themselves, of their own newspaper and literary magazine.

Both publications have repeatedly won first place national awards for excellence from the Columbia University Scholastic Press Association. They won first place awards in their respective categories again this year.

In the publications, the students themselves do the writing, communicating with other students on a variety of topics and through a variety of written forms: prose, poetry, straight news writing, etc.

The results has been multi-fold. The students have a sense of how to communicate, a sense of accomplishment at the results of effective communication, and a sense of achievement when this accomplishment is recognized.

It is difficult to imagine a child at Surgeon's school feeling stifled or unable to create. Surgeon, by placing the emphasis upon individualized instructions at the school, has keyed his teachers' programming to the specific talents of each student.

Pupils are allowed to progress through the subjects at their own rate of learning. They are encouraged to move ahead quickly in areas where they appear to excell.

Again, the individual approach of the principal himself plays a major role in keeping the pupil motivated, stimulated. Surgeon never passes up a chance to congratulate a student on an accomplishment in which he knows the pupil takes pride—no matter how small it may seem to others.

And, Surgeon does it in writing, not by means of a quick pat on the head in the corridor.

"I send students letters all the time from this office, complete with stationery from the school, in which I offer them my personal congratulations and the congratulations of the staff on what it is they have achieved.

"For many of these youngsters, this may be the first letter they've ever received. It can make quite a lasting impression."

Surgeon encourages his pupils to take an active interest in the world about them and to participate actively in projects to better the world.

A recent drive to raise funds for a family burnt out of its home and in need of food and clothing met with instant success at the school.

The young pupils each year also collect food, clothing and other items to place in special gift baskets at Christmas and Thanksgiving for needy folks.

One of the reasons for the exceptionally high quality of the work being done at Brooklyn Park Elementary, Surgeon feels, is the fact that the faculty, which the principal calls "outstanding in every respect," has set a high standard for itself and for the students.

"We give students opportunities to do things," Surgeon says, "and we encourage them to shoot for the stars. . . ."

A tribute to Surgeon's leadership and ability, the turnover rate on the school's faculty is amazingly low. "Most of our teachers here have been here a good, long time."

This provides strength from continuity and a fine base for in-depth development of long-term educational concepts and programs not possible at schools where the faculty turnover rate is very high and where projects die off right and left because of it.

Surgeon believes that a school principal—and teachers as well—should and must become involved not only in the lives of the students, but in the community at large.

Thus, he is a close friend of many parents of pupils in the school, has thrust himself into the forefront of community activities, never failing to accept responsibility and to give advice and assistance when he has been asked.

Surgeon is president of the Brooklyn Park Community Council, an organization of some 28 smaller organizations in the Brooklyn Park area.

He is chairman of the Brooklyn Park Protection Association, a group which tries to help young people in trouble.

He also serves on the county's Library Board of Trustees.

Surgeon has been principal of Brooklyn Park Elementary for 16 years. They have been 16 years of progress for the school and the community, progress for which Surgeon in no small measure is responsible.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 19 the senior Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) achieved the distinction of having served as majority leader of the Senate for a period longer than any of his predecessors. I want to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in a symbolic toast of this occasion. To the many good wishes which have been extended, may I add the best of health and the hope that we in this body may be fortunate to long have his good counsel and helping hand.

In addition, it is my hope that MIKE MANSFIELD will continue to be the leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate at least until he has held that office longer than anyone else—sometime in August 1974. But I must concur in the sentiment of the senior Senator from Vermont who expressed the hope that the record will be broken, but as minority rather than majority leader.

In this Chamber we labor long hours, sometimes at the request of the Senator from Montana exceedingly long, on important matters in the glare of public scrutiny. In such an atmosphere we come to know our colleagues well. I think no one can argue that MIKE MANSFIELD has stood the tests of time, of friendship, of loyalty and of courtesy with the best of them. Although I sometimes disagree with him on matters of substance, I have complete faith in his integrity and in his word. We know that when he says something will be done, it is; and when he says something will not be done, it is not. That is an exceedingly important quality to have in a majority leader. We are most fortunate that this leader has those qualities.

My closest relations with MIKE MANSFIELD perhaps have been on issues which are common to our two States, particularly beef imports. We have joined to introduce bills, initiate debates, and garner votes on this question, and I have always found his assistance helpful and his counsel wise. It is my hope that together, joined by a majority in this body, we shall be able to make certain that regulations concerning these imports are tightened and quotas imposed.

Again, let me offer congratulations and best wishes to the majority leader. Long may he have a front row desk in this Chamber.

CAMBODIA ACHIEVEMENTS?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, recent descriptions of the results of the dispatch of American troops into Cambodia might leave a gullible observer wondering why the war is not already over.

The President described it on June 3 as "the most successful operation of this long and difficult war." The Vice President has used similar expansive language, in fact describing it as a victory. On his recent telecast, the President likened this step to the World War II assault on the Normandy beaches.

In my view, such conclusions will soon become very false, indeed. We shall, I think, come to regret the Cambodian invasion as an error exceeded only by our original involvement in Vietnam.

We should recall that when the invasion was announced, the issue was whether the United States should supply military assistance to the new government in Cambodia. Many Members of the Senate, including the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, had expressed opposition to a new commitment in Indochina.

There was no doubt that the Lon Nol government was in trouble because of the reaction to its attacks on Vietcong sanctuaries within Cambodian borders. It seems quite plausible that, based on our past practices, Lon Nol conducted those assaults in the belief that American aid would soon be forthcoming. But in any case, regardless of the adminstration's receptivity to the idea of assisting the new Cambodian government, there appeared to be little sympathy for such assistance in the Senate.

Now, after 2 months of combat in new jungle battlefields, American air power, Vietnamese manpower, and U.S. military assistance have all somehow become unequivocally committed to the survival of the Cambodian regime. We have been sucked in, and the Vietnam war now encompasses another country and another wobbly dictatorship.

Moreover, it would be extremely difficult to find a less favorable environment for the expanded struggle. To begin with, assistance to Cambodia belies the basic aim professed by the President in South Vietnam—that of self-determination. Sihanouk had been elected by his people, and he still enjoys broad support among them. Lon Nol is in power only because he holds contempt for the processes of such elections and has therefore no qualms about seizing power by force.

But if we are unable to see our mission there as an effort to solidify the new military government, we can at least be sure that the Cambodian people see it that way. And they have seen us fight side by side with their traditional enemies, the South Vietnamese, who still remain in Cambodia and who still practice their unfortunate habits of looting Cambodian villages and raping Cambodian women. The popular, nimble neutralist, Prince Sihanouk, is now no longer neutral. He waits in Peking to inspire the Cambodian theatre of an Indochinese people's war for which—in light of the political consequences of our activities—we have helped trigger.

The Cambodian action has been a political disaster. Militarily, it has not been much better.

I fail to see, for example, how it is within the realm of reason to describe the action as a success when the Vietcong now either hold or contest roughly two thirds of the total land area of Cambodia, much of it bordering on South Vietnam. This amounts to a massive expansion of the small sanctuaries which were said to be our targets.

Nor are the statistics on captured rice and weapons particularly impressive. The President states, for example, that we captured 15 million rounds of small arms ammunition. Based on the average use between January 1, 1966, and March 31, 1970, that amount of small arms ammunition would be enough to last our side a little more than 2 days. We consume about 190 million rounds—more than 12 times the amount captured—each month. And in any case, all of those supplies can be quickly replenished.

Such is the questionable nature of the gains for which we sent American forces into Cambodia where 339 were killed and another 1,501 were wounded. The tactician who would term this venture a success would doubtless have proclaimed a victory for the Trojans.

Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post Robert Kaiser has supplied an account of how U.S. officials in Vietnam assess the results of the Cambodian action. He points out that of all the rifles captured, only about 2,000 were the AK–47's which is the basic individual weapon used in South Vietnam. He quotes officials as saying the whole cache-counting syndrome is sterile because "it can all be replaced with one boat-load."

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

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

OFFICIALS QUESTION CAMBODIAN ACHIEVEMENTS

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

SAIGON.—"We don't know very much," an American intelligence officer said last week, discussing the Indochina situation after the American offensive into Cambodia, "except that people who are doing much more talking know much less than we do."

If anyone speaks for the babel of voices in Vietnam at the end of the Cambodian operation, that officer does. His rebuke was intended partly for the President of the United States. Richard Nixon's unqualified assurances about the enormous achievements of the offensive are not freely endorsed by U.S. officials in Vietnam. The dominant feeling here seems to be uncertainty.

Nevertheless, many of those who speak critically of presidential rhetoric feel the situation in South Vietnam is better than it was before April 30. For local, tactical reasons, soldiers and civilian officials here generally think the Cambodian incursions were useful.

CONCLUSIONS DIFFERENT

It is impossible to reach any clear-cut conclusions about the Cambodian offensive. Measured in terms of its effect on the war in southern South Vietnam, the operation was probably very effective, though not decisive. Judged as a contribution to solving the United States' enormous problems in Indochina, the offensive into Cambodia may have been helpful, but it may also have done more harm than good.

Officers in the field report that they were able to search only a small fraction of the real estate in the known Communist base areas. Many miles of the frontier were never entered by ground forces. Areas where soldiers searched were seldom scoured. "You know," one officer said, "If you walk down a trail (in the jungle), what's four feet away from you, you can't see."

Senior American commanders have estimated that the U.S. and Saigon forces found 30 to 50 per cent of the material the Communists had stored in their old Cambodian sanctuaries. These are really just guesses, but the strange variety of materiel captured indicates that the allies missed a good deal.

For instance, nearly half the ammunition U.S. troops found in the Fishhook area was .51-calibre antiaircraft rounds, yet this has been a relatively small item in the Communist inventory in the past. Of all the rifles captured in the Cambodian incursion, only about 2,000 were AK–47s, the Communists' basic individual weapon.

Some officials here, including military intelligence officers, say the whole cache-counting syndrome is self-defending. "It doesn't matter," one officer said, "it can all be replaced with one boatload."

NOT SMOOTH

Cambodia was not a smooth operation. It began clumsily, with its planners not knowing how long they could stay in Cambodia, how far they could go, or what exactly they were after.

For all that, the operation seems certain to have a positive effect on the course of the war in the Mekong Delta, where North Vietnamese units have been fighting during the last 16 months.

U.S. officials think those units have depended heavily on sanctuaries and supply lines that no longer exist. Moreover, the southern Cambodian sanctuaries are in the open—unlike the jungle redoubts in the Fishhook, which can be rebuilt under cover—and will not be maintainable if Saigon continues operations in the area.

It seems likely that the North Vietnamese will be unable to move any more units into the southern delta in the near future. Those already there may find life more difficult, though that is at best an educated guess.

SERIOUS BLOW

In the III Corps region around Saigon, the operation also has dealt a serious blow to the Communists' rear. One of the six Vietcong subregions in the Saigon area has been virtually decimated, losing many key personnel including its deputy chief, who is now in government hands.

(This man, incidentally, was the highest Vietcong official the allies found in the operation.)

All the Vietcong organizations in the western half of III Corps lost sanctuaries in the Parrot's Beak that had become increasingly important to them.

By disrupting the well-organized supply depot system in the Fishhook, the allies have also forced the Communists to make greater efforts than ever to keep their forces equipped. U.S. intelligence estimates that the III Corps Vietcong logistical system used to require the services of 6,000 men, and will now need 18,000. This may be an exaggeration, but the Communists' new difficulties are real and grave.

Moreover, the South Vietnamese Army has had valuable new fighting experience, and has shown that it can cope with the North Vietnamese—when the South Vietnamese can fight in large units on open, foreign terrain, supported heavily by U.S. airplanes. Many officials here think the Army's morale is soaring as a result of its success in Cambodia, though this view is not universal.

Whatever the Cambodian offensive achievements, the war in South Vietnam is not over yet. Once again, it seems likely to shift into a new pattern.

NORTHERN FIGHTING

For example, officials here predict that big-unit fighting will now occur almost exclusively in the I and II Corps areas, the northern half of the country, but this was expected to happen soon anyhow. The remaining American units in III Corps were already scheduled to leave, probably before the end of this year. (There are no U.S. combat troops in the delta).

The Communists will have to develop the new supply line down the Sekong and Mekong Rivers from Laos into northeastern Cambodia. The enemy's rear will be further back than ever. The last time the Communists had to move their headquarters—after operations Junction City and Cedar Falls in 1967—they were able to launch the Tet offensive eight months later.

The Communists have been conserving their forces recently, and seem likely to continue doing so. Infiltration rates are still declining, and are now far below the highs of 1968. Yet the Communists have been inflicting significant damage and casualties (though nothing like what they managed in 1968), while suffering fewer losses themselves.

And, as a result of new intelligence gathered during the Cambodian operation, U.S. estimates of the enemy's strength in South Vietnam and Cambodia have risen by nearly 40,000 men.

The Communists do not seem to be capable of expanding the small amount of territory they still control, but by a judicious use of terrorism and military action they can continue to influence the population, harass the government and kill U.S. and South Vietnamese soldiers.

A major North Vietnamese effort in northern I Corps could collapse the government's presence there, though it would cost the Communists a fearful price. The war in the north could continue "for 10 years," regardless of the success of Vietnamization, in the view of one of the most experienced Americans in Vietnam.

CONSUMER CLASS ACTION—WEAPON FOR EFFECTIVE JUSTICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, although there has been increased public awareness of the need for consumer protection programs in recent years, there has been no significant reduction in the incidents of fraud. Despite good intentions and the proliferation of consumer protection laws and agencies, our society continues to require that the "buyer beware." For the past year I have been working to provide the American consumer with an effective weapon against fraud and deception, the consumer class action.

A consumer class action compensates for the inability of individual consumers to litigate small individual losses by enabling one or more representatives of a group of consumers with similar injuries to place the group injury in issue. The aggregate group claim is generally large enough to warrant the outlay of the necessary expenses and more significantly, to make it possible to obtain private counsel on reasonable terms.

Last July, during hearings on the initial consumer class action litigation, S. 1980, Virginia Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, strongly supported the basic principles of the legislation. Subsequently my proposal came under the attack of numerous special interest groups and the administration retreated from the strong position taken by Mrs. Knauer. The administration proposed instead a sorry substitute for meaningful consumer class action protection: A private remedy that is not self-starting but must be triggered by successful determination of a Government suit.

Not only would this proposal make for excessive delay, but it leaves to a Government agency rather than an injured party, the power to determine which consumers are to be protected. The administration's proposal will not provide the American public with the protection to which they are entitled.

In a recent issue of Trial magazine, Jerry S. Cohen, Esquire, of Washington, D.C., wrote a thoughtful article entitled "Weapon for Effective Justice" in which he compared the legislation that I have introduced with the administration's proposal. Mr. Cohen not only exposes the ineffectiveness of the administration's proposal, but answers persuasively the attacks which have been directed at my legislation. I recommend Mr. Cohen's article to my colleagues.

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

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

WEAPON FOR EFFECTIVE JUSTICE

(By Jerry S. Cohen)

The notion of consumer protection now has been warmly embraced by both Democrats and Republicans. But the question of how best to assist the consumer has become centered in a battle now taking place in the United States Senate Commerce Committee on the appropriate role of the class action.

Indeed traditional philosophical positions have been reversed. The Democrats are arguing for self-help through greater use of class actions. The Administration believes that the government is in the best position to decide what is best for the consumer.

Two pieces of legislation are involved—the Administration bill (S. 3201) and the Tydings bill (S. 3092).

The Administration bill permits the Federal Trade Commission to move against deceptive advertising or "any practice which is

unfair or deceptive to a consumer and is prohibited by section 5." Sec. 5(a) (1) says: "Unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce are hereby declared unlawful."

It permits the Justice Department to seek injunctions against a host of unfair and deceptive practices affecting consumers. The "hooker" is that no private action may be brought in federal court until there is a successful end to the government's lawsuit.

The Tydings bill is strictly a class action bill. It authorizes private class actions for violation of section 5 and "any act that gives rise to a civil action by a consumer or consumers under State, statutory or decisional law for the benefit of consumers."

The basis for federal jurisdiction assumes that the acts complained of are in commerce.

Both bills enlarge the jurisdiction of the federal courts. Under present law, no private action can be brought for violation of section 5 (although Senator Philip A. Hart has a bill on the sidelines, S. 3338, which would allow precisely that). Both bills would have the effect also of overriding in part *Snyder* v. *Harris*, 394 U.S. 332, which held that generally in federal actions depending on diversity for jurisdiction, the claims cannot be aggregated to meet the $10,000 jurisdictional requirement.

But the battle lines are drawn on the issue of self-help v. government pre-emption.

The Administration looks aghast at increasing the use of class actions because it would lead to "harassment" and would place an "undue burden" on the court. It would, one Administration witness said, turn the federal courts into small claim courts.

A basic principle is therefore at issue. What is the proper function of the court? Do courts exist to dispense justice or to provide a legal forum for those who can afford large attorney fees and who have only large claims?

If the basic purpose is "justice," then meritorious suits should be allowed, no matter how many they may be. Certainly justice denied to the small claimant is a blot on the concept of justice in general.

An old fable concerns the famous battle cry of the drunken admiral who, when approaching a drawbridge that threatened to take the top of his ship, cried out, "Don't raise the bridge men, lower the water."

The analogy is obvious. If so many wrongs are perpetrated that court dockets are clogged the cry "don't enlarge the courts, deny redress" has a somewhat ludicrous ring in these days of critical self-evaluation.

But those who raise the cry miss another basic point. The purpose of the class action since at least the 18th century has been to expedite the work of courts, not clog it. When claims, for instance, are aggregated, the single amount sought is somewhat greater than one might expect in small claims courts. The settlement offered to meet "small claims" in the recent antibiotics cases is $125 million.

The class action is the ultimate in judicial efficiency. Instead of hundreds or thousands of individual lawsuits, there is, in effect, only one. That the technique works well has been demonstrated in an increasing number of class actions in antitrust and Securities and Exchange Commission cases.

In the antibiotic cases, for instance, the class is all users of the antibiotics. The court has had no major problem in developing methods to deal with the huge numbers of plaintiffs represented by the class. Major innovations like the establishment of a multidistrict litigation panel to consolidate all pre-trial discovery has resulted in new frontiers of judicial efficiency. The experience of class action cases in the antitrust field has demonstrated conclusively that this device is an efficient and expeditious way of enabling the courts to handle massive numbers of plaintiffs without interfering with the efficient functioning of the courts.

What may really be behind the opposition to the Tydings bill has been described best by Attorney Aaron Fine of Philadelphia in a recent address to the ABA:

"P. T. Ryan of Philadelphia, not related to Sylvester, last month warned the Ninth Judicial Circuit that Rule 23 (the amended class action rule) goes entirely too far in giving poor litigants a chance to combine their resources, and might lead to the Welfare State, reminding us all of the Duke of Wellington's strong opposition to the development of British railroads because 'They would encourage the lower classes to move about. . . .'"

The argument that class actions will clog the courts rests on the same philosophy and has as little merit.

What about harassment? This argument is somewhat denigrating to the same courts the Administration is trying to save from clogging. It assumes the court is not able to handle its business properly.

Of course, the definition of harassment has its chameleon-like aspects depending on whether one is harassor or harassee. What is simple justice to the plaintiff may be simple harassment to the defendant. Giving a right to bring a class action does not mean that the court has to allow it. Indeed many class actions have been thrown out as such because the court did not think the requirements of Rule 23 had been met. And many lawsuits—as we all know so painfully—have been thrown out on motions to dismiss or for summary judgments. The court is able and sometimes, all too willing, to deal harshly with lawsuits it considers without merit.

Those who charge the Tydings class action bill will lead only to harassment of legitimate businessmen can charitably be described as those who have not litigated many cases in federal court—at least not as plaintiff's counsel.

But a more important issue is involved. There are a relative handful of lawyers in the FTC and the Justice Department. (And both the Justice Department and FTC will be delighted to back up my statement that they are understaffed.) Yet the country is populated (probably overpopulated) by thousands of competent counsel, many of whom are not overworked. And a number of them believe they can recognize a good lawsuit when they see it.

The laws of economics are also at work. Most lawyers are not going to handle a class action on a contingent fee basis unless their chances of success are good, which is another way of saying "unless they have a good case."

Why then should these many have to wait on the decisions of the few? What imbues the overworked government lawyer with a special wisdom as to what cases should be brought and which should not? Why should the wronged consumer have to wait contritely and patiently for the government to decide whether or not to give him a hand? All he asks is a chance to help himself, freeing government lawyers for other matters like enforcing the antitrust laws against price fixing and illegal mergers, or better yet, to beefing up their fight on organized crime. Indeed there is something almost paternalistic about the attitude that the government knows best when a consumer has been wronged.

It is time that even the American Bar Association realizes that the class action is here to stay; that it makes good sense and good justice; that the courts are mature enough to handle their internal problems.

And it is time for Congress to realize that the consumer is asking merely for the opportunity to protect himself; that there is a potent and court-proved legal weapon to allow him to do this—the class action. Consumer frustration in this land deserves something better than rhetoric and shadow legislation.

When all the fat is boiled away, the real fear of the class action is that it is an effective way to achieve justice for the consumer. And one thing should now be clear: the consumer will not long endure two standards of justice, court congestion and harassment notwithstanding.

APPOINTMENT OF DAVID K. E. BRUCE TO BE THE CHIEF OF THE UNITED STATES PEACE DELEGATION TO THE VIETNAM PEACE TALKS IN PARIS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am pleased that President Nixon last week announced the appointment of Mr. David K. E. Bruce to head the United States' delegation in Paris for the Vietnam peace talks.

Mr. Bruce brings to these difficult negotiations a broad knowledge and wide diplomatic experience gained in a distinguished service to his country covering several decades. During the late 1940's he served as chief of the ECA mission in France, and as U.S. Ambassador to France. Later he served as Under Secretary of State, Ambassador to Germany, and Ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. Bruce is highly respected as a diplomat in the capitals of Europe and the wisdom, tact and judgment he has demonstrated in the many difficult negotiations he has conducted in the past will enable him to make a major contribution in arriving at a settlement of the Vietnam issue and lead toward a settlement for Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief biographical sketch concerning Mr. Bruce, which was published in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FIVE PRESIDENTS AGREED: BRUCE IS A "GIANT"

When he retired in March, 1969, after eight years as United States Ambassador to the Court of St. James's—the longest anyone had held that post—David K. E. Bruce, was America's senior Ambassador. Before the London assignment he had been Ambassador in Paris and Bonn. At the age of 72, he is the only man ever to have served in this country's three leading embassies in Western Europe.

President Nixon, who named Mr. Bruce yesterday to head the United States delegation for the Vietnam peace talks in Paris, said more than a year ago that he and his four predecessors in the White House had disagreed on many things but "agreed that David Bruce was a giant."

Mr. Bruce, it has been noted, is a man of reason, able to be polite and analytical on the most controversial subjects. When anti-American groups came to him to complain, he first poured coffee. He knows books and silver and furniture. He can talk and he is above all, kind.

David Kirkpatrick Este Bruce was born in Baltimore on Feb. 12, 1898. His father, William Cabell Bruce, had served as United States Senator from Maryland from 1923 to 1929.

Reared in Baltimore, David Bruce entered Princeton University in 1915. Two years later he left to enlist in the Army and served in the field artillery in France. He was promoted on the battlefield and was discharged a lieutenant.

After the war, Mr. Bruce served briefly as a diplomatic courier in Europe. On his return to the United States he attended the law schools of the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland. He was admitted to the Maryland bar in 1921.

Mr. Bruce entered public life in 1924 when he was elected to the Maryland House of Delegates.

In World War II he went to London as representative of the American Red Cross, then shifted to an intelligence role there in the Office of Strategic Services. He later became a colonel in charge of O.S.S. operations in Europe.

From then on, Mr. Bruce was committed to public service. In addition to the ambassadorial positions, he was assistant Secretary of Commerce, United States aid administrator in France, representative to the Coal and Steel Community and for two years, Under Secretary of State.

AMERICA'S OBLIGATION TO HER VETERANS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the May issue of Life carried a shocking article on the deplorable conditions that exist in many of our Veterans' Administration hospitals as the result of insufficient resources for staff and operations. Entitled "From Vietnam to a Veterans' Administration Hospital: Assignment to Neglect," the article rightly stimulated a great deal of public concern and indignation.

In order to determine whether the Life story applied here in Maryland, I met personally on June 8 with the heads of veterans organizations in Maryland and then toured the major Veterans' Administration health facilities in the State. I was deeply moved and distressed by what I discovered.

Additional funds were needed everywhere to employ and train Veterans' Administration employees to inform veterans of the many rehabilitation, education, and career preparation services that are available to them. Often the great tragedy was the fact that programs existed to help veterans pick up their lives where they had left off and to successfully reenter American life, but the men did not know of them. All of the education, financial, and career benefits Congress enacts for veterans and the taxpayers support are worthless if the men for whom they are intended are not informed about them.

In the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Howard, which is located 15 miles from Baltimore, I found another tragic and unacceptable situation: Owing to a lack of funds, it was impossible to provide transportation to the hospital for volunteers to work with veterans and, worst of all, for families of veterans who were without private means of transportation.

Of all the pain suffered by the men in veterans hospitals—and I saw brave men suffering from wounds and injuries that would make the strongest man weep—none cuts so deeply or is as unendurable as loneliness. As any doctor will tell you, the support and encouragement of friends and family is the strongest medicine for a sick man. Yet it was this medicine—the love and concern of relatives and community volunteers—that many of the veterans at Fort Howard were being denied because of a lack of funds for transportation of volunteers and relatives from surrounding towns, train stations, and bus depots. There is something desperately wrong when a nation which has the money to send men a quarter-of-a-million miles to the moon fails to provide resources to transport the loved ones of Fort Howard Hospital veterans the 15 miles from Baltimore.

At the Veterans' Administration hospital at Loch Raven, Md., the problem was even more basic. Given the shortage of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities throughout the Nation, Loch Raven was converted several years ago from a TB sanitarium to a general veterans hospital. But right from the beginning, the resources needed for a complete conversion have been lacking. On my visit, it became evident that not enough money was available to hire many key medical personnel. According to hospital officials, at least $114,000 more is needed to fill the remaining health service void at Loch Raven.

And as the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs so ably chaired by the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) has demonstrated, the unacceptable conditions I witnessed in Maryland can be found in virtually every State in the Union. Inadequate funding for our veterans hospitals is clearly a problem of national dimensions.

Mr. President, the sad truth is we suddenly find ourselves confronted with a grave crisis in veterans health care in this country. Much of the sudden shortage of facilities and staff is attributable to the great increase in the number of veterans requiring medical care as a result of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

To date, more than 275,000 American boys have been wounded in action. Roughly half of them must be immediately hospitalized for their wounds and most of these at some point will need Veterans' Administration hospital or outpatient care. In the past year alone more than 50,000 Vietnam veterans were admitted to Veterans' Administration hospitals. Last year, the level of outpatient visits required reached 500,000.

Our wounded veterans, according to reports, are receiving excellent care while in overseas hospitals in Vietnam and elsewhere. But this level of excellence is not being maintained when they are shipped home to Veterans' Administration facilities in the States. Despite the 5-year time span since our increased military involvement in Southeast Asia began to cause heavy casualties, Veterans' Administration facilities remain inadequate. And to the best of my knowledge, the Veterans' Administration still is without an overall plan to meet the exigencies of this wartime situation.

The additional $100 million for Veterans' Administration medical care contained in the Senate version of the Independent Offices appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971 constitutes a major step in what must become a national campaign to insure that American veterans receive the best medical care this Nation can offer. Appropriating this additional $100 million would help to eliminate a number of serious deficiencies in our Veterans' Administration health system:

First, the ratio of staff to patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals could be raised on a par with that in our community hospitals. The overall staff-to-patient ratio for Veterans' Administration hospitals is 1.5 to 1, comparing poorly to the 2.7 to 1 community hospitals. In some Veterans' Administration hospitals, a single nurse is forced to minister to anywhere from 80 to 140 patients at one time.

Second, the equipment and maintenance and repair backlogs in Veterans' Administration hospitals that total more than $46 million according to conservative estimates could be reduced.

Third, many veterans currently are forced to wait up to 6 months for the hospital examinations and treatment they need. Additional Veterans' Administration funds would help relieve this backlog of 44,200 examinations and 8,600 treatments.

Fourth, badly needed long-term care facilities for aging and infirm veterans no longer requiring intensive hospital care could be constructed.

Fifth, funds are required for the education and training of top notch health personnel to man Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Sixth, it is considered absolutely essential that the Veterans' Administration conduct medical research if the Veterans' Administration system is to attract and retain high caliber personnel. More money would permit the initiation of new research projects.

Seventh, appropriating an additional $100 million would provide an opportunity to eliminate some of the disgraceful physical conditions that exist in our Veterans' Administration hospitals; the leaking roofs, the infestation with rats and mice, the numerous hospitals that have no air conditioning despite their location in some of the hottest parts of the Nation. The Veterans' Administration hospitals at Perry Point and Fort Howard in Maryland, for example, are desperately in need of air conditioning.

Mr. President, since my election to the Senate, I have devoted a great deal of time and energy to the area of veterans health care and other veterans benefits. If we can ask many of our young men to risk their lives for the security and future of the Nation, we can do no less than provide them with the best care when they suffer injury or sickness in the conduct of their duty. To do less is to betray them.

It is essential that Congress appropriate this additional $100 million for the health care of our veterans. I, for one, shall do everything in my power to see that this money is made available for those who so richly deserve it.

OUT OF INDOCHINA IN 18 MONTHS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, during the course of the Senate debate on the Cooper-Church amendment, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) called for the adoption of a

national policy of complete disengagement of all American forces from Indochina. Our withdrawal, he declared, should be "responsible and orderly, but it should be completed by the end of 1971."

As a longtime advocate of complete disengagement, I commend the Muskie article, which appeared recently in the New York Times magazine. It is "must" reading for anyone who may not yet realize that President Nixon's "Vietnamization" program is not designed to extricate the United States from Vietnam, but can only result in perpetuating the war and prolonging our participation in it.

I ask unanimous consent that this important, factual, and highly informative article be printed in the RECORD.

SENATOR MUSKIE ON A WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, while it is getting more and more difficult to find fresh insight into the awful tragedy of the Indochina war, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) has recently made a most valuable contribution to the debate over how to extricate ourselves from our terrible dilemma.

His article published in last Sunday's New York Times magazine presents one of the clearest and most forceful arguments I have seen for the need to set a timetable for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Senator MUSKIE points to the "frustration, fear, and sense of drift" which has enveloped this country due to our continuing and deepening involvement in the struggles of the Indochinese people. But his argument for a withdrawal schedule is based on much more than an assessment of what the war has done to the spirit and capacity of our Nation.

He argues forcefully and persuasively that nothing short of a scheduled withdrawal can break the hopeless deadlock which now grips the negotiating table. "Vietnamization," as presently revealed by the President's decision to invade Cambodia, is nothing more than "more of the same"—depending upon the assumption that President Nixon's military pressure will cause the North Vietnamese to break, even where the past administration failed. It is a policy not for getting us out, but keeping us in—and perhaps for broadening our commitment to the defense of the entire Indochinese peninsula.

Only a scheduled withdrawal of all U.S. troops can force the South Vietnamese and the other side to come to political terms and place the control of America's destining back in our hands. Whatever we could ever have accomplished has been done. We must now, as Senator MUSKIE argues, withdraw all of our troops in a reasonable period, contingent only on the return of our prisoners and the safety of our troops.

I join the Senator from Idaho in asking unanimous consent that Senator MUSKIE's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUT OF INDOCHINA IN 18 MONTHS

(By EDMUND S. MUSKIE)

WASHINGTON.—When President Nixon took office, most Americans hoped that his Administration would find the key to the Vietnam problem. We wanted to end our preoccupation with the war and get on with unfinished national business. Unfortunately, the Administration has not found the key, and the war in Indochina continues to dominate our lives. Having invaded Cambodia in an attempt to score dramatic military gains, the Administration finds itself ever more tightly bound to the war and its consequences. We cannot pry ourselves loose by force of arms, and we cannot dictate the peace.

We can, however, move to create conditions favorable to a political settlement, and that should be our objective. If we adopt that goal, we must have a clear commitment to withdraw all American forces from Indochina. The withdrawal should be responsible and orderly, but it should be completed by the end of 1971.

Such a withdrawal contrasts sharply with the Nixon Administration's policy, which calls for reductions in strength just large enough to maintain the hope of complete withdrawal—and thereby mute domestic opposition to the war—while preserving the military balance and continuing the hostilities. No matter what its aims, the net effect of the President's policy is to perpetuate the war.

We have only to look at what has happened in Indochina and at what is happening in our country to see the folly of this policy. The war has frustrated young people who question our national morality. Its consequences have frustrated their parents, who are paying for inadequate housing, overcrowded schools, poor transportation systems, inefficient medical services and a polluted environment. More and more Americans are losing faith in the capacity of our system to meet national needs.

Frustration, fear and a sense of drift have poisoned our relations with one another. Students have protested, and a few have been killed. Students and workers, both of whom want a better America, find themselves at sword's point. Black and white families, competing for limited housing, school facilities and job opportunities, are divided at a time when it is essential that they work together.

The Administration has not acted to end these divisions; it has widened them. While freedom of speech is applauded in principle, it is condemned when it is used to criticize the Administration's policies. While freedom of the press is called a virtue, all "unfavorable" press articles are described as biased. Silent majorities have been invented to oppose all those who disagree with the President. Insinuations have been made that Americans who die in Indochina are the victims of Americans who dissent.

And for what? Are hundreds of Americans and thousands of Vietnamese dying each week to stop a Communist threat to our national security, or are we fighting merely to preserve the military dictatorship in Saigon? Are we fighting in Cambodia to save Vietnam? Will we have to step up the fighting in Laos to save Cambodia? Where will we have to fight next to save Laos?

We are told that "Vietnamization" is the way to withdraw from Indochina but that it cannot succeed unless we destroy the enemy's sanctuaries in adjacent neutral territory. If this is so, Vietnamization is not a viable policy for withdrawal, for the Cambodian sanctuaries are only part of the vast network of hiding places available to the North Vietnamese and their local Communist counterparts. The clearing of the sanctuaries therefore means military activity not just in Cambodia, but in Laos and the demilitarized zone as well. Such a campaign would violate our international commitments in the area and vastly expand the war. American troops would have to be called up, not sent home.

Though President Nixon's Vietnamization strategy risks a greatly widened war as a precondition for peace, the Administration has struggled to justify it and the Cambodian operation as ways to achieve our disengagement in Southeast Asia. The absence of any logical connection between the means and the end is reflected in the gross exaggerations and shifting explanations that have accompanied each step of the Cambodian incursion.

The President told us on April 30, for instance, that his Cambodian target was "the key control center" of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong for South Vietnam. In his June 3 progress report he made no reference to this point, and for good reason. Press articles and statements from our military men disclose that the headquarters could not be found, let alone attacked.

The President also said on April 30 that the North Vietnamese were "concentrating [their] main forces in [the Cambodian sanctuaries] . . . for massive attacks on our forces and those of South Vietnam." Yet in the very next paragraph of that speech he said that North Vietnamese troops had left their Cambodian sanctuaries and were "encircling" Phnom Penh. How is it that their movement away from our forces toward a distant objective could constitute an "immediate threat" to the Americans and South Vietnamese?

The President said that the Communist thrusts into the interior of Cambodia would make that country "a vast enemy staging area and a springboard for attacks." But look at the map of the situation in Cambodia before and after our invasion. We have not been able to drive all of the enemy forces out of their sanctuaries, and they have—despite the American attacks—taken control of a large land mass. When our forces vacate the sanctuaries, the Communists will return to them, too, in great numbers. The weeks since our incursion into Cambodia have seen an increase, not a decrease, in Communist control of Cambodian territory.

The President says that the vast amount of ammunition and the great number of weapons we have captured will mean fewer American deaths in South Vietnam. I wish this were true, but the statistics are not reassuring. Administration officials say that at most we have captured 40 to 50 percent of the Communist stockpile in Cambodia. According to these same sources, this amounts to supplies for about six months. In other words, the enemy still possesses sufficient material for at least the next six months, and has six months to replenish its stocks. Moreover, if what we captured in a limited area in Cambodia can be described as "vast," then what the North Vietnamese have stockpiled in South Vietnam, Laos and North Vietnam can only be imagined as enormous.

Administration officials repeatedly disclaim any new U.S. commitment to the Cambodian military regime of Lon Nol. But what have we seen? In his April 30 speech, the President pledged "small arms and other equipment" for the Cambodians. More recently, we have been told that our Government has agreed to pay for several thousand Thai volunteers and Thai aircraft to help Lon Nol. Now we've been informed that several thousand Cambodian mercenaries trained by U.S. special Forces in Vietnam have been airlifted to Cambodia. Is this not a new commitment?

The President said he moved into Cambodia to show the Soviet Union, China and North Vietnam that we are not a "pitiful, helpless giant," but his strategy has not worked. Both Moscow and Peking have agreed to step up their assistance to North Vietnam, and Peking has begun to exert more, not less, influence in Indochina. North Vietnam

has increased the level of its military activity in Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam. All of northeast Cambodia and southern Laos are now under virtual North Vietnamese control. When the President removed the limitations on U.S. military operations and invaded the Cambodian sanctuaries, North Vietnam ended its self-restraint elsewhere.

On June 3 the President said, "We have insured the continuance and success of our withdrawal program," adding that 50,000 troops would be withdrawn by Oct. 15. He may not have realized that he was addressing the same people who heard him promise on April 20 that he would reduce American forces in Vietnam by 150,000 men by June, 1971—an average reduction of 12,500 a month. If that rate were maintained, we'd be withdrawing 75,000 rather than 50,000 troops between April 20 and Oct. 15. Apparently, the "successful" Cambodian invasion has slowed our withdrawal.

The decision to invade Cambodia was not one President Nixon inherited; it was a new action that broadened the war. This adventure, therefore, gives us a much clearer understanding of the President's Vietnamization policy.

What is Vietnamization? The President says it is "a plan in which the United States would withdraw all of its combat forces if Vietnamese forces were trained and able to take over the fighting." He has added that the timing of the plan would depend on "the level of enemy activity, the progress in the Paris peace talks and, of course, other matters—the problems particularly with regard to the rate of training of the Vietnamese forces."

All of this suggests that the President's plan is for the reduction of U.S. forces, not for their full withdrawal. The conclusion to be drawn from his withdrawal announcements is that 284,000 American troops would still be in Vietnam by the middle of next year. He has said nothing about reductions after June, 1971, except that they are contingent upon Hanoi's restraint, South Vietnamese military progress or a breakthrough in Paris. This leaves our future subject to the initiatives of Hanoi and Saigon, and it raises doubts about whether the President contemplates any significant reductions after June, 1971.

Mr. Nixon further describes Vietnamization as the road to a negotiated settlement, but a look at the situation in Paris makes it difficult to believe that negotiations are the top priority for the Administration. Our delegation in Paris has not been headed by an Ambassador vested wth the authority of the President for more than seven months, and there have been no announcements of new approaches or proposals at the talks for an even longer period.

Even if the highest priority *were* established for a negotiated settlement, however, Vietnamization does not seem likely to move us toward it. It is an essentially military strategy that cannot deal effectively with the political nature of the struggle.

The North Vietnamese and Vietcong, though they have suffered through 25 years of war, show no signs of being near the breaking point. They can still control the level of combat—nothing in the Nixon plan prevents them from continuing to do so—and they will probably not give up the fight or make major concessions at the negotiating table as long as that is true.

Then there are the Saigon forces, upon whom Vietnamization really depends. While they have improved over the years, their basic weaknesses persist. They still avoid night patrols; their officer corps, most of whose members are still chosen on the basis of social status, is widely regarded as incompetent, and the gross desertion rate runs as high as 10,000 a month. While some South Vietnamese units are reported to have performed well in Cambodia, they required extensive American support.

Behind the South Vietnamese military, of course, is the Thieu-Ky regime, which neither deserves nor receives much popular support. Though we contend that 90 per cent of the population of the hamlets is "pacified," roughly half the hamlets are still subject to significant Vietcong influence. Even at this stage of the war, the Saigon Government has no meaningful control over half of its country. Anyone who speaks out against the regime is jailed and hounded, while we stand silently by.

And despite the opposition of the Government to such talk, there persists among several South Vietnamese groups support for a peaceful settlement. In the 1967 elections, which brought President Thieu to power, 60 per cent of those who voted cast ballots for candidates who espoused some form of accommodation for peace.

In these circumstances, Mr. Nixon apparently hopes to confront Hanoi with the choice of accepting a political settlement or seeing an American military force remain in South Vietnam, propping up the Thieu-Ky regime indefinitely. If this is his strategy, he must convince Hanoi that the American people will permit him to keep 150,000 or even 200,000 American soldiers in Vietnam for the foreseeable future. On that basis, he expects Hanoi to negotiate.

Hanoi will not negotiate unless it has no other choice, and obviously that is not the case now. Moreover, the Saigon leaders, given our assurance that we will remain if there is no settlement, will be in no mood to compromise. And without Hanoi and Saigon, after all, there will be no negotiations.

What, then, are the probable consequences of the Vietnamization policy? When we have drawn our forces down to about a quarter of a million men, Hanoi will have greater freedom to step up the level of hostilities, inflicting heavy casualties on South Vietnamese units and keeping American casualties at high levels. The President clearly recognizes that Hanoi will have the military capacity to do this; that is why in every one of his statements on the fighting he has warned Hanoi that if it expands the conflict as American forces are withdrawing, he will act decisively. He clearly hopes to deter Hanoi, but his threats may have no effect.

Faced with the choice of negotiating with an intransigent South Vietnamese regime, permitting us to remain indefinitely in Vietnam or increasing the level of fighting, Hanoi is likely to choose the third course and step up the fighting, as it has in the past.

If this sequence occurs, the President will face another unpalatable choice: accepting the higher casualties, withdrawing all U.S. forces "precipitously" under pressure or escalating. He has told us that he would escalate, and—remembering his deeds as well as his words—we must take this assertion seriously. He has also said that this escalation would not be incremental but "strong and decisive." This presumably means a massive bombing campaign against North Vietnam coupled with an effort to close Haiphong harbor.

Here is the gravest danger in the President's policy. It will lead us not to the withdrawal of all American forces and an end to the fighting but to greater escalation. And if we have learned anything from our experience in Indochina it is that escalation leads not to less conflict and involvement but to more.

To raise such doubts about the wisdom of the President's policy is not to have a lack of concern for the welfare of our troops or to question their ability. It is, rather, to adopt the philosophy of Lord Chatham, who said in 1777, in discussing the American Revolution: "I love and honor the English troops; I know their virtues and their valor; I know they can achieve anything except impossibilities; and I know that the conquest of English America is an impossibility."

If the conquest of the Indochinese Communists is also an impossibility, what alternatives do we have? I believe that the answer lies in what the Congress has been doing and trying to do this last year. While the President has been committing himself more and more to Vietnamization, Congress has been seeking ways to prevent further escalation and to go beyond the President's troop-reduction policy to one of full withdrawal.

Among the major attempts to prevent further escalation was the amendment passed last year to prohibit spending for U.S. combat operations in Laos and in Thailand and the Cooper-Church Amendment, designed to prohibit the use of U.S. funds to support the war in Cambodia after June 30, the President's deadline for the Cambodian operation.

A second group of measures under discussion concerns prohibitions on the resumption of our bombings in North Vietnam and limitations on the President's authority to commit U.S. forces to combat after a certain date. A related effort is designed to insure that all of our forces will be out of Vietnam by a specific date unless the President comes to Congress, justifies a continuation of the fighting and obtains further approval. Part of this campaign is the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment, which provides for the cut-off of funds for offensive operations by Dec. 31, 1970, and the total elimination of funds for military activities in Indochina by June 30, 1971.

Another approach is the resolution I have offered to move us toward peace in Indochina. It would commit the Senate to a policy aimed at a cease-fire, complete withdrawal by a specified deadline, a political settlement and the reconstruction of the area. The resolution calls upon the President to present to Congress a plan for the full withdrawal of U.S. personnel during the 18 months after the adoption of the resolution. It also directs the appropriate committees of the Senate to submit the necessary implementing legislation.

Neither the President nor Congress should act alone in finding our way out of Indochina. Congress has the constitutional responsibility to authorize and appropriate funds; the President is Commander-in-Chief. They therefore share policymaking responsibilities.

I am convinced that a withdrawal timetable makes sense; given the choices we face, it is the only way to bring peace.

My proposal is a very simple one: The United States should develop a fixed timetable for the withdrawal of all its forces from Indochina. We should stick to that timetable, subject only to Hanoi's willingness to release all American prisoners of war and to its acceptance of measures to insure the safety of the withdrawing Americans. While I believe that all American forces should be out of Indochina in 18 months, we should be prepared to shorten this time if Hanoi agrees to a cease-fire.

One common criticism of fixed withdrawal programs, of course, is that they would lead to a "bloodbath" in South Vietnam. But that objection, like others the President has raised, has more emotional than factual validity. In the first place, the war itself is a bloodbath. The possibility of persecution after a withdrawal must be balanced against the certainty that thousands will be slaughtered if the war continues. At any rate, no settlement, political or military—and certainly nothing in our present policy—can provide a guarantee against a bloodbath. (Even if the President were to achieve his goal of a settlement based on free elections,

the Communists could win power at the polls, then do as they pleased.) And in formulating our withdrawal plan, we must, of course, accept the responsibility for evacuating and resettling those who wish to leave Vietnam.

Just as a bloodbath is only a possibility, it is by no means certain that the Communists would force their way into power in South Vietnam if all U.S. forces were withdrawn in 18 months. The military situation could be inconclusive for some time.

On the political side, one can only speculate about the problems that would be created for any government by the multiplicity of forces that would be buffeting South Vietnam without the dominating appeal of a Ho Chi Minh. The resulting uncertainties could generate the political pressures that lead to accommodation rather than the battlefield pressures that produced a Hue.

Because we are often told that our withdrawal would leave the South Vietnamese at a military disadvantage, many Americans have an image of a small people in South Vietnam left at the mercy of a giant Communist neighbor. We are easily convinced that we would be leaving a "Belgium" to fight a "Russia," while the real analogy in terms of economic and military potential is that we would be leaving a "Germany" to fight a "France." The total populations of South Vietnam and North Vietnam are approximately equal. The total number of South Vietnamese under arms is two or three times greater than the combined strength of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese. The military aid we have given to the South Vietnamese is far more extensive and sophisticated than that supplied to North Vietnam by the Soviet Union and China. The South Vietnamese are fighting at home to defend their families and villages; the enemy soldiers must travel for months over tortuous trails to fight in a strange land.

If we withdraw in 18 months, we will have had American soldiers in South Vietnam for seven years, killing the best enemy troops and training South Vietnamese. After all of this, the South Vietnamese should be able to hold their own. If they can't, no nation can accuse us of failing to meet our commitments.

In his Nov. 3 speech, the President used two other arguments against a fixed withdrawal timetable. He said that it would give Hanoi no incentive to negotiate seriously in Paris. But, by his own admission, the negotiations are at a virtual standstill and there seems to be no prospect for improvement. He also argued that Hanoi could simply wait until U.S. withdrawals had reduced our forces to the point of vulnerability in South Vietnam, then attack. But is it not perfectly clear that Hanoi could wait for this moment even if the withdrawal timetable were not fixed and announced.

In short, I find the arguments advanced by the President and others against the fixed withdrawal timetable totally unpersuasive, and the advantages of a clear-cut withdrawal announcement are considerable.

Perhaps the most important advantage is that control of our conduct will be put in our hands, not those of the North and South Vietnamese. The President's Vietnamization policy explicitly links American withdrawals to progress in Paris, the level of fighting in Indochina and the improvement in South Vietnamese capability. The first two factors are controlled by Hanoi and the third by Saigon. With a fixed timetable we would be saying to both sides that American interests, both foreign and domestic, compel our withdrawal. The Vietnamese would, at long last, be required to adjust to American interests rather than the reverse.

Only by announcing our willingness to withdraw on a fixed schedule can we hope to create a climate in which meaningful negotiations will be possible. On the things we most care about—the return of our men held as prisoners of war (some of them, incidentally, held longer than any soldiers in our history) and the safety of our troops as we withdraw—there is every likelihood of reaching an understanding with Hanoi once we indicate our willingness to set a firm date for our withdrawal. Hanoi has hinted that it might be prepared to negotiate on these issues. By contrast, the President's indeterminate schedule, which would keep a large U.S. force in Vietnam indefinitely, might force Hanoi to move against the remaining Americans, triggering a new round of escalation. It offers no prospect for the early return of our men held in North Vietnam, to whom our obligation is surely very great.

Prospects for a broader political settlement in Vietnam will also improve if we commit ourselves to a fixed withdrawal schedule. Without an American deadline, the generals who control the South Vietnamese Government will not consider a sharing of power, even with neutralists. Until they know that their weakness can no longer keep us in Vietnam, the generals will not be prepared to broaden the Government. Any truly representative government in South Vietnam would make a serious effort to negotiate with North Vietnam. And once they know we are leaving, the Hanoi leaders might also be ready for serious negotiations.

America is a very powerful nation. It is in a position now to make decisions that can help lay the foundation for a political settlement in Southeast Asia and prepare the way for the reconstruction of that area. Then, perhaps, we can turn our attention to meeting our commitments to our own people for "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

History must judge the wisdom of our involvement in Vietnam and the wisdom of our method for ending that involvement. We have no control over the former, but we do have an opportunity to determine the way in which we end the war and set the stage for future development in Southeast Asia.

JAMES SUMNER JULIAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President. On May 14, 1970, the lifelong dream of James Sumner Julian came true. It was on this date that his sixth child received a B.A. from DePauw University.

With the help of a normal schoolteacher in Danville, Ind., James Julian received a high school education. He desired to continue on to DePauw, but was financially unable to do so. He vowed at the time that all of his children would graduate from DePauw—quite an ambitious dream for a railway mail clerk.

Five of his children did graduate from DePauw. The sixth, James Julian began at Depauw in 1920, but transferred to the University of Chicago where the subject matter was better suited to his needs. He obtained a medical degree from Howard University, taught at Howard, and later practiced medicine in Baltimore, Md.

On May 14, 1970, Dr. James Julian was awarded a B.A. from DePauw, conferred by university president, Dr. William Kerstetter. At this time the Julians established a memorial fund of over $25,000 at DePauw honoring their deceased parents.

The other children who received degrees from DePauw are: Dr. Emerson R. Julian, Dr. Percy Julian, a world renowned scientist who found the chemical breakthrough that permitted the mass production of cortisone; Mrs. Mattie Julian Brown, former WYCA executive; Mrs. Elizabeth Julian White, Baltimore high school language teacher; and Mrs. Irma Raybon, former social worker.

All Americans can take pride in James Sumner Julian's dream and its realization. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday, June 10, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A FAMILY DREAM COMES TRUE: DR. JULIAN IS SIXTH IN FAMILY TO GET DEPAUW DEGREE

(By Sue Miller)

Back in 1886, James Sumner Julian was helping his mother, Lavonia Julian, a vigorous litte black woman who was born a slave, sell produce in Montgomery, Ala.

In the marketplace that sunny April day, the 16-year-old youth had a conversation with a young white woman teacher. It changed the course of his life and in later years the lives of his six children.

The talk centered on the future education of the black youth, who had just completed the sixth grade, the end of the line in public school education at that time for Negroes in Alabama.

It blossomed into a dream that was not fully realized until May 14, 1970, 84 years later.

On that day, James Julian's 68-year-old son, Dr. James S. Julian, Jr., who has practiced medicine in Baltimore for 36 years, received a B.A. degree from DePauw University.

FATHER'S DREAM

The ceremony capped the dream of Dr. Julian's father, an ambitious railway mail clerk—that his six children graduate from DePauw, even though it did not work out for him.

"I feel now as if I belong," said Dr. Julian, who is the brother of Dr. Emerson R. Julian, the Baltimore city councilman and also a physician.

He added, "I won't have to explain why the others did and I didn't graduate. To some people I have appeared to be a black sheep."

The degree conferred by Dr. William Kerstetter, president of the predominantly white university, was awarded by vote of DePauw's faculty and board of trustees.

Dr. Julian described the awarding of the degree as "a pleasant surprise," and as an experience "that nothing will ever equal."

PAID TRIBUTE TO FAMILY

Recalling the ceremony, he said, "They paid tribute to the family, as a DePauw family. I don't think I'll ever be able to experience that pleasure, joy and happiness again."

Sharing in the unusual occasion were Dr. Percy Julian, Chicago scientist who gained international fame for finding the chemical breakthrough that permitted the mass production of cortisone, class of 1920.

Also, Dr. Emerson R. Julian, 1938; Mrs. Mattie Julian Brown of Washington, former YWCA executive whose husband has been in the United States diplomatic corps, 1926; Mrs. Elizabeth Julian White, Baltimore high school language teacher, 1928, and Mrs. Irma Julian Raybon, former social worker in Brooklyn who now resides in St. Louis, 1933.

The event took place on the 100th anniversary of the birth of the man with the DePauw dream, the 50th anniversary of Dr. Percy Julian's graduation as class valedictorian and Dr. James Julian's entry to DePauw in 1920. Shortly afterward, he transfered to the University of Chicago.

MEMORIAL FUND ESTABLISHED

The Julians made the day more memorable by announcing the establishment of a memorial fund of over $25,000 at DePauw honoring their deceased parents.

Looking back, Dr. Julian feels his parents were "extremely courageous." He explains, "They gave up their home in Alabama to move to Greencastle, Ind., so we'd have the advantage of a high school education and be able to go on to DePauw."

He added, "I don't like to recall those days in Alabama." He was alluding somewhat bitterly, to the recrimination faced by blacks in the days of his youth in Alabama.

"I want to escape ever hating again," he said. "I like to feel sorry for people who do things sometimes in that respect."

The "inspiration" for the Julian-DePauw dream says Dr. Julian, was Joan Stuart of Danville, Ind., who was a teacher in the State Normal School in Montgomery when Jimmie Julian was his mother's marketplace helper.

WENT TO NORMAL SCHOOL

Miss Stuart and Mrs. Julian agreed that each week the boy's mother would give the teacher part of her produce earnings. In exchange, Miss Stuart took the youth into the State Normal School.

Miss Stuart wanted Jimmie to go on to DePauw, but financially that goal was out of reach.

As the years went by, Dr. Julian explains, he regretted that he didn't stick it out at DePauw. But, as a young man, he was in a hurry to get where he was going and the DePauw route seemed "a burden."

After finishing high school in three and a half years, he entered DePauw in 1920 at midsemester. Some of the courses he wanted were not being offered. He had trouble fitting other courses into his schedule because of his late arrival. He found himself attending other colleges in the summer.

It seemed easier, he said, to transfer to the University of Chicago, where every course began at the start of each quarter and where the subject matter suited his specific needs.

After receiving a bachelor of science degree there, he went on to Howard University where he graduated with honors from the medical school in 1934.

Before entering practice in Baltimore, Dr. Julian taught for three years in the department of bacteriology and immunology at the Howard University Medical school.

For the past 25 years, he and his wife the former Betty Taylor, of Washington, have made their home on Julianwood road in Pikesville.

Although Dr. and Mrs. Julian's three children are all college graduates, none chose DePauw.

"But we hope to pick up the tradition with the grandchildren," says Dr. Julian echoing his father's dream.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUSKIE

Due to mechanical limitations, Senator MUSKIE's statement on "Water Pollution Control Needs for Next 6 Years" will appear in a subsequent edition of the RECORD.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 20, line 17, strike "$34,478,000" and insert "$34,600,000".

On page 21, line 4, strike "$678,725,000" and insert "$692,300,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, are we under controlled time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the debate on each amendment is limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided, and the time limitation on the bill is 2 hours.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, what I am attempting to do by the amendment is to return the figure we are now working on to the budget figure that was submitted.

What we are talking about as having come from the Senate Appropriations Committee is $3,319,303,000. What was requested in the budget was $3,333,000,000.

Mr. President, I know that it is very easy for us to talk about expensive programs and to say that we should cut them back or cut them out altogether and apply those funds to the needs of the cities, domestic needs, transportation, and so forth. Let me say that if some comprehensive plan ever rears its head in the Senate as to how we should spend these billions of dollars to help the large cities, I will be the first one to hop on the wagon. But we have been dumping billions of dollars into the cities of this country, and I cannot see any improvement. So I think the philosophy of merely spending dollars is not going to help the plight of the cities.

I remember very well back in the early 1930's working in New York City during the depression. And I have to say with all charity to that city that it was a better place to live in then than it is now. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent there.

Mr. President, I do not know if we all realize what we are doing in supporting this rather drastic cut. This cut represents a 15-percent cut under last year's NASA budget. When we figure that in 1966 NASA had a budget of $3,932 billion, and that this year the budget submitted by the President was $3.333 billion, and that we are now working on legislation which will appropriate $3.319 billion roughly, then we are talking about a much higher cut than has been taken by any other department of Government that I know of.

For example, in looking through figures that were submitted by Dr. Freeman, not too many days ago in a speech made somewhere in Oregon, he called attention to the fact that defense spending in this country dropped from $80 billion in 1945 to between $12 and $13 billion annually in 1948 to 1950. Then, there was an increase when the Korean war came along when defense costs went up to $50 billion. Since that time defense expenditures have increased 49 percent, approximately equal to the simultaneous rate of price increases.

But I call to the attention of Senators who say there are great advantages to putting the money in other places that spending for health, education, welfare, and labor increased 944 percent, and for all other functions it increased 182 percent. More than one-half of the $129 billion increase in Federal expenditures between 1953 and fiscal year 1971, was applied to social purposes, and less than one-fifth to defense—and much less to NASA, the subject we are talking about today.

With only 6 percent of the world's population and between one-fourth and one-third of its developed resources, the American people today invest in educational institutions almost as much as all other nations combined.

I have to ask this question as a father and as a grandfather: Has the educational quality in this country increased that much? I do not think it has. Over the past 20 years support of schools and colleges has multiplied about eight times while personal consumption expenditures increased only somewhat more than three times.

We are asked to take a cut in the department we know as NASA. We must keep in mind not only the successful moon ventures but also the development of new ideas in aircraft fuselages and aircraft engines, and other sources of propulsion. It is not just space we are talking about. We are talking about the whole subject of aeronautics which is coupled with the space program. It is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

To bring this figure a little more closely to the attention of Senators, there were 420,000 people working for NASA at the peak back in 1966. At the end of fiscal 1970 that figure had dropped to 195,000 people, and if we put this budget through it will drop another 45,000. Mr. President, you might say, "Well, what relation has this to what we are talking about?"

I was in Los Angeles 2 weeks ago. I was driven from the airport to my hotel

by a most attractive young man, and we engaged in conversation. I asked him what his trade was. He said, "I am a college graduate. I have a doctor's degree from MIT in aeronautical engineering, but I am out of a job so I am driving a taxicab."

So I believe we go through the process of cutting the figure for NASA without giving due thought to it. I sometimes wonder what the comparison would be. Here we have almost 200,000 people out of work because of the previous cut. How much is it going to cost the Federal Government to keep those people on the unemployment rolls? I would like to have someone make the computations. I think it would be a startling figure, even though it might not equal the amount being paid. Nevertheless, as we get the knockdown effect or dribble down effect from those people who are put out of work who should not be put out of work, and who really need the work more than the person just let out of a defense plant, particularly an aerospace plant, I think we have to take all of that into consideration.

Mr. President, these drops we are talking about are not astronomical, nor is the increase. Actually what we are talking about here in the overall is about $13.575 million added to the present bill, and if we take the first amendment I have offered—considering them en bloc—it is $1.22 million.

Sometimes we in Congress are prone to believe that the only accomplishment of NASA has been to put men on the Moon, or to develop the ability to land on Mars if we want to, or the ability to put mechanized probes on Mars and visit other planets on the way back to Earth.

To calm down that idea I have had placed on the desk of each Senator this morning a Senate print entitled "Space Program Benefits." The Space Committee asked NASA if it would develop such a catalog of things we call "skinout," or "fallout" might be better. This book is interesting to read. It is nearly 400 pages long. It lists nearly thousands of ideas that have been or can be patented to make income available to people and many new jobs.

Anyone reading this booklet of space program benefits, which contains the testimony of experts in the field, cannot help but come to the conclusion that this book may well contain the nuclei of employment in the future, the basic new ideas that our young people are going to have to carry on.

I speak as a conservative. It may sound peculiar for a conservative to want to increase the budget, but money and budgets are not our only concern. I am amazed to hear liberals stand on the floor of the Senate and attack conservatives like me of wanting to go backward, and these same liberals do not want to go forward. I think it was Vice President Hubert Humphrey who once said that they were going to pull them kicking and screaming into the 20th century. If we read through this book we will realize how far we have always lagged behind even though we are the greatest technological country in the world.

Although the Wright Brothers invented the airplane there was little support for it here. During World War I our pilots flew only French and British planes. There was no U.S. aviation industry. In World War II the German Messerschmitt plane was operational while we were still testing. The British flew the first jet transport. The first supersonic transport will be the Anglo-French Concorde and the Russian Tu–144. International competition in aviation is intensifying.

Yet through expenditures of these billions of dollars we have made some rather remarkable contributions to aviation. We now have a fireproof substance that is being applied to the inside of fuselages, I understand, of United airplanes. It will be applied inside of all fuselages and to the wing surfaces of new airplanes. It is about one-eighth of an inch thick and it makes it absolutely impossible to burn that airplane. Mr. President, you could fill it with gasoline and light it and it would not burn. How much would this be worth to say there will be no future deaths by fire resulting from aircraft accidents?

I do not think those benefits can be measured in dollars and cents.

We have another little idea that dropped out of NASA, completely accidental—I have talked about it before—a little device that we think will work—its prototype has—which will tell another pilot there is another airplane at such and such an altitude, at such and such a heading, approaching at so many miles. This would be an aircraft proximity warner. Let us say it will be successful. We think it will be. How much would it be worth to say to every passenger who rides in an airplane, "There will be no more midair collisions"?

Not so long ago, in the Space Committee room, we were shown an interesting demonstration that I would hope every Member of the House and the Senate would see. In fact, we are urging NASA to "put it on the road," as we say, to demonstrate to American housewives and businessmen the possibility we now have—not possibility; it is now a fact—of fireproof material. I do not mean just a piece of cloth, but anything. Under that process, one could fireproof his house, his furniture, his rugs, his clothing, and those materials could not burn.

So what would it be worth someday to be able to say to the American people, "Forget about your fire insurance. We will put something in houses that would not let you burn them if you tried"?

This has all been a spin-off of the space program.

When we are asked, for example, to take the biggest cut in the area of research and program management, I think we are using a little penny foolishness here. Construction of facilities has remained approximately the same. Research and development has remained the same. But in research and program management we see a rather sizable drop, a drop I would like to return by my amendment.

I might say that in voting for my amendment Senators will vote to bring this sum up to a workable figure. Thousands of highly trained engineers will be permitted to stay at work in studies and in fields that are vitally needed for the future of our country and for technological knowledge.

As I have said, sometimes we forget just what comes out of all the studies and all the research that has been done. We forget that hundreds of colleges throughout the country have been receiving aid and have been contributing greatly to NASA's effort in space. We forget little fallout benefits that can be made available not only for the people of the United States, through patent and manufacturing purposes, thereby giving employment to more and more people, but also devices which, through patent use, could be used by nations friendly to us. All of this is important.

While I recognize the desire of Members of Congress to cut budgets and get spending down, I think there are other places where we can do it. Although I come from an interior State, I see nothing holy about keeping the Interior budget as high as it is. I see nothing holy about keeping agricultural spending as high as it has been all through these years.

We could go on down through all these domestic programs, but, no, we keep on the space program and we keep on the military program, on the assumption that we can divert that money to other purposes.

As I said at the outset, if somebody can stand on the floor someday and develop a formula for me that will convince me that the expenditure of $1 billion or $10 billion or more will save our cities, I will be the first one to support it.

I do not think this reduction is a responsible proposal. I think we had better consider it very carefully.

Mr. President, I know other Senators will want to be heard, and I do not want to take too much time. It is a rather simple amendment.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I want to see if I understand the Senator's amendments correctly. I have done a little adding and subtracting here. The Senator has added $13,687,000?

Mr. GOLDWATER. $13,575,000, but that is close.

Mr. PASTORE. What disturbs me about the amendment is that the Senator's proposal is over the authorization. What has the Senator to say to that?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. I wanted to bring it back to the budget figure, which would total——

Mr. PASTORE. I mean, it is beyond the authorization. If the Senator insists on his figure, $34,478,000 for construction was the figure authorized, and I do not see how the Senator can increase it above the authorization.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senate Appropriations Committee has authorized $34,478,000.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right, but the Senator would raise it up to $34.6 million.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would want to bring it up to $34.6 million, to the amount recommended by the President.

Mr. PASTORE. I know, but the authorization by the Senate committee was $34,478,000, and that has been signed by the President.

Then there is the difficulty on the other item, on research and management. The amount put in by the committee was $678,675,000; the authorized amount was $683,300,000. The Senator's amendment would raise that to $692,300,000. So the Senator would again be over the authorization.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think the Senator can get away with it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We can try.

Mr. PASTORE. It would be out of order. It is clearly out of order. We cannot provide more than is authorized. We can provide more than is estimated, but we cannot provide more than is authorized, because it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My understanding is that on a report like this it can be done.

Mr. PASTORE. I will ask the Parliamentarian.

Mr. President, is an amendment which exceeds the authorization subject to a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised, and so rules, that such a point of order would not be well taken if the appropriation intended by the amendment was within the budget estimates. As the Chair is informed, the amendment of the Senator from Arizona is.

Mr. PASTORE. Within the budget estimate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so informed by the Parliamentarian. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator to the last clause in paragraph 1 of rule XVI, titled "Amendments to Appropriation Bills," which reads "or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law" as the budget estimate is.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Chair mean if the figure proposed by the Senator from Arizona, which we are contemplating now, is within the President's budget estimate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will read the entire paragraph 1 of rule XVI:

> All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or——

Mr. PASTORE. If the Chair will stop right there, we passed the authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair finish——

> or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

The Chair is informed that the committee's report carries the budget estimate for the purpose sought to be amended, and the amendment is, therefore, within the budget estimate.

Mr. PASTORE. But, if I may pursue this, because, after all, I think we ought to get it correct, the Senate has already agreed to a conference report which has become law which establishes the amount now authorized.

The question that I am asking the Parliamentarian is this: Once the Senate, in this session—as it did only 2 weeks ago—has passed an authorization conference report which contains a figure below the one that is being suggested now, can we lawfully increase the amount that has already been authorized by the vehicle of an appropriation bill?

My understanding is that the authorization governs the amount, the ceiling. Otherwise the authorization would mean nothing. That is the question. I think the juridical law does say something about authorization in the same session of Congress. We have already authorized an amount less than that being suggested now. Can we do this without legislation?

My argument is that you have got to increase the authorization before you can vote it. I am not going to pursue this matter any further, but it seems to me that what this would do is vitiate the whole process of authorization. If you can appropriate more than the authorized amount, then you do not need authorization. That is the point I am making.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS). I think the Senator makes a point which is certainly entitled to very serious consideration by the Chair before making a final statement; and I therefore ask Senators to suspend debate for a moment until the matter has been considered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have to state on whose time.

Mr. PASTORE. The time to be equally divided. It makes no difference. Either that, or take it all out of my time. Or take it out of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the time be taken out of the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PASTORE. Now I raise my parliamentary inquiry again. Is it in order——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that Congress has previously passed, at this session, an authorization bill which has become law and has reduced the authorization for this specific purpose, and therefore the authorization is also, by reason of that law, below the amount that this amendment proposes to appropriate. Therefore, the Senator from Rhode Island is quite correct in raising a parliamentary inquiry as to a possible point of order against the pending amendment, and a point of order could——

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Chair catch its second breath and withhold its ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will catch its second breath and withhold final reply on the point of order.

Mr. PASTORE. The only suggestion I would like to make is that there is one item where the authorization is above the amount that has been recommended by the committee, and that figure is that the committee recommended, for research and program management, $678,725,000. The Senator from Arizona, by his amendment, would raise that amount to $692,300,000. The authorized figure is $683,300,000. So if he will modify his amendment to raise the amount to that figure, it would not be subject to a point of order. That is the reason I make the suggestion. If he will modify his amendment, it could go to a vote.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry to complete this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Are there any circumstances under which an authorized amount could be increased?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed, and so responds, that the Appropriations Committee can bring in an appropriation above the estimate or above the authorization, but such amendments are not in order from the floor of the Senate by a Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—I think I still have the floor—does it require unanimous consent to modify an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since the yeas and nays have not been ordered, and no action has been taken in regard to the amendment, it may be modified by the Senator as he wishes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the amendment is really in two parts. I would strike the first part, and modify the second part to read, "$683,300,000", instead of, "$692,300,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified. The Clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), as modified, is as follows:

> On page 21, line 4, strike "$678,725,000" and insert "$683,300,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me on my own time, so that I may secure clarification of the ruling?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. First, do I correctly construe the Presiding Officer's advice on the parliamentary point raised by the chairman of the committee to be that the

controlling items in the authorization are the line items, if the authorization is by line item, even though a proposed amendment would still be under the total authorization?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the purpose of further informing the Chair and the Parliamentarian, the Senator from Colorado, as I understand his parliamentary inquiry, is asking whether an amendment to an appropriation bill would be in order if it were within the overall authorized amount, but in excess of a specific item sought to be appropriated for. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct—what we call a line item within either the authorization or the appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's parliamentary inquiry is answered as follows: Such an amendment would not be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Such an amendment would not be in order if it exceeded a line item——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Set by law.

Mr. ALLOTT. A specific authorization within the authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Even though it was not in excess of the total authorization?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think we have that clear.

Now I would like to raise a second parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whose time is this to be charged?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield the Senator whatever time he needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have a second parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the ruling of the Chair a few moments ago as to the inquiry of the Senator from Arizona as to whether there were any circumstances under which an authorization could be exceeded, the response by the Presiding Officer was that it could be done by the committee. I would like to propound this parliamentary inquiry: Since an excess of the authorization by an amendment would have to be done by language, is it not true that any Senator could do so by providing the language and going in excess of the authorization if he gave the proper notice to the Senate? In other words, this power is not limited to the committee alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed, and holds, in response to the parliamentary inquiry, that a Senator could, of course, file notice of intention to move to suspend the rules, and under that procedure might accomplish what he sought.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is all I desire to clear up. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator want more time?

Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used none of his 30 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator want any further time?

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I support the Senator from Arizona in this amendment as wholeheartedly as I can. Actually, this is identical to the amendment I was going to submit later, which is joined in by Senator MURPHY, Senator TOWER, Senator SPARKMAN, Senator ALLEN, and Senator THURMOND.

What this amendment does is to restore approximately five to six hundred people in the research and program management of NASA. I should like to point out that before NASA submitted its budget this year, it eliminated 800 people from its personnel. With the cut that is in this bill, as it comes out of the Senate committee, it means that in addition to the 800 people NASA has already clipped off its work force in research and program management, it will have to trim another one to two thousand people from the payroll.

All we are talking about is $4½ million. I have been in this Chamber in the last few weeks when we have sailed through $150 million, and later today there will be a proposal with respect to $1 billion. But for $4½ million, we can keep on about five or six hundred very highly skilled personnel in NASA.

Why is this important? It is extremely important because we have already lost a good deal of our industrial base, our skilled people, who are working in the industry. We had a peak employment in this program of 425,000 3 years ago. It is now down to 190,000. That is Government and industry. By the end of next year, it will be down to 144,000.

The argument is made, "What is 500 or 600 people? If we crack this program up, later we can go out in industry and get them." The point is that they cannot be obtained. They will not be there. They have been fired. They have gone on to other employment.

What we are trying to do in this employment is to keep a skilled cadre in NASA so that we can keep this on-going program. One of the things NASA did all during the year—and the employment figures show this—is that the top employment peak of NASA was 35,000, as I recall, and that was 3 or 4 years ago. I said that in government and industry we had 425,000. NASA has always tried to keep a fairly low level of employment—so that when the space cuts came—and everybody knew they were going to come 3 or 4 years ago, that we would never be able to keep up the high rate of employment we had back in 1966. NASA kept its employment figures down so that it could continue a highly skilled cadre when the cutbacks came. That is what it is trying to do under this amendment, and that is what Senator GOLDWATER and I seek to do here—to keep on 500 or 600 highly skilled employees, so that we do have a backbone of skilled employees to carry on this program.

Another thing is important in this connection: What is going to happen if we cut out the 1,000 to 2,000 people the Senate appropriation bill will cut out if it stays in its present form? Of course, what you are going to do is to go down in the level of employment in NASA. You are not going to get the older people who have been there for many years. Those who will be cut off are the younger people, who run the missions, the research people, the planning people—the young men who are needed mostly, of rather low salaries, in comparison with the other salaries—the $10,000 and $12,000 bracket. But those are the kinds of people we need to keep on, with the necessary skills—to fly the missions, provide the safety measures, and all the rest of the things that make this a very successful research and development experiment in the United States.

But if we continue with the Senate appropriation as it now is, we are going to eliminate these younger men, and then perhaps when we want to go back and pick them up 2 or 3 years from now, if we have other programs, they will not be there. They will have been lost. They will have sought other employment.

Frankly, I think that what the committee ought to do is to accept the amendment, but I certainly hope they will not press too hard and try to knock it out. For the small, almost paltry, sum of $4½ million, we can keep approximately five or six hundred very highly skilled people in this program, and we need them. If we do not put this money back into the program, we are going to be pennywise and pound foolish.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hope no one has the impression that either I or my counterpart, the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, is against the space program, because we certainly are not. What we are saying is that the space program has to be kept in proper context with all the other priorities that face this Nation.

Our President made a speech the other day in which he said he is going to cut down Government spending, and he is going to do it in order to cut down inflation, in order to balance the budget, and in order not to come back here next year and ask for $18 billion more to raise the debt ceiling of the Nation.

After all, when we look at the problems confronting our people, let alone the problems in space, we have problems on this earth and we have to meet them. Naturally, there are only so many dollars to go around. In my State we have naval installations, and every time the

defense budget is cut, and there is always a push on the floor here to cut it, and people are laid off, of course, there is sorrow. Sometimes an injustice is done to a man who has worked for his Government loyally and faithfully over a period of years. But, on the other hand, we have got to take into account that we have been appropriating a great deal of money for space. I am talking about $3,319,000,000. So that I believe we are talking about a lot of money. This idea that a cut or a failure to increase it by $4½ million is going to do irreparable harm to the program, of course, does not sound like a logical argument to me. I do not want to say that it is specious because that is not a kind word to use, but the fact remains that if we are going to look at the priorities of the Nation, we have to look at the question of housing. That will come up later on. We have the question of housing for the elderly. That will come up later on. We have the question of pollution. That will come up later on. We have the question of pollution of our water. That will come up later on. Thus, we have all these problems.

The question is: Where do we put the money? Do we put it in space or do we put it here on earth?

That is about the size of it.

I am not saying, let us crucify the space program. I think we have been generous with the space program. But I have not been convinced yet, and I have said this to Dr. Paine, who is a great friend of mine, an alumnus of Brown University of which I am a trustee, where he was given an honorary degree, and he is a great scientist and has done wonderful work, but they have not convinced me yet why we have got to go to the moon five or six times.

Naturally, we would discover something new every time we went there. There is no question about that. I think that every time we take a walk down Constitution Avenue, we should discover something new. But the fact remains, we have got to put the program in its proper context. We cannot talk out of both sides of our mouths.

If we are going to cut down on inflation by cutting the budget, we have got to look where we can do the cutting. I think myself that the two legislative committees, which are influential committees of the Senate, composed of the most influential men in the Senate and the House, have scrutinized the budget and have come up with a figure which I think is a reasonable figure. As a matter of fact, I think the figure is a little too generous. But there we are. I hope that Dr. Paine, all his fellow scientists, and all his technicians do not get the idea that we are trying to decimate the space program. All we are trying to do is to be sensible in the spending of our money in relation to all the obligations, commitments, and priorities that we have.

I know that perhaps three or four hundred people might be laid off. I realize that difficulty and I feel sorry about the loss of a single job. They had to close down the installation in Massachusetts. We are sorry about that. But, by the same token, in appropriating $6 billion, my question is: Where is the money going to come from, and who will pay it? How do we answer to the taxpayers?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Rhode Island makes a good point about priorities, that here in the Senate on appropriations we have to establish priorities, but I would ask the Senator: Is not the appropriation now before the Senate more than $1 billion under what the budget request was on NASA?

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator ask that question again, please?

Mr. GURNEY. Is not the appropriation we have before us now about $1 billion less than the NASA request for this fiscal year?

Mr. PASTORE. I doubt that. The Senator means the President's request on NASA?

Mr. GURNEY. No. I am talking about NASA's.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, if we ran the Government according to what every department wanted, the budget would be $400 billion, not $200 billion. I went all through that when I was Governor of Rhode Island. If we gave every department every nickel it wanted, we would have to double the taxes. Thus, I know they asked for $400 million and President Nixon said cut it down. So they came back and made it a little less. The President said go back and cut it some more, so they went back and came back later and it was a little less. All I am asking them to do is to go back once again and cut it a little more. The President had a crack at them three times, and I should like to get a crack at them just once.

Mr. GURNEY. For the Senator's information, it was a billion dollars under the request. Since the Senator from Rhode Island is interested in priorities, let me pose another question to him: How much is this appropriation under last year's appropriation?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator means on NASA?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Much less.

Mr. GURNEY. How much?

Mr. PASTORE. It was the smallest one.

Mr. GURNEY. Well, for the Senator's information, it is one-half a billion dollars.

Mr. PASTORE. $700 million, I understand.

Mr. GURNEY. Well, that is even more. I had $500 million. The Senator said $700 million. I will take the Senator's figure.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator can see how generous I am.

Mr. GURNEY. Is that not considerably less?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is.

Mr. GURNEY. Does that not establish a priority?

Mr. PASTORE. To a certain extent, but the Senator must realize that the last moon mission was aborted. We have to admit that was a costly item. It was suggested that they make a review and make further inspections, and that they also conduct an investigation to find out whether they were being careful enough. Let me say this to the Senator that, if the astronauts on Apollo 13 were still spinning up there in a circulating, orbiting tomb, that would have been a devastating blow to the space program.

All I am asking is that we be careful when we send three men up there. I am told there was no reason why the accident should have happened if they had been a little more careful. I do not want to make any accusation, but, after all, we should slow down and be as safe as possible.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The very people the Senator intends to cut off in this appropriation bill, the five or six hundred people, are the very people who are now working on safety programs, the very program that will make future flight programs safer.

Mr. PASTORE. There is nothing in the budget that says they have to lay off people working for safety. We have $3,319,000,000 here for space and there is no reason why those working on safety should be cut.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me ask the Senator this question. Is the Senator saying if the appropriation stays at the level it now is, that NASA will not have to leave any people there out of it?

Mr. PASTORE.. I will not say that, but it will not be that many.

Mr. GURNEY. How many will it be?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know. The Senator will have to ask Dr. Paine that.

Mr. GURNEY. It is between 1,000 and 2,000.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think the Senator means that. Does he tell me that $4½ million lays off 2,000 experts?

Mr. GURNEY. I am asking the Senator. That is the information I have.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the question. The question is: Is it necessary? Now the Senator says it is. I do not think it is. I think this matter should come to a vote in the Senate. I get the point of the Senator from Florida. I think he has made his case. All I am trying to say here is that if we appropriated all the money everyone wants, there just would not be enough money to take care of everyone's requests and we would have to increase taxes. Let us face it.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me say that the Senator from Rhode Island is always generous with his time and always listens to arguments by those who oppose him. I appreciate that very much. I simply say that I think we have made this priority and built it into the program by cutting it about one-half billion dollars, or $700 million, if we use the Senator's figure, from last year. I would also make the observation that I doubt if any Senator here, or anyone on this floor at this moment, could indicate any welfare program that has been cut, any welfare program that has not gone up in the appropriations for this year. I simply say that for $4.5 million, that is all we are talking about in a budget that greatly exceeds the $200 billion, we can save 500 to 600 highly skilled personnel that I think the program needs.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the Senator realizes the problem that faces the Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator from New York is contemplating an amendment to cut the present $600 million below the figure reported by the committee. The Senator from Wisconsin is going to suggest an amendment to go back to the House figure. So, there we are. We have got it coming and going. Therefore, this is a matter for the Senate to decide and I shall abide by its decision.

I shall vote against the increase, because I must; but I say, in full fairness to those who will vote, that they are sincere and well-motivated; but it is a question that we on the committee had to face, the question of where to put the money, and I think we have done about the best job we could.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island: Is it not true that although the Apollo program has been largely accomplished as to allow a cutback on Apollo of $956 million, the fact is that the bill now before us, before it is amended, provides for $3 million more than last year's appropriation. Even the House bill provides $212 million over last year's appropriation.

It is true that there is an overall cut, but this is because the Apollo program, the moonshot, the lunar landing program, has been achieved. So I think the provisions made by the Appropriations Committee led by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island are generous and, as he pointed out, I will try to establish in a few minutes, after we vote on the pending amendment, that they are too generous.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida whatever time he needs within the limits of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am in a very difficult position. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and a member of the Appropriations Committee. On both of these committees I have helped to work out the program to the best of my ability.

Much as I would like to support the amendment, since I think it would mean the retention of people whom I would hate to see go, I cannot do it, because there has been this long give and take in the Subcommittee on Appropriations and in the full committee.

The chairman of the subcommittee will remember that I wanted to pull them out of the authorization, which is about $14 million more than the committee bill involved. The committee bill is something over $400 million below the appropriations for last year. We worked out this arrangement and, so far as I am concerned, I feel bound by the give and take that took place there, because there are many in the subcommittee and in the full committee that wanted to cut it much more. We finally agreed on this figure.

I say to the chairman of the subcommittee that I will stick with him on this amendment regretfully—and maybe hurtfully, so far as my own State is concerned. But I remember all of the give and take on both committees, and I think we should stand by the appropriation as it finally came from the Appropriations Committee.

I hope that others on the Appropriations Committee who wanted much bigger cuts will take the same position, because if they do we will be able to speedily dispose of this matter and get along with the other business.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. It it typical of him that he always speaks as a statesman.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my distinguished junior colleague.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the NASA appropriation figure for research and program management now under consideration is $13.575 million less than the already low budget request for $678,725,000. The authorization figure for research and program management was $683,300,000, $9 million less than the budget request. The Appropriations Committee recommendation in research and program management is $4.575 million less than the authorization level. My amendment restores this $4.575 million, thereby raising the total amount for research and program management to the authorization figure of $683,300 million. If my amendment is passed, NASA would still have to absorb a reduction of $9 million in research and program management.

Mr. President, as we know, research and program management, among other things provides the costs of operating and maintaining our field centers throughout the space agency. Over 70 percent of this appropriation goes for personnel compensation and benefits. The remaining 30 percent is used for institutional support, such as facilities and technical services of NASA civil service employees. The size of the NASA budget for institutional support has been constantly reduced over the past few years. Institutional support has gone down from a level of $236 million in fiscal year 1967 to a level of $177 million in fiscal year 1971 budget. This reduction of $59 million in 4 years has been absorbed despite continued cost increases.

Due to a personnel limitation in the authorization bill which prevents NASA from reprograming funds from other areas to research and program management, the major portion—70 percent—of the recommended $13-million-plus reduction will have to be applied to personnel cutbacks.

Mr. President, I strongly feel that NASA cannot absorb such a large reduction in personnel without jeopardizing future mission success and safety. NASA has estimated that to accommodate a cut of this magnitude would require a reduction in force of approximately 1,200 to 2,000 employees. This number is in addition to the 800 positions already abolished by the space agency before their request was submitted to Congress. If we take the $13 million reduction the committee is now proposing, and it is applied strictly to personnel compensation, we will, in effect, be laying off and firing up to 2,000 people in NASA this next fiscal year.

NASA has determined that by applying stringent economy measures, such as reduction of overtime and summer employment and the closing of the Electronics Research Center, coupled with normal attrition, and planned separations, a cut of $4 million can be absorbed.

If my amendment is adopted and the total cut amounts to only $9 million instead of $13 million, NASA will be in a much more favorable position. Assuming a $4 million cut can be absorbed by NASA, the $13 million cut will mean a reduction of 1,200 to 2,000 permanent employees. Under my amendment, the layoffs could be reduced by half—to roughly 600 to 1,000 employees. That is why the additional $4.575 million is so important. The deeper the cut beyond the $4 million level, the more profound the effect on NASA personnel. In my judgment the $4.5 million spent in this area for this specific purpose will have a very salutary effect on NASA—its morale and its effectiveness. It is a comparatively small sum, but one that has far-reaching and substantial effects on the space program.

NASA's work force in its field centers is already down to what is approaching skeleton proportions. At Cape Kennedy, we have steadily made severe cuts in manpower over the last 4 years. NASA has already reduced its strength in permanent positions substantially: 1,655 people in 1968 left NASA; 1,338 left in 1969; 798 left in 1970. We know that the closing of the Electronics Research Center in Boston and other cutbacks will eliminate 800 additional employees in 1971, exclusive of those who will be forced to leave if the committee recommendation in research and program management is adopted. This means between 1967 and 1971, NASA will have reduced its strength by 4,591. This, of course, does not include the thousands of contractor personnel laid off. Already our aerospace team—industry, civil service, and universities—has dwindled from 420,000 people 3 years ago, to 190,000 today. By the end of fiscal year 1971, the number of people engaged in space activities will drop to an estimated 144,000. How can we calculate the loss in expertise and skill, built up during the sixties? We must not and should not break up this team to the point that we risk mission safety and the ability to reconstruct the team when the need arises—as surely it must in some future day.

The space program is vital to the economy—one need only look at what is happening in the aerospace industry. The Labor Department recently said the Nation's sharp rise in unemployment this year has hit hardest among skilled white-collar workers in aircraft and aerospace industries, especially in the Midwest and west coast. The analysis by the Bureau of Labor Statistics said:

> This suggests that cutbacks in the defense and aerospace fields, the impacts of which are also being felt in many other industries have been primary factors in halting the growth of factory employment since mid-1969, one of the surprising facts about

the recent rise in unemployment has been the extent to which it has affected workers in high skill jobs. The jobless rate for the professional and technical group has now returned to a level last attained—and then for only a very brief period—in 1963.

The Labor Department said recently:

The aerospace cutbacks have affected not only the big contractors but also dozens of small suppliers and subcontractors. Many are already bankrupt, and others have been reduced to skeleton crews with little or no backlog.

The Wall Street Journal not long ago headlined an article "From Apollo to Tastee Freez" to show the severe impact the space budget cuts have had on skilled professionals—the engineers, technicians, and scientists—who make up the backbone of a highly industrialized society. To quote from the article:

A 50-year-old man (name—Gene Aldrich), with two engineering degrees and 25 years of experience in the aerospace business, who helped design the Apollo command and service modules, now drives a yellow cab and considers himself lucky. Thousands of other out-of-work aerospace scientists are drawing $65-a-week unemployment compensation. Some try with little success to sell real estate or life insurance, others use life savings to buy fried chicken franchises, and a few cut lawns or wash dishes. They call themselves the "Aero-braceros" and vow that their sons will never become engineers.

I can recount from personal knowledge the depression that has hit Brevard County in my own State. Brevard as we know is the site of Cape Kennedy; unemployment in Brevard County as of May 30 is almost 5 percent. This is higher than the national average. At the cape, in June 1969, we had almost 24,000 people—23,600—civil service and contractor personnel actively engaged in the space program. As of May 1970, the figure is down to 17,000—16,866—roughly 7,000 people have been shut out within the last 12 months.

I realize we are in the midst of developing a new set of national priorities. I do not quarrel with that. NASA already has been assigned a low priority. Let us not put it out of business. I suggest that NASA is not a marginal or expendable program. At the time of the debate on the NASA authorization the record was filled with examples of how the technology developed by NASA had important and immediate domestic application—in medicine, in physics, in astronomy, new transportation communication and management systems, computer networks, environmental control, improved metallurgy, weather prediction, methods of recycling air and water. The list goes on and on; we all know these byproducts and the immense contribution they have made to our country. Now is not the time to destroy NASA: it has produced so much that is good and valuable. The glamour, we are told, is gone and now is the time to cut NASA. Well, the glamour is not what we should interest ourselves in—we should recognize the critical fact that the space program is a great deal more than just hardware or landing men on the moon. It is an investment in the future—a sound investment which has paid great national dividends already and will continue to do so if we have the courage and the foresight to act responsibly now.

I most sincerely, emphatically urge my colleagues to give this amendment favorable consideration.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) and other Senators. This amendment simply restores $4.575 million to the NASA research and program account, and is fully authorized by the conference report on the NASA authorization bill which the Senate adopted on June 22.

I support this amendment because it will prevent further deep cuts into NASA personnel. Even under the authorized total of $683,300,000 for research and program management, NASA estimates it will have to conduct a reduction in force of 600 to 1,000 employees, which is on top of an 800 reduction already planned for the 1971 budget. NASA employment has been going down steadily in the past few years; there has been a total reduction of over 4,500 employees just since fiscal year 1967. This has been an orderly process. The deep and unexpected cut in the committee bill, however, disrupts this orderly process and in my opinion might well jeopardize the safety and efficiency of NASA mission operations.

If this amendment should fail, it is possible that NASA will have to discharge an additional 600 employees above the 600 to 1,000. I ask my colleagues to think seriously of the adverse effect such a serious reduction would have on the viability of the national space program and indeed—by its rippling effect—on the U.S. aerospace industry which is already in serious decline.

I commend the Senator from Florida for proposing this amendment, and I am happy to be a cosponsor of it. Because of its great importance, I would like to explain some of the details and circumstances surrounding it.

Research and program management is one of the three accounts in which NASA receives its total appropriation—the others being research and development and construction of facilities. About 75 percent of the R. & P.M. request of $692.3 million is for personnel and personnel related costs. The authorization bill reduced this $692.3 million to $683.3 million—a reduction of $9 million—and directed that all of the reduction be taken in the personnel category. This accounts for the contemplated reduction of 600 to 1,000 employees—which is, as I have noted, on top of an 800 reduction already planned for.

The appropriation bill before us further reduces research and program management by $4.575 million, to a level of $678,725,000. This lower level is the same figure contained in the bill as passed by the House. It is this $4.575 million that the Gurney amendment seeks to restore.

It might well be asked, if a $9 million reduction results in a reduction in force of 600 to 1,000, why would an additional cut of only $4.575 million result in almost doubling that figure? Why would it not take a second $9 million cut to double the RIF? I have looked into this, and can provide the following answer.

Under the $9 million cut in personnel costs, NASA planning provides for certain economies in such things as overtime pay and temporary employment, and for savings in the turnover of the NASA Electronics Research Center at Cambridge, Mass., to the Department of Transportation. But roughly $4.5 million of this $9 million must be directed at people, and the equivalent of $4.5 million is 600 to 1,000 people. Therefore, we can see that another $4.5 million, to which the Gurney amendment is addressed, could well produce the loss of another 600 to 1,000 jobs, since the possibilities for savings in the overtime, temporary-employee, and other categories would be virtually exhausted.

There are, of course, several other elements in the R. & P.M. category—the other 25 percent of the total. These are such functions as travel, automatic data processing, facilities services, technical services, and administrative support. They are referred to in total as "institutional support." However, institutional support has been reduced $59 million in 4 years, and a further cut of $4.575 million in an already austere plan would be virtually unacceptable.

Mr. President, the matter before us is not really as complicated as I may have made it appear. But it is as serious as I have made it appear. You just cannot cut this agency down to the very bone and still expect to maintain the worldwide prestige that the space program has brought to the United States. You run the risk of denying a very bright and exciting future for the broadening of man's knowledge of the universe and the application of space technology to the solution of earthly problems and the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the Gurney amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), would each vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) would vote nay.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) is paired with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT). If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is paired with the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON). If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58 as follows:

[No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Aiken	Goldwater	Montoya
Allen	Gurney	Scott
Cooper	Hatfield	Sparkman
Cranston	Jackson	Thurmond
Fannin	Long	Tower

NAYS—58

Allott	Goodell	Muskie
Baker	Griffin	Nelson
Bayh	Harris	Packwood
Bellmon	Hart	Pastore
Bennett	Hartke	Pell
Bible	Holland	Prouty
Boggs	Hollings	Proxmire
Brooke	Hruska	Randolph
Burdick	Hughes	Saxbe
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Schweiker
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Smith, Ill.
Cannon	Kennedy	Spong
Case	Mansfield	Stennis
Cotton	McClellan	Symington
Dole	McGee	Talmadge
Dominick	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Eagleton	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Miller	
Fulbright	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—27

Anderson	Hansen	Pearson
Church	Javits	Percy
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Curtis	Magnuson	Russell
Dodd	Mathias	Smith, Maine
Ervin	McCarthy	Stevens
Fong	Moss	Tydings
Gore	Mundt	Yarborough
Gravel	Murphy	Young, Ohio

So Mr. GOLDWATER'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMERICA'S VA HOSPITALS ARE BECOMING A NATIONAL DISGRACE

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, we hear an awful lot about fiscal responsibility these days. Those words fill the air like bullets in a war. Well, we have a war and it is producing devastating numbers of crippled American boys. These ever growing lists are added to the millions of veterans already present in our society and deserving of first-rate medical care. It is time that society learn about what happens to these boys after they have served their country—after they have come home—after they have passed through the pain and aggravation of the battlefield and combat zone.

There are 166 VA hospitals around the Nation—the largest system of its kind anywhere. Millions of veterans are supposed to be able to look to and find first-class, specialized care of any type in them. Yet it is increasingly obvious that this is not the case. Denials have filled the air, as many have beaten their breasts and complained that these accusations have not got a shred of truth to them. The facts, particularly in several nationally distributed exposés, say otherwise. It is hard indeed to refute the grim, horrible testimony of crippled veterans lying unattended in shabby, grimy surroundings. Yet this is exactly what has been portrayed. It is impossible for any number of denials to attain credibility. The unvarnished truth is that many veterans are being neglected—are not receiving first-class care—are not being accorded intense care—are not receiving benefits of the latest in medical technology. It is America's shame. It is America's disgrace. Even dictatorships have been known not to turn their backs on their veterans. It is a shabby way to save money, and I want no part of it.

New Mexico veterans are suffering consequences of this medical care crisis. In December of 1969, the House Veterans' Administration Committee investigation of the Albuquerque VA hospital revealed a funding deficiency of almost $500,000 for fiscal year 1970. Subsequent allocations of funds reduced this only to $400,000.

This is the only VA hospital facility in our entire State. These 138,000 New Mexico veterans are utterly dependent upon it for the care the Government has promised them. This number of veterans is swelling constantly as a result of the war in Southeast Asia.

This hospital requires more specialized equipment, additional drugs and chemical supplies, food, blood and blood products. It needs at least 38 more qualified staff members.

Special facilities available, such as intensive care and coronary care units, special X-ray procedures and speech pathology services cannot be fully utilized due to insufficient personnel and operating funds. I do not question the devotion of the National and State Veterans' Administration people. From the Administrator on down, these people are devoted to the well being and health of the Nation's veterans. But it is impossible to restore good health or maintain decent health when money is lacking—when commitment is lacking—when penny-pinching replaces compassion as far as our veterans are concerned.

The committee here has recommended an extra $80 million for medical care within the VA for our veterans. Such money would be expended by the Administrator for anything he feels will help the veterans under his care. It could go for intensive care units, special treatment for spinal injuries or anything else. In the case of the Albuquerque VA facility, psychiatric care and extra funds for the deficiencies I listed earlier would change the lives of a good many veterans there. I shall support this increase on behalf of the veterans of the State of New Mexico.

Further, I congratulate the committee and its chairman for living up to their clear responsibility to the veterans of the United States.

WILMINGTON'S VA HOSPITAL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and others discussed at length the problems facing our Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I am quite in agreement with them that the situation regarding funding and staffing of the Veterans' Administration medical programs is a serious one. The Congress, I believe, must make the funds available for improvement in the care we provide our wounded and ill veterans.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) and the members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee are to be congratulated for the foresight they have shown in this area.

The $100 million they added to the bill for veterans' care will go far toward correcting some of the more critical shortcomings of the system. Much remains to be done, however.

I would like to point out, though, that the personnel who operate our veterans' hospitals in most cases are dedicated, hard-working people who get the most out of the money they have available.

The Veterans' Administration hospital in Wilmington, Del., is a good example of this fine attitude. Just this morning a newspaper article by Mr. Henry F. Davidson of the Wilmington Evening Journal came across my desk.

Headlined, "Hospital Serves Many Vets Well," the article explains in depth the efforts of the hospital administrators to provide compassionate and efficient care to our veterans.

We in Delaware are proud of our Veterans' Administration hospital, which has served the veterans of many States for 20 years.

I would like to congratulate Dr. Harry E. Walkup and the members of his staff

for their excellent efforts on behalf of our veterans and Mr. Davidson for his recognition of those efforts.

They have been doing their best with what is available. I hope that in the future they have more available to do even better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Davidson's article, which appeared in yesterday's Evening Journal be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

SEEKS COMMUNITY TIES: HOSPITAL SERVES MANY VETS WELL

(By Henry F. Davidson)

Patients at the Wilmington Veterans Administration Hospital get better care than they would elsewhere, in the opinion of the chief of medical service, and somehow it is done at a lower cost.

Dr. William G. Jones, recently promoted to chief of staff and currently wearing both hats, gets essentially the same kind of patients as a voluntary private hospital.

It is classed as a general medical-surgical hospital. The nearest like it is in East Orange, N.J., so patients pour in from the Eastern Shore of Maryland, southern New Jersey and nearby Pennsylvania, as well as Delaware.

The Wilmington hospital does not get badly wounded veterans from Vietnam, who need extended care, although it may occasionally receive a Delaware veteran who needs some hospitalization after discharge and prefers to be in his own community.

The hospital director, Dr. Harry E. Walkup, tries to keep the beds filled by notifying the Philadelphia V.A. hospital of vacancies but on Friday there were about 60 empty beds—a cyclical situation experienced by most hospitals.

The hospital which has had 48,000 patients since it opened 20 years ago, has had 3,481 admissions so far this fiscal year for a total of 82,141 patient days.

The average length of a patient stay is 23.7 days. This is much longer than in a voluntary general hospital for several reasons, including the older age of many of the patients.

The major reason, explained by Robert J. Ryan, the assistant director, is that a person may come in for a specific reason such as appendicitis.

In a private hospital, he would most likely have it out and go home but at the V.A., he is given an over-all physical examination and might end up with another operation for hemorrhoids and some dental work. If he has high blood pressure, this might be stabilized before discharge, all adding days.

There is an income restriction for nonservice-connected medical problems, so most of the patients are of relatively modest means. A certain group of more well-to-do come when they need long hospitalization, such as after a heart attack, which is financially devastating without insurance, even for middle-income veterans. Ryan says the patient type changes with the economy and resulting layoffs and hirings.

Eligibility for admission for nonservice-connected illness requires certification by a doctor that hospitalization is needed, the availability of a bed, and a signed form stating that the veteran cannot afford private hospitalization.

Even with the problem of determining eligibility, Ryan says a first admission takes only about an hour, and subsequent ones much less time.

The operating budget—called a "target allowance" in Veterans Administrationese—was $5.4 million in fiscal 1970 and is up to $6,374,000 for the year beginning July 1. Dividing patient days into the 1970 figure produces a daily cost of $44.46, substantially below other Wilmington hospitals.

There always seems to be construction going on at the Elsmere plant. A $1 million research building is fairly well set for construction next year. At present, a major internal remodeling is converting the former neuropsychiatric service into something else—perhaps medical beds but possibly a neurosensory center combining neurological and neurosurgical facilities, which could be a treatment center for veterans from a large geographic area.

It's difficult for an outsider to grasp the complexities of V.A. construction programs. Ryan is a layman and business manager of the works. He explains that, within the target allowance, a sum is set aside which can be spent for projects under $5,000 at the discretion of the director.

Some parking lots are being built under this allowance but parking will still be a problem which becomes serious when weekends bring a heavy load of visitors, although most of the staff is off then.

Projects between $5,000 and $25,000 require approval from V.A. headquarters but Ryan said this isn't usually a stumbling block and being so close to Washington is convenient, since a visit is much more effective than a telephone call.

Anything above $25,000 goes into the national budget and requires approval first by a congressional committee. This involves politics and can be time-consuming. The Wilmington hospital was authorized by Congress in 1944 and funds were appropriated in 1947. Construction began the next year and the first patients moved in from the temporary hospital at the Greater Wilmington Airport on March 21, 1950.

Ryan takes a tour of the hospital weekly with a nurse, engineer and maintenance official to spot deficiencies. A layman who went along for the hour-and-a-half trek from the ninth floor down couldn't find anything amiss and, except in the construction areas, nothing but spotlessness.

Robert L. Angelini, chief of the building management division, went on the rounds and said no deodorant is used in cleaning the building to mask odors. He explained a recent change to a glossy but nonslip floor wax.

R. Leighton Brown, assistant chief engineering officer, brought Ryan up to date on construction.

Angelini noted with regret the budget only permits cleaning the outside windows twice a year. His own crew is too shorthanded to tackle the job; it is contracted out. It's relatively dangerous work and, since veterans receive preference in hiring, some of them are partially disabled and can't take it on.

Ryan says a small hospital is easier to administer, but it suffers from a lack of personnel-in-depth, making it difficult to schedule vacations. There is a large group at Elsmere with 15 years service, who get 26 days off or five full weeks plus a day.

When there are only two or three employes doing the same thing, this mandates split vacations but Ryan says he tries to make sure everyone gets at least two weeks of prime vacation time.

But despite the difficulties, Ryan likes a small hospital after experience with big 1,500-bed ones where, he says, people are always building empires in corners and if something goes wrong, it can be years before the administration finds out. His every-Wednesday rounds are part of his way of keeping in touch with things.

Jones says his problem is a shortage of doctors although Ryan promises him he can have a few more if qualified ones can be found. One woman physician introduced on the rounds, Dr. Ulker P. Texcan, said pleadingly, "We really need help."

Jones says the major appeal of VA work to compensate for low salaries is the chance to practice good medicine and still have time for a normal family life. Since his wife is also a staff physician, their combined salaries put them well up in their profession.

Ryan says a comprehensive set of rules forbids doctors having private practice although they may teach and they have abundant opportunities for research, this being outside the target allowance which may be a major reason patient costs are much below room rates in university medical centers.

Jones feels the hospital has established itself as a valuable asset to the state, not just because it has 17 per cent of the 2,026 general hospital beds or more than 6 per cent of the total beds counting specialized institutions, but because of its sharing programs.

A major one is the training of University of Delaware nursing students in their major clinical work. There will be a start to a master's degree program plus refresher courses to help older nurses back into practice next year.

Consultants, mainly from Bryn Mawr Hospital and Jefferson Medical School, but also from the Wilmington medical and dental communities, also tie the hospital to the community, Jones feels.

Jones said he'd like to see the hospital more and more involved in community medicine and there are many ways the community can legally use the hospital. One missed chance, he feels, came about when the Wilmington Medical Center decided to go ahead with its cardiac catheterization expansion just at the time the VA Hospital was going forward on an advanced cardiac catheterization laboratory which Jones feels could have served the entire state.

The major achievement of such laboratories is injecting dyes into the blood stream and taking motion pictures of the heart in operation.

There is a gulf of sorts between the hospital and the local medical profession—there are different economic interests and few VA staff members belong to the local medical societies.

Two other laboratories in the process of being equipped are an isotope laboratory, which uses radioactive materials to harmlessly plot the location of tumors on photographic film, and a pulmonary function center, which will be able to do very sophisticated diagnoses of lung diseases.

More construction is going on in what was a 39-bed nursing-home care unit being transferred to Ft. Howard, Md. Most patients needing nursing-home care are now put in private institutions with the VA paying the bills. Ryan said this runs around $15 or $17 a day, rates negotiated with the institution by Washington, and is much less expensive than hospitalization.

Because of all the construction going on, there are only 300 beds but there will be 350 when things quiet down.

One reason not much is known about the hospital in the community is that most of its patients are from out-of-state. It covers Delaware, the Eastern Shore of Maryland and parts of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, although a veteran has the right to go to any hospital in the country he wants.

Some idea of the patient load can be gleaned from a recent day when there were 90 surgical patients and 148 medical, of whom 23 were seriously ill. In fiscal year 1969, there were 278 deaths, more than there will be this year.

There is an enormous volunteer program at the hospital with help from all the veterans organizations and such others as the Masons and churches as well as individual volunteers.

VA HOSPITALS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee has responded

effectively to the urgent needs of our hospitalized veterans by recommending $1.857 billion in the 1971 fiscal year for medical care and $79 million for construction of veterans hospital facilities.

Hearings conducted by the Senate Veterans Affairs Subcommittee clearly documented that these funds are a bare minimum of what is required to prevent a tragic reduction in the quality of the medical services available to our veterans.

The administration proposed a spending level of $1.752 billion for veterans medical needs while the House of Representatives approved a figure of $1.777 billion. Both of those amounts represent record high funding for this area of activity for the Veterans Administration. However, with a greater number of veterans to serve and inflation causing medical costs to soar, even the amount passed by the House is only a standstill figure that may keep pace with rising expenses.

Several major problem areas were revealed in the hearings conducted by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) in the Senate and the Congressman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) in the House. One is the lack of adequate staffing in our veterans medical facilities. While the staffing ratio for an average community or State hospital is 2.72 employees for each patient, the staffing ratio for VA hospitals is about 1.5 to 1. Congressman TEAGUE has set a staffing ratio of 2 to 1 as the goal for veterans hospitals to attain in order to insure hospitalized veterans of adequate medical attention.

Two additional problems now facing the VA involve a backlog of $46 million for required equipment and maintenance expenses and the growing demand for new and expanded facilities, which is greatly complicated by the overall freeze on Federal construction announced in the last fiscal year.

A brief review of the current operation of the veterans hospitals in Wisconsin indicates the serious difficulties that the Veterans Administration is typically encountering. In 1969 Wisconsin Veterans Administration hospitals faced funding deficiencies for fiscal year 1970 of over $2.2 million—a deficit which was only slightly reduced to $1.8 million by the supplemental appropriations approved by Congress during the year. The Madison VA hospital operated in 1969 at a deficit of $637,000 including $356,000 for staff and $197,000 for maintenance and repair funds. The addition of $77,930 in 1970 has done little to relieve this problem. The staffing ratio for the hospital is 1.4 staff to each patient, and in order to reach a staffing ratio of two staff to each patient the Madison hospital would need to hire 177 additional employees at an annual cost of $1,413,000.

The Tomah psychiatric hospital reported a funding deficiency for 1969 of $276,000, most of which is attributable to personnel and maintenance costs. The addition of $48,646 in 1970 still left a considerable deficit which will require a reduction of the hospital staff. At this time in order to achieve the desired staffing ratio of 2 to 1, the hospital would require an additional $984,000.

The Wood general medical and surgical hospital had a deficit in 1969 of $1.3 million, and though an additional $262,869 was received in 1970, the hospital director was forced to state:

> We must continue to restrict expenditures for all purposes very severely in order to avoid an anti-deficiency violation.

An additional $916,000 would be needed to achieve a staffing ratio of 2 to 1.

If the Senate committee's recommendations become law, the proposed funded level would provide my State of Wisconsin with an additional $1,766,100 in assistance. According to an estimated breakdown cited by Senator CRANSTON, the funds would be allocated in Wisconsin on the following basis: $276,600 for additional general medical care personnel, $138,000 for spinal cord injury staff and personnel, $1,082,100 for the elimination of equipment, maintenance, and repair backlogs, $124,100 for the elimination of dental case backlog, $95,200 for physicians's assistants, and $50,100 for allied health and intensive care training.

I strongly support the committee's action and commend the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Mr. PASTORE, and the chairman of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, Mr. CRANSTON, for their leadership at this critical time for our hospitalized veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENTS NO. 764

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 764.

I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with. I shall explain them.

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

Amendments No. 764 are as follows:

On page 20, line 11, strike "$2,606,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000,000".

On page 20, line 17, strike "$34,478,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,275,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment would cut back the funds to be appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1971 to the level approved by the House of Representatives.

In the line item designated research and development, the House approved $2½ billion for this fiscal year. The Senate Appropriations Committee increased this figure to $2,606,100,000. And for the line item designated construction of facilities, the House approved $18,275,000. This was increased to $34,478,000 by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

My amendment would cut both of these figures back to the House-approved level—a cut of $122,303,000.

Mr. President, the amount to be cut by my amendment is not an overwhelming sum of money. It amounts to less than 4 percent of the total space budget for the coming fiscal year. But it is hardly a trifling sum.

The $122 million to be cut by my amendment is more than the entire amount budgeted this year for air pollution control. It exceeds by $16 million the total to be spent this year on the school milk program. This $122 million would be sufficient to provide a subsidy for the building of some 125,000 to 150,000 new low- and moderate-income housing units under the section 235 and 236 programs.

Perhaps one of the most ironic contrasts of all is in this very bill we are considering today. In title III, providing money for the HUD programs, the administration has budgeted $75 million for the open space program—a highly worthwhile program which makes Federal money available to provide desperately needed parks and recreational areas for our teeming urban centers. The open space program in title III limps along with $75 million, while we tack on an additional $122 million for outer space. But which program provides tangible benefits to our people? The open space program wins hands down.

Mr. President, a couple of years back, we were engaged in a torrid race with the Soviet Union to achieve the first manned lunar landing. The space budget was several hundreds of million dollars higher, reflecting the cost of running that race. Mr. President, we have now won that race. We have established ourselves as first in technology, first in scientific exploration, and first in national dedication. Now that Apollo 11 is behind us, we should no longer feel the desperate need to prove ourselves. We have done that—and with the whole world looking on.

Mr. President, the modest amendment I am proposing today would not involve any drastic curtailment in our space program. It would still permit the Apollo program to go ahead as presently scheduled. It would still allow NASA to begin development of the space shuttle-space station program—although I personally believe that program should be postponed. It would still allow the Sky Lab program to proceed. And it would also permit NASA's many very worthwhile unmanned programs—programs which I believe should be receiving the lion's share of the NASA budget—to proceed as scheduled.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I think it is essential that the Senate go on record in favor of the leanest possible space budget. I say essential not only because I believe that our spending priorities should be reordered, with space given a lower priority; I believe this is essential if we are to ever make good on our determination to do something about inflation, and about the ever-increasing wage-price spiral. We cannot expect the private sector to exercise restraint unless and until we are willing to restrain our own spending. And increasing the NASA budget by $122 million is not the way to do it.

Mr. President, only by paring the NASA budget to the absolute minimum can we begin to hold down some of the gargantuan costs this program has entailed in the past. Mr. President, everything about the space program seems to be many, many times as expensive as comparable

programs here on earth. For example, if I were to order a set of tongs, a scoop, and a long-handled hammer to do some work around the house, these tools would hardly cost much more than $100 or so. But these same tools, ordered for use by the Apollo 11 astronauts for their moon flight, to pick up moon rocks, and perform simple lunar experiments, cost NASA $45,000. This figure, astronomical enough at first glance, becomes even more astronomical when one considers that these items are used just once, and then discarded on the moon. New tools, presumably costing no less, will have to be procured for each subsequent landing.

Other examples:

The lunar package ALSEP—Apollo Lunar Surface Exploration Package—being built by Bendix Corp., will cost NASA $25 million.

The lunar rover, the small jeep to be used to drive around a limited area by the astronauts, will cost close to $5 million each.

Back packs for each astronaut, used to keep them alive during their walks on the moon, and which are then discarded on the lunar surface before the return to earth, cost $200,000 each.

The TV camera used on Apollo 11 to send TV pictures from the lunar surface cost $250,000. It was discarded also.

Spacesuits worn by the astronauts, exclusive of the back packs, cost $100,000 each.

In addition to the overwhelming costs of our space projects, and the need to reorder our priorities, the other major reason for paring the space budget to a minimum is to improve chances of international cooperation.

Here is an area where the benefits, Mr. President, are international. We make no attempt to restrict what we have learned in our space explorations to this country. They are given to scientists throughout the world. Since the benefits are distributed throughout the world, why should not the costs be shared; or why should we not invite other countries, at least, to share them with us?

By going ahead full steam with our space program, and especially by beginning new programs, we lose the opportunity to bring in other nations on our space program.

This was a problem we ran into repeatedly with Apollo. Every time we suggested international cooperation, we were told that procedures and technology was too far along—that we could not possibly expect other countries to come in with the program so far along.

But, if we pare down our space programs, and particularly the development of new programs—such as the space shuttle—we vastly increase the chances of international participation. And there are encouraging indications that some of the Western European nations may be interested in getting in on the ground floor of the space shuttle. We should do all we can to encourage this, and increasing our space budget is not the way to do it.

Are other nations, in fact, willing to join us? This is really the crux of the issue as far as international cooperation is concerned. I suggested last year, and I reiterate it, that we have not done anywhere near all we can to encourage international participation in space. One of the problems arises from the fact that NASA has carried the ball in this area by itself—the same NASA whose number one goal since its inception in 1958 has been to establish American superiority in space. It is only natural that NASA might be of two minds in its pursuit of cooperation from abroad, and that its efforts in this area might not have been as vigorous or as hospitable as they might have been if conducted independently and apart from NASA. To this end, Mr. President, last year I introduced Senate Resolution 285, which would have the Senate Foreign Relations Committee make a thorough study of the potential for international cooperation in space exploration. Such a study would provide the independent perspective on this which up until now has been absent.

Senate Resolution 285 lists two possible approaches:

First. An international consortium, similar to INTELSAT, to handle all space flights, with NASA acting as the American manager, similar to the role COMSAT plays in the international communications consortium. Other countries would contribute according to their ability and financial resources.

Second. Set up a United Nations Space Council, under the jurisdiction of the United Nations—an organization similar in structure to the World Health Organization.

This country has shouldered the burden of space exploration alone for too long. We cannot expect this to change unless we curtail our expenditures on space. I strongly urge the Senate to cut the space budget back to the House-approved figure of $3.197 billion.

Finally, Mr. President, in summary, the amendment to be voted on today would bring the figures for NASA, as I say, back into line with the figures enacted by the House of Representatives.

The House-approved budget for NASA of $3.197 billion is still a very generous budget, and does not impose curtailment of any major program. It will still permit:

The Apollo moon landings to proceed as presently scheduled.

Beginning the space shuttle-space station program.

Development of the Sky Lab project.

Continuation of NASA's unmanned programs—including Mariner, Explorer, Viking, Nimbus—weather—and the Earth Resources Technology Satellite.

The Apollo program accounts for virtually all of the cutback in NASA spending from prior fiscal years.

This is a point that I think we should be especially aware of, because the principal argument against reductions in the space program below the action taken by the Appropriations Committee is that it has already been cut, it is lower than it was in 1969, it is lower than it was in 1968, and so forth.

Mr. President, there is a reason for that. The reason is because the Apollo program is well over the hump in expenditures. Procurement is out of the way, and that program can be reduced, and everyone expects that it should be reduced.

This year, the reduction in Apollo is $730 million. What we have to do is compare that reduction in the Apollo program with the overall reduction. When we do that, we see that, except for Apollo, the House-approved figure, which this amendment would secure, represents an overall increase—an increase of $212 million over last year's appropriation.

So, Mr. President, anyone who says we are cutting the space program, without recognizing that it is really simply an automatic cutback which we would assume we would normally have in the Apollo program, is deceiving himself.

The Senate committee appropriation provides a $334 million increase in the total appropriation, laying aside the Apollo program. The House appropriation, which this modest amendment would provide, would still permit a $212 million increase in the funds for the space program aside from Apollo.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President. I made my intention on this amendment known to the committee.

There have been several amendments discussed in excess of this proposed reduction of $136 million, which was the cut made by the House of Representatives. I do not think I would have gone further than the $136 million, but I intend to vote for this amendment.

The committee, I repeat, knows my position. But in deference to the committee, because the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of the amount in the bill. I assign the time on this amendment to the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), who will control the time in opposition.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, because of the severe impact any additional reductions would have on our Nation's space program, I feel a responsibility to speak in opposition to the pending amendment.

We are making decisions today, Mr. President, that transcend appropriation considerations and spending priorities. These decisions go far beyond the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget. They go to the heart of our Nation's vitality today and its course in the future. We are deciding whether the United States shall continue to exert leadership in science, technology, and industry and blaze new trails into mankind's future, or whether we shall retrench and abandon the demands of the future in favor of concentrating on the domestic problems of today.

Perhaps that sounds like an unfair generalization. I think it is not. We can take all the arguments that have been advanced for reducing NASA's budget and boil them down to one basic contention—that we should put off our sophisticated space exploration and divert the money instead to the Nation's serious domestic needs. It is a declaration, essentially, that we have too many

problems, too many needs, right here at home to afford any serious and effective activity in space. It is an argument that is powerfully persuasive—and politically attractive in these troubled times. But it is a policy that could turn this great Nation from the road to future greatness and send it down a dead end street of muddled mediocrity.

We must do everything we can to deal with today's problems of housing and poverty and education and opportunity. In the process, however, we must avoid the temptation of ignoring the equally pressing needs of the future.

Mankind would still be stumbling around in the dark ages if it had tried to solve all of its domestic problems before exploring the challenges of the unknown. There were problems at home when Columbus set sail for the new world. The money that was spent to build a railroad across this continent—surely it could have been better used to improve education and working conditions here in the East. The Wright brothers would have had less ridicule and criticsm if they had concentrated their inventive genius helping the poor. I could go on indefinitely.

The point is that every important advance in the history of mankind would never have occurred if it had been put off until other, more immediate needs were handled. But each of these advances brought benefits to mankind that far outweighed the alternatives that might have been offered. Who could have forecast early in this century, for example, that the Wright brothers' tinkering with a kite and an engine would lead to the mammoth transportation industry—and all the benefits that industry provides—in little more than 50 years? We can only begin to surmise some of the benefits that await our continuing exploration of space.

The unprecedented successes and achievements already made by the space program and the extremely valuable future benefits the program holds for all mankind, demand that its progress not be impeded further.

In science, our space program has already given us new insight into our universe and promises to be a significant factor in the understanding of the earth environment. Our automated satellites have revolutionized world communications and produce daily weather patterns now used in more than 50 countries. Space program developments made available to industry for public use range from fire-resistant materials and automotive safety devices to applications in medicine involving cancer research, clinical X-rays and remote sensing devices for heart patients.

Although these space achievements have proved extremely beneficial to people everywhere, future developments promise to far excel what already has been done. Air, sea, and land traffic control by satellite will make transportation more safe and efficient. New global environment information systems will help in a better understanding of the intricate processes of the oceans, in the production of food and better management of our mineral and natural resources.

And this is just a preliminary glimpse. Undreamed of advances lie beyond if we have the courage to support the fine beginning we have made in space.

I do not think it has to be an either/or decision. I believe we can provide at least minimum support for our space program while we accelerate our efforts to solve domestic programs. But the reduction in the NASA budget proposed in the pending amendment does make it an either/or situation because of the crippling effect it would have on the space program.

The appropriation before us is already a bare-bones budget for space. It was cut severely before it came to Congress. We have cut it further in committee. But the slash taken by the House would be crippling. To chop that deeply—and close the door to any reasonable conference negotiation—would be costly and shortsighted.

Mr. President, I must in good conscience support the NASA appropriation as reported by the committee. It is the lowest effective figure. Even at $3,319,303,000, the bill would provide the smallest space budget since fiscal year 1962.

I believe it would be unconscionable not to continue the progress of the space program at the minimum level recommended by the committee. Therefore, I urge each of my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the NASA fiscal year 1971 appropriation merits the support of every Senator. Not only have the NASA aeronautical and space programs been extraordinarily successful during the past few years, but also, that success has been achieved during years of constantly decreasing budgets. An agency that produces that kind of result should have the support of Congress.

The amount reported out by the committee will permit a fiscal year 1971 budget plan for NASA that will be about $540 million less than the budget plan for the current fiscal year, 1970. This will cause a further slowdown in the space program. So we should not expect the continued forward thrust of the program that we have become accustomed to during the past few years. One cannot cut a program continuously for 5 years in a row, so that its total appropriation for fiscal year 1971 will become 36 percent less than it was in fiscal year 1965, and expect the same results.

However, the program represented by the appropriation reported by the committee will preserve and emphasize the ingredients of a strong future capability in space. It is centered on the development over a period of years of an economical, reusable space transportation system, including the space shuttle and the space station.

Mr. President, since the space shuttle is under attack, I point out that the space shuttle is a transportation system that would put both manned and unmanned or automated systems into earth orbit. It is not strictly a manned program—in fact, the artificial division between manned and unmanned spacecraft in the old sense is disappearing, as it should.

However, neither the shuttle nor the space station is an approved program for development. The funds provided by this appropriation will permit the study of the space shuttle and the space station to continue. Only if the results of these studies are favorable will the executive branch be faced with whether or not to move forward with this as a development program; and, only if the executive branch decides to move forward with it, will Congress have to decide whether or not it wants to support a space shuttle and/or space station development program.

Other NASA programs provided for in this appropriations are to:

First, continue strong efforts on the practical applications of space technology for the benefit of mankind;

Second, continue lunar exploration with the remaining Apollo hardware and to conduct the Apollo applications earth orbital flights with Apollo hardware previously under procurement in a way so as to derive the maximum scientific and technical value;

Third, continue with some stretchouts and deferrals, planetary exploration and the scientific investigation of space;

Fourth, continue increasing the amount of resources directed to aeronautics, which is very important, and I want to emphasize it, because sometimes we think of NASA as only a space agency; it also includes aeronautics; and

Fifth, maintain the essential technical, operational, and management capabilities in NASA on which the future in aeronautics and space depends.

Mr. President, some difficult decisions had to be made in order to reduce this budget down to where it is. The most significant decisions include:

First, closing down the Electronics Research Center in Cambridge, Mass.;

Second, suspending the production of the Saturn V launch vehicle after the original 15 vehicles;

Third, placing the Mississippi Test Facility in a mothball status after the final Saturn V test in December 1970; reducing the work force at the Michoud Assembly in New Orleans to the minimum necessary to support Saturn V flights and placing on a standby status the White Sands Test Facility in New Mexico late in fiscal year 1971;

Fourth, canceling the Apollo 20 lunar mission;

Fifth, delaying the initial Apollo applications project flights by 4 months to late 1972;

Sixth, delaying the Apollo 18 and 19 lunar missions until 1974;

Seventh, delaying the unmanned Viking Mars missions from 1973 to 1975;

Eighth, delaying the launch of the ATS application technology satellites F and G by 12 months;

Ninth, canceling the NASA sustaining university program.

The effects of these actions are going to be felt in many sections of the country. Employment on the space program will continue to drop. Employment on the space program has already dropped from 420,000 to less than 190,000 and by

the end of fiscal year 1971, is expected to be down to about 144,000. This is regrettable, but the spending on a program cannot be reduced by $2½ billion without some people losing their jobs. However, Mr. President, I think the program has been cut enough. A strong program in aeronautics and space is important to the United States. It is important for the scientific and technical results. Benefits derived from it are important to the people. It is important to the country's market position in the world. It is important to our country's prestige.

Mr. President, let me read a single sentence in answer to a question put by the senior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH):

> There is no question that the success of the Apollo mission did more to bolster American prestige abroad than any single event since the termination of the Pacific War in 1945.

Mr. President, I do not think anybody can put a dollar value on what the prestige of the United States is worth to her people, but any program that can elicit such a statement from our Department of State merits support.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I hope other Members of the Senate will join me in voting against the pending amendment to reduce the NASA appropriation by $122 million. In effect, this amendment would set NASA funding at the $3 billion, $197 million figure previously approved by the House. This amount, however, is $136 million less than President Nixon's request for NASA for the next fiscal year, and it is $213 million less than the authorization agreed to between the House and Senate and signed into law by the President.

Although Senator MONDALE'S amendment of yesterday was directed specifically at the space shuttle program, it should be noted that the amendment before us today would accomplish an even greater reduction in NASA spending than the amendment which the Senate rejected yesterday. With a reduction of this magnitude, NASA would be forced to terminate, or at least drastically curtail, important space projects which could include the NERVA nuclear rocket program, future Apollo lunar flights the orbiting astronomical observatory, known at OAO, and the next phase of the applications technology satellite, ATS.

Of these, the NERVA and ATS projects are important especially to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Not only my State, however, but the States of New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas Nevada, California and Washington are also the homes of firms participating in our national space effort. Indirectly, as the home of subcontractors or in other ways, a great many other States are also involved.

Mr. President, what we are talking about today can be directly translated into one term—jobs. The amendment now before us, if approved, would take off NASA payrolls an additional 7,000 to 10,000 employees beyond the 45,000 who would have been phased out, in any event, under the administration's budget.

It is always popular, Mr. President, to attack the space budget when one talks of cutting nonessential Federal expenditures. This problem, which occurs yearly for NASA, has in many ways the same effect as termites in the foundation of a house. The gradual nibbling away goes unnoticed for several years until a part of the house collapses due to lack of support. Although it is politically attractive to represent a cutting away of agency fat from all estimates, we are coming dangerously close to incapacitating NASA by the continuing yearly budget cuts by those who fail to understand the long-range significance of these cuts.

Mr. President, there has already been a considerable reordering of priorities reflected in space program cutbacks. Total nationwide employment, which reached a peak of 420,000 for NASA in early 1966, will fall to 144,000 under the administration's budget request—and will go much further downward with this amendment. The fact, remains, however, that we can go only so far without reaching essentially an abandonment of America's role in space. We are already dangerously near that point—even without this amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

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

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will yield me additional time, I will yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania whether it is not a fact that the first section of the amendment under consideration is really a question that we decided yesterday, whether it applies to the very same item and practically the same amount, because yesterday the amendment seeking a $110 million cut was rejected, and the first section of this amendment provides for a $106 million cut as to the same item.

Mr. SCOTT. It is my understanding that it applies to the same general item, although it is no longer pinpointed toward the shuttle program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The response of the Senator from Pennsylvania was correct. This is not a restriction on the space shuttle station at all. This is simply a cut. Yesterday's amendment was a restriction, not a reduction. This is a reduction of $106 million in research and $16 milion in construction. I quote from what the House found when it made this recommendation. Let me read it:

> The appropriation of $2.5 billion which is recommended for research and development is a reduction of $106 million from the budget estimate of $2.6 billion. The funds recommended will provide for one Apollo flight instead of two for fiscal 1971.

So what this would do is not to restrict the space shuttle station but would provide that next year there would be one lunar fight instead of two.

If this constitutes any substantial scientific loss, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first of all, I want to agree very much with the splendid statements made by the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Pennsylvania, as well as my colleague from Arizona. I should like to cover two or three things now with respect to this amendment. I think it is possible that the question of cutting funds for research and development is being fuzzed over.

The amendment does not specifically eliminate moneys for the space shuttle program. The Senator from Wisconsin is absolutely right on that. However, the cut which he proposes in that particular line item of research and development, if effected, would necessarily also affect the space shuttle program. Thus, to that extent, it is a reflection upon the space shuttle program which we voted on yesterday.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Wisconsin also pointed out that this would result principally from slippage of Apollo 15. The report indicates, however, that they claim that would represent a saving of over $100 million. NASA has already scheduled the changes. NASA comes up with a report that that will really only result in a saving of $20 million but that the schedule has already been made, that is, the slippage. They also estimate that as a result of the investigation into the unfortunate incident which occurred, there will have to be a modifiation of the oxygen tank on the service module on Apollos 14 and 15 and that will cost between $10 million and $15 million. So, what we are talking about, really, is a small and insignificant figure here in the overall adjustments over those particular figures, so that the cut, if applied by the Senator from Wisconsin's amendment, would not be able to effect those savings in the manner he suggested.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for bringing this matter up because in that he is absolutely right.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE). The Senator from Colorado has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I want to yield subsequently to the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), so that I will now make my remarks necessarily very brief.

As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has stated, the NASA budget was cut three times by the Bureau of the Budget. It has had its budget cut by the House. As a result of these

cuts NASA will have a bare bones program for fiscal year 1971.

It may be difficult to convey the impact of a cut like this to a person not acquainted with the space structure. But once we have spent so much time in this country, 12 years, in bringing together the vast complex of contractors, private contractors, scientists, and engineers in this kind of team effort, we cannot just cut it off and the replace it tomorrow. This argument was made yesterday, particularly with the space shuttle. If the space shuttle does not go forward, we will have no means of putting men in an orbital laboratory between 1974 and perhaps 1977 or 1978. Thus, in that period, there would be a complete hiatus so far as American space programs are concerned.

There is a continued stretchout of all planetary explorations. Unless anyone should harbor the wrong idea, there are no plans on the board now to send men to Mars or to Venus, or anywhere else. We are not talking about the present Apollo program. The Space Committee—and several members of that committee are now in the Chamber—has the opportunity, any time, to limit the flights it wishes to limit. Now, already, this year, they have suspended for an indefinite period production of additional Saturn V's after the original 15. That places the two test facilities in Mississippi on a standby status in 1971, after the Saturn V test is completed this December. They have reduced the work force of the facility in New Orleans to the minimum necessary to support a limited future Saturn flight, canceled the Apollo 20 lunar mission, and suspended production of the lunar command.

As the distinguished Senator from Nevada has pointed out, I do not know whether he used a specific date, but I believe Apollo 14 has already been set back for some time in the next calendar year, some time in January. This will mean a delay in the initial sky laboratory prototype space station flight by 4 months, to late 1972; a delay in Apollos 18 and 19 to maybe 1973 or 1974; a delay in the Viking Mars mission, which will be an unmanned mission, not a manned mission, from 1973 to 1975, and a delay in the application of technology satellites by about 1 year.

In terms of what we are talking about, one can use a lot of figures. I should like to state a few.

The whole of the space program here accounts for about 1½ percent of the total Federal budget, the total Federal expenditures.

On a per capita basis, we spend $134 a year on restaurants and bars; $104 on telephone services; on laundry and cleaning $37; on automobile repairs $25; on television sets, $20; on automobile tires, $20; on tobacco $18; on social action programs $386; and on defense $368. On space we only spend $17 annually per person.

Thus, out of these 10 or 12 categories, space is easily clear down at the bottom of the list on a per capita basis.

Now, just one other word, and then I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida. Those of us on this committee particularly, who have had the opportunity to view the scientific programs in this country, agree that the entire space program has provided more forward thrust and more dynamic qualities to our whole scientific effort than any other scientific program we have in the United States. It has done more in medicine, more in metallurgy, more in physics, more in astrophysics—name the field—the field of space has provided more drive forward than any other scientific program.

In concluding, Mr. President—and I hope I am not being improper in saying this—the distinguished senior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) has been detained, but I want to say that as one of the members of the Space Committee, she was very, very insistent and fought hard in committee for the figure that the committee reported to the Senate.

In view of the studious qualities which she always gives to her work—I hope she is able to be in the Chamber before the Senate votes—Senators will be interested in her views. I also have a telegram from a distinguished Senator who cannot be here today addressed to me, and it reads:

> DEAR SENATOR: In connection with H.R. 17548, the Independent Offices Appropriations Bill for 1971, I strongly support the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee relative to the NASA appropriation and hope that it will be supported by the Senate.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> CLINTON P. ANDERSON.
>
> *Chairman, Committee on Astronautical and Space Sciences.*

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I want to say first that I have already been placed in a difficult situation today by having to vote against an amendment which would have increased the bill and kept it within the authorization and within the budget. I did so because of the immense amount of work which was done—and I was one who helped to do it—in the Appropriations Subcommittee and in the full Appropriations Committee and, prior to that even, in the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Legislative Committee in trying to bring out a bill which would meet the situation as best we could and at the same time recognize the economic conditions of the Nation.

The report of the able chairman of the subcommittee, who worked very hard on this matter, shows very clearly on page 10 that the amount recommended in the bill is $415,330,000 under the 1970 appropriation. It also shows that it is $13,697,000 under the estimate, and $91 million plus under the authorization. Mr. President, that indicates something about the careful way in which the committee went through the various items in the bill.

I want to call attention to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin does just this—he attempts to substitute the judgment of the House Committee on Appropriations for the judgment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations when, in the House committee, there is no representation by the Legislative Committee members, whereas in the Senate committee we had on our committee which worked with this matter very carefully, the chairman of the Legislative Committee, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON); the ranking minority member of the Legislative Committee, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH); the Senator from Florida, one of the members; the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), one of the members; and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), one of the members of the Legislative Committee.

There is no such situation on the House side. So, we had at least five participating members in the Appropriations Committee that marked up the bill who had also been members of the Legislative Committee, including the two senior members of that committee.

We very carefully examined just what the House committee had done by way of reductions and then, we met in part what they had done. For instance, in the matter of the first part of this amendment, the House committee on page 9 of its report shows that it reduced the research and development figure from $2,606,000,000 to $2,500,000,000 and explained it with these words:

> The funds recommended will provide for one Apollo flight instead of two flights in fiscal year 1971.

Mr. President, that was a mathematical computation which did not happen to be in accord with the actual facts, because the actual facts, as shown to us in careful hearings, were these, that the skeleton crews which are required to do everything that is necessary in connection with the launching, in connection with spacecraft tracking at the distant points of the earth and the reporting of the information to Houston, and in connection with the operation of mission control were the smallest that could be kept together and still do the job, the very careful and complicated job that is required.

We cannot just divide in two the sum that is provided for the launching of two Apollos and say, "We will cut one item out. Therefore, we will cut out half the amount."

We took this testimony very carefully, and there is only a $20 million cut possible in the launching of just one Apollo, if we launch only one flight in this fiscal year, as compared with the launching of two.

I think that Senators can see very easily why that is true, because we cannot release the whole personnel complement which is required to do the careful countdown and all of the other things, including tracking and data acquisition all the way around the earth, and then get them back together again a year later for a second, similar effort.

To the contrary, about a $20 million saving was the most that was possible, and that was reflected in the report of the bill by the Senate committee. That is the major item involved in the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill.

I trust that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, who is fol-

lowing very closely what I am saying, will realize that it is absolutely true that when we have to hold together all of the personnel to handle the intricate launching operation and all the observation, transmissions, and communications which are required, it makes very little difference whether we will launch one or two Apollos in the course of this fiscal year.

We will launch one in January. We may launch the other before the end of this year. We may launch it right after the end of the year. But it makes very little difference in the total amount required.

I wanted to make that point completely clear. I wanted to make it completely clear that the Senate committee had among its membership the people who knew something about this program, because we sat upon the legislative hearings week after week and, as a matter of fact, year after year. There are at least five such members who were also members of the Appropriations Committee which marked up this bill.

I advocated the entire authorized amount, as my friend, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, knows. However, at the same time I stood by the committee finding as to what reduction could be accepted, and that is a reduction of about $14 million as I remember the figure.

It is difficult for me and it is hard to explain in Florida, where I come from, why this was done. There was an extended give and take that took place in that committee, aided also by the comments of the people who had worked hard during all the hearings both on the legislative side and on the appropriations side.

I cannot say too much for the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) who has been most faithful in his attendance upon the Appropriations Subcommittee as the ranking minority member, and who has made many contributions to the final decision that was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE). The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator if he can give me 3 more minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a more difficult thing to understand is the cut in the facilities request, because the House committee did provide for certain facilities work—and the amounts are not large—that was necessary in connection with the ongoing space program. And yet that cut in the facilities request that was worked out by the Appropriations Committee in the House, which, as I say, had no legislative background, would simply disallow certain small facilities construction—no item of it is more than $3 million or $4 million—which is necessary in connection with programs that are moving ahead under other parts of the bill.

The Senator from Nevada knows perfectly well that there is one such facility in his own State which is necessary to support a program approved elsewhere in the bill. And the same thing could be said with reference to the other facilities items that are cut out.

This is a very carefully worked out bill, and it provides for a cut of some $415 million from last year. It provides for an amount little more than half as much as we were spending 4 years ago. It provides for the carrying on of this program with every saving that we knew how to accomplish which could be sustained and still have a practical program move ahead.

Mr. President, I hope that Members of the Senate will decide that their own committee, composed as it is, not only of members of the Committee on Appropriations, but also of at least five members of the Legislative Committee, has a little better background against which to bring out a strong bill than was the case in the other body. Sometimes the situation is reversed but in this matter the Senate committee had, by all means, the better chance to understand these manifold programs and bring out a dovetail program under which we could move ahead without too great a loss of motion and still approve the objectives to which this Nation is dedicated.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire how much time remains on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. We yield time to the Senator on the bill. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. STENNIS. Five minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that throughout this entire year I have never seen any bill worked on more carefully, and more assiduously, and given more time by the Space Committee. There was very little contribution I made to that work myself, even though I do have the privilege of being on the committee. At the markup, in the conference, and in many of the consultations I was able to attend I noticed a searching review all the way through for these 6 months of the calendar year for this entire program. Then, over at Appropriations we had a very lively and splendid discussion of the major parts, virtually all parts of the bill. There was some division of opinion but we got together on this matter in the end.

In committee there was not a unanimous vote on the major items but it was fairly close to it. I have never had more confidence in a bill representing the composite view of the Senate—both the authorization and the appropriation—than the bill we have before us. I think the paring has been very timely and very sound.

We do not have a large part at all of the operation of the space program in my State. But we have a very valuable installation there of some of the finest setups of computers, laboratories, machine shops, and like matters to be found anywhere in the world that we believe should be used, and we believe will be used, and I am confident they will be used to some extent by other departments of the Government.

After the committee heard all the facts in that connection they gladly included an amount for not just the preservation of that facility, but to keep enough technicians and scientists there to have it open for a year at least. I am glad to report progress is being made in using these facilities that were put there to support the testing in all kinds of different activities by the various departments of Government. I mention that because it is an outstanding illustration of salvaging and saving a further investment.

I am content to rest my argument on the careful and sound consideration by these committees. This has been passed on, in effect by the membership of this body, which has shown confidence in the figures.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that the Mississippi installation would not be touched by my amendment. That is in a separate part of the bill. It would not touch the language or the appropriation.

Mr. STENNIS. I wanted to touch on that subject matter. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield 2 minutes to me so that I may ask a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have listened to the discussion with a great deal of interest. I must say that, as a nonmember of the committee, the essence of the arguments in opposition to the amendment seems to be that the committee made an unusually in-depth study of this phase of the appropriations bill. While I appreciate that very much, I am still listening for a response to the point made by the Senator from Wisconsin which was that the cut in the amount of the appropriations is traceable almost entirely to the Apollo program, and that the cut has been offset somewhat by increases in other areas of the research and development program. If that is so, then it seems to me that we are not endangering a loss of our fine industrial scientific complex that has been built into the space program. I would like to have an answer.

Several Senators addressed the chair.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would be glad to give the Senator the answer, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes for this question and answer.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Testimony received the other day from NASA was to the effect that to allow the Nation two flights on Apollo will require an expenditure of between $10 million and $16 million. This money has to be spent to improve the oxygen system. NASA owns all the hardware, if they want to continue to Apollo 20, so it is not an expenditure for more equipment at all. Included in here would be sums for administration, payment of salaries, and so forth.

If we go to one lunar exploration a year in about 2 years we will be out of crews. When we talk about the training of crews, we are talking about a little more money than there is here.

What the Senator from Wisconsin is doing is no more than NASA has already done in reducing to one flight a year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's response, but I am not sure I understand it yet. I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to say the reduction in the amount of the appropriation bill, as compared to last year, is almost entirely in the Apollo program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think I can clarify that. I read a part of the House report that states as follows:

> An appropriation of $2.5 billion is recommended for research and development. This is a reduction of $106.1 million from the budget estimate of $2.606 billion. The funds recommended will provide for one Apollo flight instead of two flights in Fiscal Year 1971.

I understood from what the Senator from Nevada said that the estimate of NASA is that this particular change will save only about $20 million. I do not challenge the Senator from Nevada. I am not sure the NASA estimate is correct, although it may be correct.

However, if we read further in the House report, they stress that this would require careful study. They did say that space shuttle should go ahead and they favor it going ahead.

This would mean they would have to pare programs elsewhere. This would amount to a cut of $122 million out of a $3 billion program, or a 4-percent cut.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my view this kind of reduction can be made without serious injury to the overall program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I think this matter has been debated enough and everyone has made up his mind on how he is going to vote. I want to make one point clear.

This is not a question of whether we are going to have a space program or not have a space program. All we are saying is this. It was contemplated originally we would have so many flights to the moon. It does not necessarily mean just because we have the hardware we have to use it, no matter what we are looking for.

I would like to have one of the Members on the floor who have been discussing the matter for the benefit of NASA, to stand up and tell me why we have to go to the moon four or five times more. I have not been able to get a rational answer to that question.

Is it just because we have the hardware that we have to keep going to the moon? Will somebody please tell me what we are going to discover there the third time, what we are going to discover there the fourth time, what we are going to discover there the fifth time? And what is it we are looking for that is more important than improving the education of our children on earth, building homes for the elderly, and so forth? Will somebody please answer that question for me? I have not heard the answer yet.

We are not going to cut out the space program, but there was a mishap on Apollo 13. There is going to be a slowdown. The cut is only 4 percent. That is a cut that is within reason, so we can proceed after a close scrutiny. I do not think it is going to paralyze the space program. All it is going to do is make the program go a little more slowly and bring this matter into proper perspective in view of the other needs of the Nation. I do not believe it is going to hurt the space program. They will live with it.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. NASA has slowed down. One space flight is planned, not two. Now they are talking about Apollo 15, and the end, not Apollo 22. The testimony before the committee indicated that.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator said that will be about the end. Why should it not be the end? Tell us any good reason why they have to keep going to the moon. Will somebody answer that question? (Applause in the galleries.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. I tried to.

Mr. PASTORE. I have not heard the answer.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has not given me much of a chance. They are planned programs and scientific studies relating to the earth itself that will be of value to the earth itself, perhaps not to the group of people the Senator indicated we ought to help, but there is under possible study military use of the moon. We have navigational problems that might be studied with better understanding of what can be handled from the moon itself. I think these are two areas in which addition to man's knowledge will be served.

I think we would be taking a real backward step by agreeing to this amendment. I am surprised that it would be the liberals, who are always criticizing us for going backward, who would make this proposal. It looks like they want to shut the door.

Mr. PASTORE. We do not want to shut the door. The Senator has not given me an answer to my question. All he has given me is generalities. That is what we heard in the committee. They said it is going to be for the scientific improvement of mankind. I understand that, but we have to take care of the immediate needs of man on earth. I am saying, let us not shut off the space program, but let us cut it by 4 percent. Is that so bad when we have need of so many other things?

I asked the question, Do we go to the moon for all this knowledge that will help mankind? The answer was "Yes." Why does the taxpayer of America always have to take care of all mankind? Why do we not look in the mirror once in a while and see the image of America and see what we need to do here?

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am in complete agreement when the Senator from Rhode Island questions where the money is going to come from. The Senator from Arizone has been asking that question for the last 20 years. We keep spending and spending and spending. Yet, as I indicated, in partial response to the Senator's question as to why we want to go to the moon and why they want to do it, I have yet to see a plan come out here on the floor for spending $20 billion, or whatever the amount is, to save our cities and help our transportation needs. I would like to see one.

Mr. PASTORE. It is going to come up right after this one.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes.

There is going to be a movement to raise funds for urban renewal. We will see what happens on that.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has asked why we sould go four or five more times to the moon. I just want to point out that this is a decision for the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and the chairman of this subcommittee, being a member of that committee, can participate in that decision. But with reference to the budget, there is only one flight to the moon planned for this fiscal year, and that is what we are talking about now, and that flight has been deferred to the first of the calendar year.

Mr. PASTORE. Originally two had been provided for. If Apollo 13 had not been aborted, there would have been two more. Because of that happening, we are going to have one.

My argument is, let us look at this carefully. Let us not go ahead full speed. We have reached the moon. We proved to the world that we could get there first. We threw our hats in the air the first time. Wonderful. We went there the second time to pick up more stones.

What benefit is there in a third trip to pick up more stones?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not think I can add to what the Senator from Rhode Island has said, because he has said it as well as anyone could. I want the record to show my support of his views.

I think the news in the morning's press makes more evident than ever that this country is in serious condition, and that we cannot afford this kind of luxury. This might have been justified in days when we thought we had unlimited wealth and had that responsibility, but I cannot see the justification for our continuing to explore the moon, as the

Senator from Rhode Island has said, three or four or 10 times, when we need this money for so many needs here on earth.

The idea that this bill was carefully worked out does not seem to be relevant whatever to the real question. I have no doubt that it was carefully prepared. With the kind of industrial support it has, and the way the installations have been spread throughout the country, I suppose it has as large a constituency as any program we have, outside the Pentagon itself.

I do not want to be self-righteous about it. I would be bound to confess that if I had a $100 million installation in my State, I would be tempted to vote against a proposal to cut it. I would be hard put to vote against an agricultural program. In fact, I do find it difficult to vote against agriculture programs. I have never voted against them. But I cannot understand why a Senator who does not have a $100 million installation in his State would vote against this proposal, because he surely is sensitive to the needs in other areas. Much though we might have to adjust to the demands of our constituents—and I am not the least bit reluctant to confess I have to do it, as does everyone else—it is a question of judgment in reconciling our national interests to our local interests. Having no such local interest, I think it comes to a matter of priorities, and this demand is far below the demands of education, health, pollution, and so forth.

Yesterday morning the newspapers had a story that right across the river they are dumping raw sewage into the Potomac because they do not have the money to provide adequate sewage treatment, and they do not have any real prospects of getting the money. One reason they do not is that we tax them so heavily for going to the moon and for fighting the war in Vietnam.

I read in the newspapers that the administration is going to ask for an extra $100 million, in addition to the $365 million spent this year, for one little country. Cambodia is asking for more money, according to the papers. The stories are that the Thais are asking for a similar amount for sending troops to Cambodia that we paid them to send to South Vietnam. No doubt the administration will do it, although not with my approval. All these demands, however, are brought to our attention.

I think we have to make up our minds and choose between these matters. It seems very strange to me when I hear that "conservatives" are for the space program. That is to me a very strange use of the terms "conservative" and "liberal." I can see nothing whatever conservative about voting to expand or maintain the space program at its present level. That would seem to me to be radical and irresponsible, in view of the needs of the rest of this country.

As to the need for the war in Vietnam, as everyone knows, I would like to see it brought to a conclusion by a negotiated settlement; but if the administration is unable to do that, and does not do it, no doubt there will be the demand for money to pay for the continuation of it.

We cannot continue to go to the moon and still maintain armies—not only our own armies, but everyone else's armies in Vietnam. This is what is bringing on the bankruptcy of the biggest railroad in this country; and no doubt there will be other bankruptcies. The market continues to move down—not that that in itself is that important, but it is a sign that the leading financial brains of this country are very pessimistic about our economic future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot understand, if "conservative" means seeking to conserve the basic democratic capitalistic system in this country, how anyone who calls himself a conservative could be so imprudent and profligate as to vote to spend money at this level on matters which are not directly and positively necessary for the continuation of our system.

I believe the Senator from Rhode Island is absolutely correct. He has asked a question that has not been answered. He asked yesterday a very similar question. It was not answered then, and it was not answered today. It certainly is no answer to say it was carefully prepared, or to say that we have the computers, and they ought to be put to work, whether or not they serve a useful purpose.

Are we never going to be able to extricate ourselves from the mistakes of the past? We have computers of all kinds, all over this country, and if we have to keep them working on questionable programs just because we built them in the first place, I certainly cannot see the logic in that argument.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. It has been contended that we do not have programs in which we can spend money effectively to help our own people. A little later in the debate, I intend to offer an amendment which will increase the amount available for grants for construction of sewage disposal facilities, as provided for in this bill, from $200 million to $500 million. HUD tells us that they have applications ready to go to spend that money effectively. We know our communities do not have the funds available. The House passed the bill with that figure at $500 million. The committee bill provides $200 million.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin as a way to cut some money out of this bill that it is unnecessary for us to spend, and then come back and put some money into the places where we so desperately need to solve problems in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 1 minute has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have just 1 minute remaining. I use it to point out that even if this amendment is accepted, and we go back to the House figure, the fact will be that we will still be spending $212 million more than we spent for space last year, leaving the Apollo program aside. The fact is that all of that reduction has been in the Apollo program, which, as we know, is over the hump anyway. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I allot 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the generous Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to pages 693 and 694 of the committee hearings, wherein specific questions were raised about the reduction in expense to be accomplished by going from two lunar flights a year to one. I am quoting, now, from the testimony of Dr. Paine, talking to the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE):

> So, I do not know of any other Government programs, outside of an end of a war, which have decreased as much as we have. We have dropped from 420,000 Americans working on NASA programs to the present 190,000 and will go down to 145,000 by the end of fiscal year 1971.

Then Senator PASTORE asked the specific question:

> But I am talking now about these lunar landings, and I would like to have you direct yourself to that. Do you need the same backup for two as you might need for one, or need the same backup for one as you might need for two?
>
> Dr. PAINE. Yes.
>
> Senator PASTORE. What is the problem here?
>
> Dr. PAINE. Two Apollo flights per year is the minimum number that we would feel comfortable about firing on an 8-hour day, 40-hour week, one-shift basis. We have to have enough people on this one-shift operation, and we have to keep their skills up.

Also, in the testimony on the Apollo 13 accident before the Senate Space Committee on June 30, when I myself was questioning Mr. Myers, the NASA Assistant Administrator for Manned Space Flight, as to the saving, here is his answer to me, as found on page 118 of the transcript:

> Mr. MYERS. Our estimate is that that change in the schedule would save approximately $20 million, rather than the $106 million.

There is no question about it, Mr. President. The House of Representatives, acting without the benefit of a single member of their legislative committee on their Appropriations Committee, did not come to a sound conclusion. The Senate had on its Appropriations Committee, as shown by the hearings record, five members of the legislative committee, including the chairman and the ranking minority member.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). Although the stated intention is to reduce expenditures in our Nation which is faced with growing social problems, the ultimate effect is to kill the proverbial goose which lays the golden egg.

NASA has established a unique record of success during its lifetime in performing tremendously complex space missions. This record culminated with a great and historic achievement on July 20, 1969, when the United States landed men safely on the moon and returned them to earth for deserved acclaim by people around the world. The first mission was followed closely by a second landing, and then the recent superb performance of three brave astronauts who safely returned their space craft after the racking explosion in the service module of Apollo 13.

The really significant point to all this is the demonstrated capability of the United States to state its intention to undertake a long-range goal and perform it despite a variety of highly complex requirements and problems which confront such missions. Our ability to accomplish such missions has established us as the world leader in the field of technology.

By the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, Congress created NASA and directed it to conduct its program so as to contribute to one or more of eight objectives. Among these were the establishment of long-range studies of the problems involved in various space activities, the development and operation of the vehicles necessary to carry equipment and organisms through space, and to preserve the role of the United States as the leader in aeronautic and space science and technology.

Having responded to the mandate of Congress, and after having established a leadership role for the United States in space exploration, we are now at a decision point—whether or not to maintain this role and capability to support future space objectives.

Through the past decade, we have found one thing to be clear: if we are going to continue to be the world leader in science and technology we must continue to support fully a broad-based program of space science and exploration. Many of our programs and projects do not catch public attention as do the manned space missions. But, it is the pursuit of just such research tasks and the establishment of new technologies that will enable our Nation to undertake future aeronautical and space activities and to maintain world leadership in the broader fields of science and technology. Many of these tasks involve discovering fundamentals and advancing the state of the art. By their very nature they are long lead-time projects. They are not always susceptible to precise scheduling of results. Thus, the most severe danger is that they are vulnerable to attack by those who seek ways of eliminating expenditures which do not have immediate results.

The amendment with which we are dealing attempts to reverse the trend in manned space exploration, or to prohibit NASA from undertaking further manned space flight. However, following several years of careful hearings before the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and studying the planning documents of NASA and the President's Space Task Group, it is clear that a forward looking space program for the future for this Nation should include continuation of manned space flight activity.

The objectives recommended by the Space Task Group state that the United States should emphasize various program activities, including the development of new systems and technology for space operations with emphasis on: first, commonality, second, reuseability, and third, economy—and I wish to emphasize that word—through a program directed initially toward development of a new transportation space capability and space station modules which utilize this new capability.

In April I had the privilege of chairing the Senate Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences which was investigating space benefits. I pointed out to Dr. Paine who was the first witness that people frequently ask the question: "What good is it doing?" The testimony and colloquy which followed should be read by all who would threaten the future viability of our space effort or, as I said before, would kill the golden goose.

Our space program has had a great and revolutionary impact on technology, such as computers, aviation, aerospace, the research and development process; on science, such as space astronomy, space photography, space geodesy; on meteorology, where we have already improved our weather forecasting, on communications, where we can now see world events at the very time of their occurrence. New management techniques have been developed through the space program which have revolutionized our ability to get difficult things done in this country.

But, equally important, though a bit harder to define, is the effect our manned space program has had on stabilizing world affairs among the major powers. In a letter to Dr. Thomas Paine, U. Alexis Johnson stated on April 3, 1970:

> The unprecedented success of the program, the free and unfettered openness with which it has been conducted, its contributions to science and to commerce, and the technical and diplomatic skills of our astronauts, all have added greatly to the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world and to our influence in world affairs . . . contributions of the space program to America's strength are too large and too obvious to need specification in this statement. . . . The success and character of the space program have had an important and highly beneficial effect on our posture in the world and on our foreign relations. It has added to our national strength in many ways, and promoted national security.

Put another way, the Space Task Group noted that:

> The landing on the moon has captured the imagination of the world. It is now abundantly clear to the man in the street, as well as to the political leaders of the world, that mankind now has at its service a new technological capability, an important characteristic of which is that its applicability transcends national boundaries. If we retain the identification of the world with our space program, we have an opportunity for significant political effects on nations and peoples and on their relationships to each other, which in the long run may be quite profound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON). All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), would each vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) is paired with the

Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY). If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 213 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Bayh	Inouye	Pearson
Brooke	Kennedy	Pell
Burdick	McCarthy	Prouty
Case	McGee	Proxmire
Eagleton	McGovern	Randolph
Fulbright	McIntyre	Schweiker
Goodell	Miller	Spong
Harris	Mondale	Symington
Hart	Muskie	Tydings
Hartke	Nelson	Williams, N.J.
Hollings	Packwood	Williams, Del.
Hughes	Pastore	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Dole	Long
Allen	Dominick	McClellan
Allott	Eastland	Montoya
Baker	Ellender	Saxbe
Bellmon	Fannin	Scott
Bennett	Goldwater	Smith, Ill.
Bible	Griffin	Sparkman
Boggs	Gurney	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hatfield	Talmadge
Cannon	Holland	Thurmond
Cooper	Hruska	Tower
Cotton	Jackson	Young, N. Dak.
Cranston	Jordan, Idaho	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—3

Byrd of West Virginia, for.
Mansfield, for.
Metcalf, for.

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Gravel	Murphy
Church	Hansen	Percy
Cook	Javits	Ribicoff
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dodd	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Mathias	Stevens
Fong	Moss	Yarborough
Gore	Mundt	Young, Ohio

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be considered

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Proxmire amendment was rejected.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is paired with the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 214 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken	Dole	Long
Allen	Dominick	McClellan
Allott	Eastland	Montoya
Baker	Ellender	Packwood
Bellmon	Fannin	Saxbe
Bennett	Goldwater	Scott
Bible	Griffin	Smith
Boggs	Gurney	Sparkman
Byrd, Va.	Hatfield	Stennis
Cannon	Holland	Talmadge
Cooper	Hruska	Thurmond
Cotton	Jackson	Tower
Cranston	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—34

Bayh	Harris	McCarthy
Brooke	Hart	McGee
Burdick	Hartke	McGovern
Case	Hollings	McIntyre
Eagleton	Hughes	Miller
Fulbright	Inouye	Mondale
Goodell	Kennedy	Muskie
Nelson	Proxmire	Tydings
Pastore	Randolph	Williams, N.J.
Pearson	Schweiker	Williams, Del.
Pell	Spong	
Prouty	Symington	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—3

Mansfield, against.
Metcalf, against.
Byrd of West Virginia, against.

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Gravel	Murphy
Church	Hansen	Percy
Cook	Javits	Ribicoff
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Dodd	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Mathias	Stevens
Fong	Moss	Yarborough
Gore	Mundt	Young, Ohio

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 8, lines 23 and 24, strike "$119,756,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$120,672,500."

On page 9, line 6, strike out "$71,428,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$70,512,600."

On page 9, line 12, strike out "Denton, Texas."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO REPORT ON S. 2108

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may have until midnight tonight to file a report on S. 2108, the bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, if we may have order for 1 minute, I can explain the amendment.

The amendment is offered on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), who is very concerned about this matter. However, he was called out of Washington because of the funeral of one of his dearest and closest friends. The Senator from Texas has asked me to offer the amendment in his behalf.

The amendment would provide that the city of Denton, Tex.—a city for which he has great concern—would not be deferred. Set aside in the bill is $916,000 to be provided for the construction of a public building in Denton, Tex.

Mr. President, I have talked with the Senators in charge of the bill on both sides, and they feel that Denton is not one of the projects that should be deferred.

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

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the Senator from Texas yesterday afternoon and with the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF). I have talked the matter over with my counterpart, the ranking member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), and we are willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) and the members of his Subcommittee for the excellent work they have done on this appropriation bill for the Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I would like to call attention to just one item in this measure and discuss it briefly. The need to proceed on this measure expeditiously is appreciated, but I would be remiss in my duty to the people of Texas if I failed to call attention to this important matter.

Under the heading "Construction, Public Building Projects," in the appropriation for the General Services Administration, on page 8 and 9 of the bill, a proviso defers a project of great importance to Texas. This project is the construction of a Post Office and Federal Office Building at Denton, Texas. The deletion of this project which has already been funded and planned is a cause of serious concern.

It is difficult to discern a defensible reason for scuttling this project which was long ago planned, approved and funded. Certainly we are all concerned with the need to exercise fiscal responsibility in these times when the nation's economy has been so badly manipulated toward inflation and recession.

However, I can only describe as fiscally irresponsible action which halts orderly progress toward providing facilities where the need has long ago been demonstrated and amply justified.

The Post Office and office building in Denton, Texas, was proposed in 1964 and was originally scheduled for completion over two years ago. This needed facility should not be delayed and postponed further.

In its budget for 1971, the Administration recommended the "deferral" of this project in Denton, Texas. The amount of money needed to insure orderly progress is not a great amount in relation to that devoted to such construction projects. The amount needed is only $916,000.

While this is a relatively insignificant part of this bill which appropriates nearly $18 billion, it is very important to those citizens of Denton, Texas, who are suffering from the lack of adequate postal facilities. These facilities are necessary in order to provide them with the type of postal service they need and have the right to expect.

I submit that it is an injustice to these citizens to force them to continue to bear the burden of inconvenience and of inefficient mail service caused by inadequate facilities.

In view of the great amount of planning and preparation that has already gone into this project, I believe that it is particularly important that this amendment to permit the funds previously appropriated for the Denton Post Office to be used for the orderly continuation of this project.

This inclusion of this project is of particular concern to me because if the Senate does not take action at this time, the item cannot even be considered when the bill is in Conference. I urge that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 758

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 758 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 39, line 13, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert the following: $500,000,000".

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, the amendment is cosponsored by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) and me.

My amendment No. 758 would increase appropriations for grants for basic water and sewer facilities from $200 million to $500 million in fiscal year 1971.

This HUD program generally provides financial assistance to communities with a population of 5,500 or more for the construction of water and sewer facilities. The assistance is made in the form of grants of up to 50 percent of the total project cost.

A budget request of $150 million was made for the program for fiscal year 1971. The House approved an appropriation of $500 million and the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended a figure of $200 million.

This program is essential for the development of our larger villages and towns. Without adequate systems these communities will be unable to attract industry so that they might grow. They will be unable to persuade their youth to look forward to a bright future by remaining in their communities. Mayor after mayor has appealed to me, saying, "We are losing our businesses; we are losing our youth to the big cities—please help us in our efforts to retain a viable community."

At the present time I am making every effort to obtain funds for a water system for the town of Eden, outside of Buffalo. The town is unable to open its new $15 million school because it has an inadequate water system. Because it is reaching its debt limit, the town is unable to finance the school, a water system, and a sewer system. It must have help.

This situation could be repeated, I am sure, in every State in the Union. Another example is the village of Delhi, in Delaware County, N.Y.

The village of Delhi had a 1960 population of 2,307. It was thus eligible to apply for Farmers Home Administration funds.

However, HUD accepted the application due to the characteristics of the community and its projected growth.

The village applied for HUD funds in 1966, 1967 and 1968; the applications were denied because of "lack of funds." The application was returned, with the suggestion that Delhi seek other means of financing.

HUD made no effort to advise the Farmers Home Administration (FHA). Farmers Home knew nothing of these declines—even if it had, they could do nothing with an application until it was officially referred from HUD to FHA.

The community obviously did not know what to do; they wrote me in April 1970 asking if they were now required to file with FHA.

I wrote to HUD on May 12 and reviewed the situation and pointed out that the village had lost 4 years in the FHA pipeline for funding.

HUD responded on May 26 and said they would be glad to consider another application from Delhi, and that they would "be of all possible help within the funding limitations of the program."

The funding limitation have caused the same frustration, delay among countless other communities.

Since the House passed the additional $300 million, I have been in communication with officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to ascertain the capabilities of communities to proceed immediately. We all know that there is a grave need for water and sewer facilities in the communities of this Nation. Because of underfunding, thousands of localities have been deterred from providing adequate water and sewer facilities for the people of the community. In some cases, they have been forced to rely on old out-of-date systems or worse, no system at all.

For this reason, I have introduced the amendment to increase the appropriations for the water and sewer grant program from $200 million to the House-passed level of $500 million.

I would like to share the information I received from HUD regarding the program funding problems and I ask that my correspondence with the Department be included in the RECORD here. The information clearly demonstrates the need for additional funds.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1970.

Mr. W. GERARD LYONS,
Senior Assistant for Congressional Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LYONS: I am writing to request information with regard to your Department's program of matching grants for basic water and sewer facilities, under Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102) as amended.

As you know, the House on May 12 appropriated $500 million for this program, and I would like the following information as soon as possible so that it can be analyzed prior to Senate consideration of the Fiscal Year 1971 Appropriations bill:

1. *Authorizations/Appropriations/Expenditures (actual or estimated).*

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation	Expenditures (actual or estimated)
1966	$200,000,000	$100,000,000	[1] $5,684,000
1967	200,000,000	100,000,000	[1] 137,270,000
1968	350,000,000	165,000,000	[1] 156,281,000
1969	200,000,000	165,000,000	[1] 166,830,000
1970	115,000,000	135,000,000	[2] 150,407,000
Subtotal		665,000,000	616,472,000
1971	100,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
Total	1,165,000,000		

[1] Actual.
[2] Estimated.

As you know the Act provides that "Any amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended, and any amounts authorized for any fiscal year under this section but not appropriated may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1971."

The above appropriations and expenditures were reflected in the Budget Appendices for Fiscal Year 1968 through Fiscal Year 1971.

I would appreciate it if you would confirm or clarify the following conclusions that I have made in light of this data:

Appropriations.—In view of the fact that funds appropriated by Congress are available until expended, it would appear that $48,528,000 is available for expenditure prior to June 30, 1970.

Authorizations.—It would appear that $500 million in authorization remains available for appropriation for Fiscal Year 1971.

2. FEDERAL MATCHING

Although the Act permits up to 50 per cent matching by the Federal Government, what is the actual average percentage of Federal matching?

Under certain circumstances the Act permits up to 90 per cent Federal matching for communities of less than 10,000. What is HUD's record in providing matching over 50%?

3. HUD DENIAL OF APPLICATIONS

Beginning with Fiscal Year 1966, how many, and what is the Federal share of the cost of, applications have been denied by HUD because of lack of funds, and for which applications have not been resubmitted?

With regard to the Federal cost, I realize that it might be time consuming to provide this data on a basis other than 50–50 matching. However, if time permits, I would like the information to reflect as accurate a picture as possible.

4. REFERRALS TO FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Beginning with Fiscal Year 1966, how many applications have been referred to the Farmers Home Administration? What is their total Federal cost?

5. PENDING APPLICATIONS

a. Approximately how many eligible applications are pending in Washington that are ready to move if funds were available? I would like the information to reflect the States (or if this is not quickly available, the regions) from which the applications originated. What is their total Federal cost?

b. I would like the same information on applications that are in the various stages of processing in the Regional Offices.

c. Could HUD efficiently obligate $549 million (the balance authorized and the amount in budgetary reserve from previous appropriations) before the end of Fiscal Year 1971?

6. POPULATION LIMITATION ON AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR RURAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

In Conference Report 91–740 of December 12, 1969, House-Senate Conferees agreed that HUD and the Agriculture Department should conduct a joint study on the 5500 population limit on areas for Farmers Home Administration programs. The conferees recognized that there is a distinct gap that exists in rural America that have populations of more than 5500 which are not adequately served by either HUD or Agriculture.

Is this joint study presently under way? When will a report (or an interim report) be issued?

Thank you very much for your cooperation in providing the above information.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GOODELL.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1970.

Hon. CHARLES GOODELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOODELL: Thank you for your letter of May 13 regarding our Water and Sewer Facilities Grant Program.

We offer the following comments on the conclusions set forth in your letter.

1. AUTHORIZATION/APPROPRIATION/EXPENDITURES

The $616,472,000 in estimated cumulative obligations as of June 30, 1970, represents projects approvals for which formal grant agreements have been executed. Additional implied commitments, totaling approximately $48 million, are estimated to be oustanding as of June 30, 1970, in the form of fund reservations. Accordingly, total approvals at the end of this fiscal year are estimated to amount to very close to the cumulative appropriation of $665 million, so that the $48,528,000 you have assumed as additionally available for the program has in fact already been placed under fund reservation.

Your conclusion that $500 million in authorization remains available for appropriation for FY 1971 is correct.

2. FEDERAL MATCHING

The average Federal grant participation is 31.5 percent. This percentage is in large measure attributable to the fact that our ceiling on individual grants is $1.5 million so that on large projects (ranging, say, from $4–10 million) the Federal percentage is relatively low.

Ten grants of more than 50 percent, totaling $5,355,461, have been approved to date. Eligibility requirements for such grants sharply curtail the number of under 10,000 communities that can qualify.

3. HUD DENIAL OF APPLICATIONS

Immediately available figures indicate that approximately 2,259 applications, totaling $1,436,000 have been disapproved because of program funding limitations. We have no data available on the number and amount of these disapproved applications which have been resubmitted. The estimated total project costs for these disapproved applications amounts to $3 billion.

4. REFERRALS TO FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A total of 1,606 requests aggregating $340,377,262 have been referred by HUD to the Farmers Home Administration.

5. PENDING APPLICATIONS

We have no grant applications on hand in Washington, since program operations are decentralized and are administered by our Regional Offices. As of April 30, 1970, the Regional Offices had a backlog of 254 projects, which on the basis of full applications, appear to be legally eligible for grants. These applications request grant funds aggregating $135.1 million. In addition to these full applications, the Regional Offices have on hand preliminary applications (as to which they have made no determination of eligibility) covering an additional 529 projects totaling $292.7 million. Past experience would suggest that from one-third to one-half of these would probably result in full applications for eligible projects.

These raw numbers do not tell the whole story, however. Legally eligible applications must undergo further review to select those which are most deserving and to ascertain the local financial capability to proceed. In this connection, we find that in today's capital market many communities are having great difficulty in financing the local share of project cost.

Therefore, the backlog figures set forth above do not accurately measure the opportunity for efficient use of funds within the program. It is impossible to give you an exact figure without very detailed analysis of the project backlog.

The distribution of the backlog (preliminary and full applications) among the Regional Offices is as follows: Region I (New York), 2.3 percent; Region II (Philadelphia), 16.1 percent; Region III (Atlanta), 19.0 percent; Region IV (Chicago), 37.5 percent; Region V (Fort Worth), 11.5 percent; Region VI (San Francisco), 13.0 percent; and Region VII (Puerto Rico), 0.6 percent.

6. POPULATION LIMITATION ON AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR RURAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

A HUD–USDA Task Force has issued its joint report on this item, as set forth in the enclosed excerpt from the October 6, 1969, issue of the Congressional Record. The Interagency Task Force is continuing to hold regular meetings to develop the implementation of the 16-point program recommended in the report.

I shall be happy to supply any further aid you may require.

Sincerely yours,

W. GERARD LYONS,
Senior Assistant for Congressional Relations.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 29, 1970.

Mr. W. GERARD LYONS,
Senior Assistant for Congressional Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LYONS: Thank you very much for your letter of the 26th, which was in response to my request of the 13th regarding HUD's Water and Sewer Facilities Grant Program. There are several points on which I would like to have clarification:

1. AUTHORIZATIONS/APPROPRIATIONS/EXPENDITURES

You state that HUD has made additional implied commitments totaling approximately $48 million and these commitments are thus outstanding in the form of fund reservations.

Were these implied commitments made by the Regional Offices?

Is the $48,528,000 not now in budgetary reserve?

2. FEDERAL MATCHING

What is the average Federal grant participation on individual grants that are $1.5 million or under?

What is the average Federal grant participation on individual grants that are over $1.5 million?

How many communities of under 10,000 that met the eligibility requirements for over 50 percent matching were not funded because of program funding limitations?

Of the 10 grants of over 50 percent matching that have been approved to date, what is the average Federal grant participation?

3. HUD DENIAL OF APPLICATION

Of the 2,259 applications that have been disapproved because of program funding limitations, how many of these have come from communities of less than 10,000? Of less than 15,000?

I appreciate your cooperation in providing me with this additional information.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GOODELL.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1970.

Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOODELL: Thank you for your recent letter requesting additional information about the Water and Sewer Facilities Grant Program.

We offer the following comments in response to your questions.

1. AUTHORIZATION/APPROPRIATION/EXPENDITURES

The $48 million represents absolute commitments by this Department for specific water and sewer projects. These funds have been committed but formal grant agreements have not as yet been executed by the Government. This money is not in a budgetary reserve but in fact has been committed for approved projects.

2. FEDERAL MATCHING

The average Federal grant for water and sewer projects is $448,849 or approximately 30% of the total project cost. With the exception of two grants which barely exceeded $1.5 million due solely to relocation expenses, the Department has approved only one water and sewer grant in excess of $1.5 million. This grant of $2.5 million will fund approximately 41% of the total project costs of $6 million.

I find that no projects from communities under 10,000 population which requested a grant in excess of 50% were disapproved because of program funding limitations.

The average grant for the ten projects in excess of 50% Federal participation is $535,546.00 or 70.6% of the total project cost.

3. HUD DENIAL OF APPLICATIONS

I regret to advise you that we do not have available a breakdown of applications from communities of less than 10,000 population or less than 15,000 population which have been disapproved because of program funding limitations. This type of data must be computed manually and unfortunately because of our limited staff we are unable to furnish this type of information at this time.

I appreciate your interest and shall be happy to supply any further information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

W. GERARD LYONS,
Senior Assistant for Congressional Relations.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York for offering this amendment. I am aware of the fact that these small communities—and I do not know the situation in New York but I do know the situation in Louisiana—very much want to provide water facilities and sewerage facilities.

The usual experience when they come in with an application for facilities that are desperately needed by the community is that they will inquire of the district office and then be told that they are out of money, and they can file the application if they want to, but there is no money available.

Mr. President, if Senators want to do something about pollution, the place to start is here where communities cannot provide sewerage facilities because the money is not available. In addition, many communities do not have the money to pay the interest rate, and if they could, some of them are bonded to the full extent to which they can bond themselves.

The Senator's proposal would make available this amount of money on a matching basis, is that correct?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

Mr. LONG. So for $500 million I am sure the Senator would achieve $1 billion worth of pollution control and sanitation.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the Senator for his comments and his support. It would be more than $1 billion. The average grant now provided by the Federal Government is 30 percent of the total project costs. Although the law authorizes them to go to 50 percent, in most cases they have not gone to 50 percent matching. The additional $300 million provided in this amendment would provide in antipollution programs well over $1 billion. This is a desperately needed program.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is aware of the fact that we have before the Committee on Finance at the present time a family assistance proposal as part of the welfare package that would increase the cost of Government by about $4 billion a year. We are aware that when that bill comes before the Senate amendments will be offered to run that bill up to perhaps $12 billion a year. This Senator is not too much concerned about the dollar figure for welfare, but I am concerned about what we get for that dollar figure.

The money which the Senator proposes to spend would not only put many people to work in small communities in this country, but also it would help carry out essential program of sanitation, cleanliness, and pollution control. Every job provided in that category is needed, not only for the employment it would provide, but even more for the services to be rendered.

In this area where we are providing something to benefit everyone in the country—and very greatly to those who need it most—we would do well to agree to the Senator's amendment. I shall be pleased to vote for the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York for offering the amendment. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. President, I talk frequently with the mayors in my State. Almost all of them plead and beg for funds for sewer facilities. We hear a great deal of discussion about the problems of our cities, and they are vast problems, indeed. We will never solve the problems of our urban areas until we make it more attractive for people to live in the small towns and villages.

We have water and sewer problems in those small villages and towns that make it utterly impossible for them to attract and hold industries in order to make jobs available to people who are born and reared in those areas.

I have seen the manifold benefits that are produced when towns and villages and small communities in Georgia are able to provide water and sewer systems. Frequently they are able to attract industries to their areas that they were not able to attract before. In that way, they are able to provide jobs for people and when that happens, the people will not go off to the cities where they become the objects of welfare.

This amendment would restore to the pending bill the full amount authorized to be appropriated by section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, the $500 million for fiscal year 1971.

When the pending bill was reported out of the House Appropriations Committee, it contained only $150 million for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to communities for basic water and sewer facilities. The present amendment would restore to H.R. 17548 the funds added on the House floor by my good friend, the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of Georgia, BOB STEPHENS. Congressmen STEPHENS successfully led the fight to amend H.R. 17548 to provide $500 million for water and sewer grants to small communities. BOB STEPHENS fought for this amendment because he realized the great unmet need for water and sewer facilities in the small towns and communities of his district.

In December 1969, the Farmers Home Administration conducted a survey of all communities with populations of 5,500 or less to determine the need for water and sewer systems in the rural areas of the Nation. This survey showed that there were 1,003 communities in Georgia without a water system and 1,359 communities without a sewer system. The Georgia Municipal Association has estimated that only about 50 percent of Georgia's population is on public sewerage, and only about one-half this percentage is connected to systems which provide adequate sewage treatment. The 250 million gallons of industrial waste and 225 million gallons of raw sewage are being dumped daily into Georgia streams.

When I talk to mayors and other local officials, I frequently hear desperate tales of raw sewage running in the streets.

In the face of these glaring facts, the attitude of this administration is disturbing. It has taken considerable prodding from Members of the Congress to get the administration to expend the funds appropriated for the use of the Farmers Home Administration for grants to water and waste disposal systems in small villages. When the House of Representa-

tives was debating this issue in May, the administration reported that it had $43 million uncommitted from the funds appropriated for water and sewer for fiscal 1970.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to make grants for basic water and sewer systems to communities with populations of 2,000 and above. However, HUD has been referring most of the applications from communities with population between 2,000 and 5,500 to the Farmers Home Administration, which has even less money than HUD.

I hope that if the present amendment is approved, HUD will face up to its responsibility to meet the pressing needs of the smaller communities as well as the larger ones. Some of the most desperate situations in my own State are in communities with less than 5,500 people.

Mr. President, I am shocked, not only by the administration's reluctance to spend water and sewer money appropriated by the Congress; I am also chagrined by the failure of the administration to request more than $150 million to meet a need which requires billions. I realize that the current budget is one of the tightest that we have ever seen. I know that the administration, in making its budget requests, must go through an intricate process of balancing its priorities. However, I submit that the administration's priorities are wrong if it cannot squeeze more than $150 million out of a $200 billion budget to remedy this disgraceful situation. The failure of the administration to request adequate funds for this program is rather typical of an unfortunate set of priorities which plagues our Nation.

Certainly, I would be the last to deny that the explosive situation in our inner cities demands our best efforts. The largest cities of this Nation are fast becoming both unlivable and ungovernable.

However, we can never expect to solve these problems as long as our congested, overcrowded cities are burdened with a continued influx of rural immigrants. Every year, almost half a million people move from the rural to urban areas of this Nation. Some of these are eager youngsters who have moved to the city for an education or for a good job. However, most of this number is poorly educated and ill-equipped to cope with the pressures and problems of urban living. They are fuel on the tinderboxes of our inner cities.

Trying to solve the problems of the inner city while failing to cope with the problem of rural outmigration is like trying to repair a war-torn city while the bombs are still falling.

Unfortunately, we as a Nation have never come to realize this. We scurry about trying to plug holes to avert a crisis here and stop a riot there. We never sit still long enough to determine what must be done to build a healthy society and a society in which everyone will have a chance for a decent kind of life, a quality environment. We must reorder our priorities. We must make a national commitment to not only stop the problem of rural outmigration, but to reverse the trend and relieve the population pressures of our cities.

In regard to the immediate problem, we must, as a bare minimum, provide adequate water and sewage facilities for the small towns and communities of the Nation. Industries cannot be expected to locate in areas without an adequate water supply and without an adequate sewage facility. Rural residents can be expected to leave areas where they do not event have access to these very basic requisites of a decent standard of living.

Increased funding of the water-sewer grant program will not provide a new life for the country. It will not solve the problems of rural America. However, it is a starting point. It is a basic requisite in our attempt to raise the quality of life of rural America and make it an area where people want to live and work.

If we want to do something about pollution, and I think we do, I know of no better place to start than by the installation of water and sewer facilities in the towns, villages, and cities of this country.

I commend the Senator. I shall support the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New York that I had an indentical amendment prepared that I was going to offer when I learned that the Senator from New York was going to offer this amendment. I thought I was one of the sponsors. I would like to be included as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama may be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for taking the lead in this matter.

I strongly support the full funding of the HUD water-sewer program. Ever since this program got started in the mid-1960's, it has been evident that it is one of the most sought-after Federal assistance programs we have. Every Member of the Senate, I venture to say, has heard from local governments in his State, time and time again, to help them with an application for a critically needed project in their community. Each of us probably receives more calls on water-sewers applications than for any other Federal program.

There just is no question about the needs of local governments for greater Federal assistance in providing water and sewer lines to the newly urbanizing areas of our country. The program has been running at the level of only $150 million a year, which is completely inadequate. HUD records show that over $2.5 billion in local applications have been turned down, mostly for lack of Federal funds. Total project costs of these grant applications would amount to $5.5 billion. All of us know that this $2.5 billion in turned-down applications does not indicate the real needs of counties and municipalities for water-sewer assistance. During the last 2 or 3 years the HUD regional offices have had a deliberate policy of discouraging further applications because of the lack of funds. If local governments were able to submit applications for all their eligible projects, I think it would be safe to estimate that there would be a backlog of at least three or four times the amount shown in HUD records.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a State-by-State listing of the number of grant applications turned down by HUD. Included in this tabulation are the dollar amounts of grant applications and the dollar amounts of total project costs. I would like to pick out a few States to illustrate what has been happening in this program:

My own State, Alabama, is not as badly situated as some, but we have 51 grant applications for water and sewer assistance, amounting to $15 million, which have not been funded by HUD. California has 271 unfunded applications, for $158 million in grants toward projects costing $365 million. Louisiana applicants have 107 projects unfunded. These amount to more than $70 million.

New York communities are waiting for funding for 426 applications, amounting to $441 million—and so on.

Every State has its communities, desperately in need of water and sewer facilities, which have applied for assistance from HUD. There are more than 4,000 of these unfunded applications, totaling $2,496,750,000.

At a time when we are talking so much about the need for fighting pollution, we ought not to hold up this appropriation designed to help communities to offer their citizens pure water and a healthful waste-disposal system. I am asking that the full list of unfunded applications, by States, be printed at the close of my remarks.

The availability of community facilities, especially water and sewer lines, is directly related to the construction of critically needed new housing. How can we begin to meet our national housing goals—determined by the Congress in the 1968 Housing Act—if we do not provide the necessary public facilities for the development of housing in our newly urbanizing areas? This is particularly important in the current housing market. This is the time to get basic public facilities in place so that when money conditions ease, we will have a start made in at least one area.

I commend the Members of the House for having the foresight and the courage to vote the full $500 million on the House floor. They demonstrated their keen sensitivity to the need and demand for this program. I strongly urge the Members of this body to show the same sensitivity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of pending grant applications be printed in the RECORD.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR WATER AND SEWER ASSISTANCE NOT FUNDED BY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

State	Number of grant applications	Grant applications amount (in millions)	Total project cost (in millions)
Alabama	51	$15.68	$33.66
Alaska	15	7.27	17.15
Arizona	31	11.85	26.30
Arkansas	52	20.97	45.57
California	271	158.17	365.25
Colorado	73	19.71	48.62
Connecticut	95	59.82	155.36
Delaware	8	3.30	6.99
Florida	135	69.12	164.03
Georgia	43	19.64	46.39
Hawaii	19	5.78	14.12
Idaho	3	.69	1.39
Illinois	191	89.58	201.96
Indiana	77	48.57	131.00
Iowa	67	20.58	44.89
Kansas	60	13.60	28.89
Kentucky	28	55.89	136.54
Louisiana	107	70.17	158.16
Maine	48	8.31	18.58
Maryland	47	22.44	51.12
Massachusetts	225	93.33	227.23
Michigan	308	331.20	722.95
Minnesota	63	42.49	68.76
Mississippi	29	10.88	28.48
Missouri	104	34.06	80.56
Montana	14	2.47	4.89
Nebraska	45	16.80	48.64
Nevada	16	4.30	11.27
New Hampshire	27	11.84	27.00
New Jersey	163	92.55	209.20
New Mexico	13	2.61	6.83
New York	426	441.50	887.13
North Carolina	48	19.12	51.30
North Dakota	7	2.01	3.51
Ohio	255	204.45	420.62
Oklahoma	51	15.31	36.68
Oregon	47	26.18	65.68
Pennsylvania	317	158.68	343.72
Rhode Island	26	16.93	39.08
South Carolina	44	16.63	48.40
South Dakota	17	3.76	8.07
Tennessee	47	16.33	38.91
Texas	224	55.39	130.52
Utah	60	14.01	33.41
Vermont	33	7.41	16.89
Virginia	55	47.10	101.47
Washington	63	17.06	40.51
West Virginia	36	25.13	35.54
Wisconsin	85	37.79	84.74
Wyoming	5	.37	.79
Puerto Rico	25	5.78	13.81
Virgin Islands	1	.14	.29
National total	4,308	2,496.75	5,538.22

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his remarks. I am delighted to be able to cosponsor this measure with him.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, apropos what the Senator said. I was unaware of the thousands of applications that are pending for help in connection with water and sewer services. But there is no doubt in my mind from my experience there would be many thousands more than that applying if they thought the money were available. This is one of the primary services people need. If anyone wants to fight pollution, this is the place to start.

In many instances the pollution begins in these small cities, it flows down the river, and contaminates as it moves along. If the situation were taken care of in the small towns there could be clear water all the way down the river.

I hope the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. The Senator is absolutely right.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Senator requested the yeas and nays on the amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to be a cosponsor of the amendment. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the Senator from Arkansas as a cosponsor of the amendment.

As of April 30, the Department had a backlog of 254 projects that were eligible for funding, for which $135.1 million in grant funds were requested. By the end of fiscal year 1970, about $35 million should have been approved from the remaining funds available, leaving a balance of approximately $100 million in eligible projects that cannot be financed until fiscal year 1971 funds become available.

In addition, on April 30, the Regional Offices had on hand preliminary applications covering 529 projects totaling $292.7 million. HUD advises that from one-third to one-half of these are likely to result in full applications for eiligible projects.

Over the past 5 years, from fiscal year 1966 to the present, HUD has denied 2,259 community applications because of funding limitations. These had a total project cost of approximately $3 billion.

Although HUD officials could give no information on the number of communities that have resubmitted their applications, if my mail from New York is any indication, a great many communities have not resubmitted applications since they feel it is a hopeless effort to apply for funds that are in such short supply, as indicated by the Senator from Louisiana.

HUD has also referred to the Farmers Home Administration a total of 1,606 requests aggregating $340 million. Parenthetically, I should like to note at this point that these applications, however valid the reasons were for referral, add to an already extremely severe financing problem faced by the Farmers Home Administration under its rural water and sewer program for communities of 5,500 or less. For this program, the administration has budgeted for fiscal year 1971 only $20 million in development grants and $40 million in direct loans. I have proposed an amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill which would increase the appropriations for this program, and I will call the proposal up at the appropriate time during the consideration of that bill.

First of all it is apparent to me that the total of projects that could be financed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in fiscal year 1971 would actually require over $500 million in Federal funds as provided in my amendment.

In addition, I have learned from HUD that the average Federal grant made for a water and sewer facility project is approximately $450,000 which amounts to about 30 percent of a total project cost. Because individual grants are limited to $1.5 million, only smaller communities are able to realize any meaningful assistance from this program. I would submit to my colleagues that this sum would be far from adequate for large cities and much more appropriate for the development of a more modest system.

Mr. President, I felt a responsibility to introduce this amendment. I believe that the fortunes of rural, suburban and urban America are inextricably bound together. Because of our failure to realize this interrelationship in the past, the fortunes of all three have suffered.

The rural and small town communities have been drained of both human and natural resources. The vitality and dynamism that once made these localities the backbone of our society and economy has been sapped.

The urban areas, on the other hand, have been overwhelmed by the tragic migration of people from the rural areas. This migration has created demands to which the city systems and services have not been able to respond. As a result, industry has left for the suburbs and the people have been abandoned in the center city—jobless, poor, and ill-housed.

The suburbs—the ever-widening circles of affluence outside our depressed cities—have entirely different problems than the urban or rural areas. They also suffer from an isolation, both geographical and spiritual, from other communities.

The interrelationship between our communities and the subsequent interdependence has never been integrated into national policy. As a result, each group has become indifferent and even suspicious of the other. Where simultaneous growth should exist for the benefit of all, the resources of one are left to atrophy while those of another are nurtured and cultivated.

For example, today we are discussing the problems of urban renewal and the urgent need to restore our cities. We must recognize that this same need exists in smaller cities, towns, villages, and rural areas. A grant program for the development and construction of water and sewer facilities is an integral part of the restoration or development of our small communities.

Mr. President, I believe the increase to $500 million for the water and sewer grant program appropriation is most warranted.

Since the average HUD grant is approximately $500,000, the additional $300 million, if passed today, may give financial assistance for the construction and development of water and sewer grants to 600 additional communities.

As I mentioned before, these facilities are an essential component in the redevelopment of localities, particularly smaller towns and villages.

In addition, many of the communities that have been denied assistance in the past because of underfunding, will be encouraged to resubmit their applications for grant assistance.

Mr. President, increased funding would also indirectly provide greater assistance to poorer communities—those with a lower tax base.

Currently, the authorizing statute, section 702 of the Housing and Urban De-

velopment Act of 1965, as stated previously, permits up to 50 percent Federal matching for the total project cost. The actual Federal share, however, averages 30 percent. Understandably, this practice has been utilized to achieve a wider distribution of funds to a greater number of communities. As a result, however, the local share for water and sewer projects has amounted to 70 percent of the total project cost.

Many localities are simply unable to finance the 70 percent—the lion's share of the financial burden.

The disturbing conclusion is borne out in a May 26 letter to me from HUD which states:

> Legally eligible applications must undergo further review to select those which are most deserving and to ascertain the local financial capability to proceed. In this connection, we find that in today's capital market many communities are having great difficulty in financing the local share of project cost.

In effect, then, many communities become ineligible for Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I submit that if more Federal funds were appropriated, the Department would be in a better position to provide 50 percent of the costs of the projects. Matching at 50 percent would enable many communities that must stay within their statutory debt ceiling to borrow funds to provide their share of the cost of their projects.

Finally, increased Federal funding would allow many localities to move ahead rapidly with their environmental protection programs. They recognize the urgent need to clean up our rivers and lakes so that water is fit to drink. They look forward to the time when polluted waterways can once again become recreation areas.

President Nixon stated in his message on the quality of the American environment:

> At the turn of the century, our chief environmental concern was to conserve what we had—and out of this concern grew the often embattled but always determined conservation movement. Today, conservation is as important as ever—but no longer is it enough to conserve what we have; we must also restore what we have lost. We have to go beyond conservation to embrace restoration. The task of cleaning up our environment calls for a total mobilization by all of us. It involves governments at every level; it requires the help of every citizen.

The Nation's communities want to respond to this call for action. However, they need the wherewithal—the financial assistance—to mobilize for this campaign. At present, the HUD basic water and sewer facilities program is the only program available for restoring clean water to their communities.

As long as the program goes underfunded, these communities will suffer from lack of adequate water and sewer facilities. In addition, because of the interrelationship that exists with others, the people living in communities located downstream or on the same body of water or within a reasonable distance will also have to pay the price for polluted waterways.

As long as insufficient funds are appropriated for this program, real progress toward cleaning up our environment is in jeopardy.

Mr. President, we cannot provide the essential water and sewer facilities for our communities without adequate funding. These facilities are not amenities—they are essential to the health and well-being of our people and critical to the preservation of our environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which would provide a total of $500 million for this important program in fiscal year 1971.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the official budget estimate on this item was $150 million; $150 million was voted out by the House Appropriations Committee, and there was an amendment on the floor to raise the figure from $150 million to $500 million. A teller vote was taken, and it was 73 to 63. About 130 votes were cast.

It came over to our side, and, excepting for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, nobody else appeared to testify before our committee.

There was considerable discussion in our committee as to what we should do with that item.

In view of the fact that no presentation had been made, except by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who suggested that we delete the $350 million, the committee increased the sum of $50 million over the budget making it $200 million. The committee felt that in this way the matter would be in conference and open for further discussion.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As a matter of fact, did we not raise the appropriation last year from $135 million to $200 million, which is a very generous raise?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. There is no question at all that the Senator is right. Water is very essential in the communities. Sanitation is very essential. Even in my own State of Rhode Island, where we have a congested population and metropolitan problems, we do have our rural areas, and I know they have difficulties there living with septic tanks. The soil can only absorb so much, and we may have a pestilence or typhoid fever in the future, and then it will be too late to do something about it.

I am not arguing against the amendment. I am going to let the Senate decide what it should do. I certainly am not going to go to conference with a space program of $3.319 billion and say we cannot have sanitation. I tell you very frankly, Mr. President, after what we voted for for space, to argue against this amendment is like arguing against the Ten Commandments, and I am all for the Ten Commandments. If any Senator wants to talk against it, I will give him all the time he needs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suppose I have been as interested in this particular problem as anyone on the Senate floor has. One of the first speeches I made in the Senate was about pollution in the Potomac, and I found very few interested listeners at that time. That was 15 years ago.

I do not think there is any question that the money the Senator proposes can be used. I do not think there is any question that we could put 10 times the amount of money we are putting into our cities—and we are putting in about $35 billion a year at the present time—and that it could be used. And I do not think there is any limitation on the amount of money that can be used as long as the Federal Government is putting up the major share of the moneys that the cities expend.

This is not an easy thing for me to say, but the Federal Government really is no different from a family. At some time every faimly—at least it was true in my family—has to decide whether it is going to buy Johnny a new pair of shoes or Joe a new pair of pants or Susie a new dress or Joanie a new hat or coat.

We have been talking loosely about what we should do on the floor of the Senate. It is the President's responsibility to come up to Congress with a budget. It is our responsibility to first authorize and then later to appropriate. In this particular bill we are already several hundred million dollars over the budget, and somewhere, some time, somebody has to stand up and point out that we have some responsibilities with respect to our fiscal situation, because with the projected situation as it now looks, we face a $7 billion deficit this year.

I have listened to the economists of President Kennedy and President Johnson, and I have listened to the economists of President Nixon. I heard Gardner Ackley, in the presence of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, say that the economic impact of deficit spending was in the relationship of $3 or $4 to $1, so that, if we go $7 billion in debt, the inflationary impact on the country is 3 to 4 times that amount, or from $21 billion to $28 billion—the equivalent of printing that amount. The present economic adviser makes the more conservative estimate of 2 to 1.

So we have to decide here among things that we all want. I have many cities which want this money also. I think all of us—or at least I do—have to ask ourselves whether or not, in the whole concept of the needs of this country, building this item up by $300 million above the figure recommended by the committee is being financially responsible, in consideration of the inflationary pressures that are being exerted on the economy.

In my opinion, this is the worst and toughest problem that faces the people of the United States—the problem of whipping inflation. But if we continue with all other bills as we have started, if we fail to pass the revenue measures that we need—and so far there has been very little action on anything on that score—then we are certainly going to be in a deficit position, and a very serious deficit position, which in turn will nullify almost every effort we can make to stop inflation.

I do not quarrel with the junior Senator from New York about the need for this expenditure, nor about its advisability. I point out that my position is to stand with the committee position, and the committee position was already

$50 million over the budget. That was the situation with the $200 million provided in the bill. My chairman apparently, from what he has just said, feels differently. Of course, that is his prerogative, as it is the prerogative of any Senator.

But we have to consider what we are doing to the economy. I point out that I myself, in the past—and I point specifically to the last year—made a motion in committee which raised the amount for this particular item above the budget.

It is meritorious, it is praiseworthy, and it is needed. But we need money, hundreds of millions of dollars, for transportation in our cities. We need hundreds of millions of dollars for new airport facilities all around the country. We need hundreds of millions of dollars to rebuild our cities. We need hundreds of billions of dollars, perhaps, ultimately, to take care of all the needs of our people. We need hundreds of millions of dollars in education. We need hundreds of millions of dollars in research. In fact, any way we look, we need and could use hundreds of millions of dollars.

So, somewhere along the line, we have to chisel out these hundreds of millions—and sometimes billions—of dollars, the need for which faces us on every hand.

Because I thought the committee was taking a responsible position, even though I have gone over the budget before, and I was willing to go over the budget this time, I personally, regardless of how other Senators may feel, out of a sense of responsibility to our whole financial and fiscal picture, intend to vote against the amendment.

I have only one other thing to say, and that is that there is an additional value to the figure placed here by the committee. That value is this: We are going to have many serious items in controversy between the House of Representatives and the Senate. If this figure is put in at $500 million, it would detract and take away from the Senate one of the strong bargaining positions which we now have.

I think that is the whole story, Mr. President, as far as I am concerned. We cannot, on each bill that comes before us say, "This is the only important thing." If we can spend money for this, why can we not do it for space? If we can spend money on that, why can we not do it on sewers? If we can spend money on this, why can we not do it on education? If we can spend money on this, why can we not even build the transportation systems necessary to our cities?

This argument can be used ad infinitum. If we can spend money on transportation for our big cities, why can we not put so much more in cancer research, or schools? We hear this argument day after day, year after year. Simply because I believe that, in this whole concept, it is the responsible position to hold to the figure recommended by the committee, I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I respect very much what the Senator from Colorado has said. I would simply point out that this country, right now, is in danger of becoming one big national cesspool. I think we can find the money within the restraints of an anti-inflationary policy to build the sewage facilities that have to be built in order to clean up our water.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the unfunded applications for grants for water and sewer facilities in my State of Arkansas as of May 31, 1970, which shows 16 unfunded projects, with a total amount requested of $4,804,000. I merely wish the RECORD to show the situation in my State.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES PENDING AS OF MAY 31, 1970—STATE OF ARKANSAS

City	County	Project No.	Applicant	Project	Grant amount (thousands)
White Hall	Jefferson	WS-0013	City of White Hall	Sewer	$164
North Little Rock	Pulaski	WS-0054	Impr. District No. 104	Water	29
Center Hill	Greene	WS-0067	City of Center Hill	Water and sewer	196
Gosnell	Mississippi	WS-0072	Town of Gosnell	Sewer	180
Conway	Faulkner	WS-0074	Municipal Impr. District No. 5	Water	60
Clarkville	Johnson	WS-0075	City of Clarkville	do	248
Nashville	Howard	WS-0077	City of Nashville	Water and sewer	709
Benton	Saline	WS-0081	City of Benton		57
Malvern	Hot Springs	WS-0082	City of Malvern	Water and sewer	432
Crossett	Ashley	WS-0080	City of Crossett	Water	417
West Fork	Washington	WS-0083	City of West Fork	Sewer	87
Little Rock	Pulaski	WS-0084	City of Little Rock	do	433
North Little Rock	Pulaski	WS-0085	Impr. District No. 96	do	82
Nashville	Howard	WS-0086	City of Nashville	Water and sewer	569
Maumella	New Pulaski	WS-0087	Maumella New Town Water and Sewer Impr. District	do	1,015
Jacksonville	Pulaski	WS-0088	Jacksonville Pulaski	Sewer	26
Total		16			4,804

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield me just one moment?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree completely with the position just stated by the Senator from Colorado. I think the amount we have added to last year's appropriation of $135 million and the budget estimate of $150 million, to make the total of $200 million recommended, is a very generous and very substantial increase.

I call attention to the fact that by no means does this figure measure the total amount of the developments that are involved. I have inquired, and have not been able to obtain the exact facts. I understand from one of the able Senators that his understanding is that the grants cannot exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the development. I do not recall. I am not on the legislative committee which handles this particular matter.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have just ascertained, having been told by a staff member, that the figure the Senator has used of a maximum of 50 percent is correct; but, because of the number of applications, the funding averages out to about 37 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would mean that if the same average applied, the $200 million grants recommended by the committee would be swelled to nearly three times that amount—somewhere between $550 million and $600 million of expenditures—for this excellent purpose in 1971.

I want the RECORD to show that this by no means represents the full amount of the developments which would be involved. It seems to me that we would not only be greatly surpassing what would be a reasonable increase—and the committee has recommended an increase from $135 million to $200 million, which is $50 million more than the House committee recommended—but it would also be such a tremendous increase that I think we would be asking for trouble from the Executive. Of course, I have no authority whatever to speak for the Executive and do not know what his attitude would be; but I certainly feel that such a jump, from $135 million to $500 million,

as here proposed, for the grant part of these financial arrangements for basic water and sewer facilities is much too great an increase, and I think it would bring the charge of irresponsibility.

I shall, of course, vote against the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the word "irresponsibility" has been batted around. It all depends on what foot your shoe is on. After all, we just got through voting $3,319,303,000 for the space program; and the same people who are now saying that this amount for sewers is inflationary, for some reason had every argument to justify our going to the moon. I say that if we never go to the moon again, I think we can live with it; but if we do not have the proper sewers and we have pestilence, then God help us.

GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the House increased the appropriation for basic water and sewer facility grants from the budget request of $150 million to $500 million.

It is my understanding that persons opposing that increase claim there is no backlog of applications under this program.

That is technically correct because HUD invites a formal application only when it appears that money is available for the project.

Perhaps the best way to make that point would be to quote from testimony offered a House appropriations subcommittee by Samuel C. Jackson, Assistant Secretary to Metropolitan Planning and Development.

In answer to a question about the difference between preliminary and full applications, Mr. Jackson said:

> We have a procedure here, Mr. Chairman, where we have a preliminary application where we take the community through a period of a careful assessment of plans and also we make sure we do not conflict with other water programs, water-sewer programs of one of the other agencies with programs similar to ours. We invite them to file a formal application when it appears that we have the money to actually proceed with that project during that fiscal year.

Testimony indicates that HUD has 1,000 preliminary applications for basic water and sewer grants, but because of the limit of $150 million, HUD will only accept 300 formal applications.

Mr. President, the demand for the full authorization under this program exists. I urge that the Senate concur with the House action.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I favor the grant program for water and sewer facilities. It is an important and desirable program.

The Bureau of the Budget recommends the appropriation of $150 million. The Senate committee would increase that to $200 million. I support the $50 million increase, but with a budget so badly out of balance, I cannot support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York to add an additional $300 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. GRIFFIN (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Connnecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is paired with the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS). If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 17, as follows:

[No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Aiken	Hart	Pastore
Baker	Hartke	Pearson
Bayh	Hatfield	Pell
Bible	Hollings	Prouty
Boggs	Hughes	Proxmire
Brooke	Inouye	Randolph
Burdick	Jackson	Saxbe
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy	Schweiker
Cannon	Long	Scott
Case	Mansfield	Smith, Ill.
Cooper	McClellan	Sparkman
Cotton	McGovern	Spong
Cranston	McIntyre	Stennis
Eagleton	Metcalf	Symington
Eastland	Mondale	Talmadge
Ellender	Montoya	Tydings
Fulbright	Muskie	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	Nelson	
Harris	Packwood	

NAYS—17

Allen	Dominick	Jordan, Idaho
Allott	Fannin	Miller
Bellmon	Goldwater	Thurmond
Bennett	Gurney	Tower
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Williams, Del.
Dole	Hruska	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Young of North Dakota, against.
Griffin, against.

NOT VOTING—26

Anderson	Hansen	Murphy
Church	Javits	Percy
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Curtis	Magnuson	Russell
Dodd	Mathias	Smith, Maine
Ervin	McCarthy	Stevens
Fong	McGee	Yarborough
Gore	Moss	Young, Ohio
Gravel	Mundt	

So Mr. GOODELL's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. GOODELL and Mr. PASTORE moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VA HOSPITAL

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the ranking minority member of the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and his able staff have closely followed and participated in the investigation of the Veterans' Administration hospitals by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, Senator JAVITS would have voiced his strong support for the Appropriations Committee amendment to add $100 million to the VA medical and hospital program appropriation had he not been unavoidably absent during consideration of the independent offices appropriations bill, H.R. 17548.

AMENDMENT NO. 762

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 762 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 762

On page 36, line 20, delete the figure "$1,300,000,000" and insert in place thereof the figure "$2,287,500,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this amendment, offered by Senator JAVITS and me, is cosponsored by Senators BAYH, BROOKE, CANNON, CASE, CRANSTON, EAGLETON, GOODELL, GORE, GRAVEL, HARRIS, HUGHES, KENNEDY, MUSKIE, SCHWEIKER, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

In addition, 31 Senators joined Senator JAVITS and me in signing a May 26 letter urging the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee to fund the urban renewal program at its full authorization.

I ask unanimous consent, at the conclusion of my remarks, to have a copy of the letter printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in seeking that full authorization, we honor a commitment made last November when we failed by three votes to add $587,500,000 to the budget request for urban renewal for fiscal year 1970.

What we tried to do then, and what we are trying to do today involves a commitment Congress and the executive branch made to our Nation's cities when the urban renewal program was established in 1949.

That commitment was a promise to help our cities rehabilitate areas of blight.

That we have not lived up to that commitment is evident today by the facts that demand exceeds authorizations approved for urban renewal, that the administration does not even ask for full authorizations, and that Congress fails to appropriate the full amount possible.

Let me break down the authorization-appropriation situation for urban renewal.

Last year's appropriation of $1 billion was $587 million short of the full authorization. That authorization is still available.

On July 1, a new authorization of $1.7 billion became available.

That means Congress can appropriate about $2.3 billion, which is what we seek to do.

If our amendment is accepted, the Senate will add $1.3 billion to the administration's budget request and to the House approved figure, and $1 billion to the total of $1.3 billion recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The Senate, in addition to last year's vote and the letter signed by 33 Senators this year, has shown strong support for increasing the urban renewal appropriation above the committee's recommendation of $1.3 billion.

On June 22, less than 1 month ago, the Senate, in approving an amendment offered by Senator PASTORE, the able chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the HUD budget requests, voted 70 to 12 to add about $600 million to the supplemental appropriations bill. Adding that figure to the committee recommendation of $1.3 billion, it can be said that there is clear Senate support for a minimum funding level of about $1.9 billion.

Unhappily, in acting on the conference report, the House struck the $600 million from the supplemental. However, before anyone raises the argument that the House action on that bill indicates the futility of approving an appropriation of $2.3 billion, I would like to quote the position taken in that debate by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Representative MAHON said:

> The 1971 bill is the appropriate and orderly place and time to decide the funding level for urban renewal. . . . The other body will provide whatever sum it decides to provide. Then we will go to conference with the Senate to determine what the final figure will be for the fiscal year. . . .

Mr. MAHON based that position on the fact that the supplemental was being considered just 8 days before the end of the fiscal year, and it was hard to claim any urgency in adding the urban renewal funds to that measure.

My point in quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not to support or dispute the position taken by Mr. MAHON, but rather to point out that there is no reason to believe that the position taken by the House on the supplemental will be repeated in a conference on this appropriations bill. More to the point, it seems to me, the position taken by Mr. MAHON argues strongly that the Senate should appropriate the full authorization so as to be in as strong a position as possible in the conference.

But the case for the full authorization for urban renewal rests on far stronger ground than merely seeking to strengthen the Senate's bargaining position.

In correspondence from George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and in testimony by a department witness before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, it was reported that the value of unfunded urban renewal applications on hand at the start of the fiscal year would total $3 billion.

On March 2, in response to a letter from Senator PASTORE, Senator JAVITS and me, Secretary Romney wrote:

> The demand for renewal funds is continuing high. The backlog of applications on hand totalled $2.7 billion on January 1, 1970. We expect this to rise to about $3 billion by the end of the fiscal year after utilizing all funds available.

Lawrence Cox, Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Management, testifying before a House appropriations subcommittee on March 16, said:

> To indicate the need and support for the program, after the $1 billion appropriated for fiscal year 1970 is spent, the Department will have a backlog of urban renewal applications totalling approximately $3 billion.

While some later estimates, I understand, have set the figure at slightly under the $3 billion, the demand on hand still exceeds the full authorization of $2.3 billion, and the short fall will grow as new applications are received during the year.

And in that regard, it is important to remember that HUD cannot approve projects whose costs total more than the amount of money which has been appropriated for urban renewal.

Last year, Secretary Romney testified that new applications are received at the rate of about $200 million a month.

This year, Assistant Secretary Cox, while not projecting a dollar figure, told the House subcommittee that HUD expected that probably "as many as 400" projects would reach the funding stage in fiscal year 1971.

In its budget justification, the Department divided its appropriation request of $1 billion this way:

The $400 million for existing urban renewal programs;

The $300 million for neighborhood development programs;

The $125 million for other existing programs funded by urban renewal appropriations;

And only $175 million for new programs.

According to Mr. Cox, HUD anticipates funding only about 53 new urban renewal projects this year.

Even more serious, the $400 million to be allocated to existing programs for amendatories is $300 million short of the need.

That means, under the budget request, for example, 11 Michigan cities with unfunded neighborhood development programs pending, and another 17 Michigan cities with conventional urban renewal programs pending will have little chance of receiving Federal funds during the coming fiscal year.

That also means that even if we appropriate the full authorization, we will be short of the demand on hand, and only a limited number of new projects will be funded.

Mr. President, the importance of the urban renewal program to rehabilitating our cities perhaps can best be stated in the words of administration officials.

Referring again to his appearance before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, Secretary Cox said:

> The restoration of our decayed and deteriorating urban areas is important for the simple reason that our cities are the core and lifeblood of the surrounding areas. They sustain a wide range of economic, social, educational and cultural activities that might not otherwise be available to the vast majority of people who live in our cities, towns and metropolitan areas.
>
> The urban renewal program is one of our most important instruments for combating environmental problems of all kinds—decayed, rat-infested buildings, overcrowded living conditons and dirty streets, visual ugliness and traffic congestion, inadequate water and unseparated sewer facilities, and even air pollution.

Last year, Secretary Romney made such statements as:

> To meet the 10-year housing goals, urban renewal must provide sites for a substantial portion of the new dwelling units required for low and moderate income persons in locations where they are most needed.
>
> Extensive urban renewal assistance is a prime component in the designated neighborhoods of the 150 model cities. These neighborhoods represent large blighted areas where public facilities and improvements have been inadequate and where a high pro-

portion of the dilapidated and substandard structures are inhabited by low income people. The model city activities cannot succeed without timely assistance from the Urban Renewal Program.

I would like to go back to my comments on Breakthrough and just make one additional point. Breakthrough is only going to succeed if we have adequate funding of the housing programs that are contained in the various housing statutes. This includes 235, home ownership, 236, the rent subsidy, and the rent supplement program, as well as urban renewal. One of the toughest parts in this Breakthrough program is going to be to secure the land for the housing, and urban renewal is one means of securing suitable land for such volume housing projection.

Mr. President, I think that the Secretary made the case for full funding last year, and these remarks are as true today as they were then.

There are those who will contend that any increase in urban renewal expenditures will fuel inflation. I reject that contention on two grounds.

First, according to officials of the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors, who support this amendment, as well as officials at HUD, it is my understanding that because of lead time required for planning, little, if any of the money appropriated for urban renewal, regardless of the amount, is spent in the year it is appropriated.

The budget outlay of slightly more than $1 billion was actually appropriated in previous years. However, to repeat, the level of appropriations available controls the number of new projects which can be approved.

Equally important, urban renewal expenditures are not inflationary for, unlike dollars going for ABM, they put goods into the marketplace and increase the tax base for communities.

For example, in the city of Detroit, urban renewal has financed construction or rehabilitation of more than 8,000 moderate and low-rent housing units and added $150 million to the city's tax base.

And the same holds true for small towns which participate in the program. For example, I am told that when a renewal project is completed in the town of Santa Fe Springs, Calif., population, 16,000, the assessed valuation will jump from $146,360 to $1.7 million, with a corresponding increase in tax revenues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report on the accomplishments of the urban renewal program and a list of specific examples of the effect of urban renewal on local tax revenues and assessed valuations prepared by the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PROGRAM

Housing—Over a quarter of a million new or rehabilitated housing units have already been started or completed (53% low and moderate income housing). When all redevelopment in programs approved through June 30, 1969, is completed, it will have generated nearly 1.3 million housing units (66% low and moderate income).

Jobs—Currently over 5,000 commercial, industrial, and institutional structures have been completed or are under construction. This activity has generated about half a million permanent jobs. When present planned redevelopment is completed, over 2.2 million jobs will have been generated.

Investment—Approximately $5.30 of local private and public investment has been generated for each federal urban renewal dollar.

Tax Base—The assessed tax valuation of land and improvements has increased an average of 240% in completed renewal projects, thus expanding the local tax base.

Selected Examples of the Effect of Urban Renewal on Local Tax Revenue:

1. National City, California (47,000)—Has a renewal project in survey and planning stage. Current assessed value of the area = $595,279; when project is completed there will be a 400% increase to $3,058,912. Real estate taxes will increase from $60,000 to $250,000 a year. In addition, project is expected to generate an additional $100,000 in sales taxes.

2. Santa Fe Springs, Calif. (16,000).

Prerenewal 1964:	
Assessed value	$416,360
Tax revenue	41,730
Postrenewal 1972:	
Assessed value	1,700,000
Tax revenue	170,000

3. Cumberland, Md. (31,000).

Tax revenue before renewal	45,000
Tax revenue after renewal	290,460

4. Tulsa, Okla. (325,000).

Assessed property value before renewal	6,836,000
Assessed property value after renewal	127,734,000

5. Franklin, Pa. (10,000). When project completed, taxes will be approximately $100,000, as opposed to $7,500 prior to renewal.

Examples of increases in assessed or market value of property as a result of renewal (completed projects, existing projects, and proposed projects):

[Rounded figures in millions]

1. San Francisco, California	19.3
2. Los Angeles, California	24.1
3. Hartford, Connecticut	52.8
4. Wilmington, Delaware	3.9
5. Torrington, Connecticut	5
6. Evansville, Indiana	5
7. Wichita, Kansas	11,399,800
8. Baltimore, Maryland	104,355,000
9. Lawrence, Massachusetts	1
10. Boston, Massachusetts	36
11. Flint, Michigan	8.5
12. Muskegon, Michigan	1
13. Atlantic City, New Jersey	3
14. Paterson, New Jersey	7.7
15. Binghamton, New York	20
16. Cincinnati, Ohio	108
17. Toledo, Ohio	14
18. Akron, Ohio	54
19. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	25
20. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	140
21. Lancaster, Pennsylvania	30
22. Providence, Rhode Island	23
23. Whitesboro, Texas	1.065
24. Milwaukee, Wisconsin	6.5
25. New Britain, Connecticut	10
26. Richmond, California	32
27. New Castle, Pennsylvania	100

Examples of Increased Annual Tax Revenue as a Result of Pending, Ongoing or Completed Projects:

	Per year
1. Sylacauga, Alabama	$15,748
2. San Leandro, California	100,000
3. Daytona Beach, Florida	17,000
4. Hilo, Hawaii	125,000
5. Gary, Indiana	30,000
6. Brockton, Massachusetts	40,000
7. Lansing, Michigan	100,000
8. Chisholm, Minnesota	$5,000
9. Columbia, Missouri	78,000
10. Albany, New York	140,000
11. Raleigh, North Carolina	37,500
12. Winston-Salem, North Carolina	1,247,710
13. Middletown, Ohio	14,200
14. Altoona, Pennsylvania	10,000
15. Pawtucket, Rhode Island	300,000
16. Sioux Falls, South Dakota	150,000
17. Morrison, Tennessee	79,000
18. Memphis, Tennessee	381,000
19. Newport News, Virginia	173,857
20. Richmond, Virginia	142,228
21. Hoquiam, Washington	8,000
22. Milwaukee, Wisconsin	724,045
23. Anderson, Indiana	40,000
24. Portland, Maine	33,000
25. Danville, Kentucky	20,000

Examples of percentage increase in assessed property values as a result of pending, ongoing, or completed projects:

	Percent
1. Huntsville, Alabama	500
2. Little Rock, Arkansas	251
3. Stockton, California	600
4. Atlanta, Georgia	200
5. Perth Amboy, New Jersey	400
6. Dayton, Ohio	100
7. Charleston, West Virginia	300

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I think even a brief review of that material indicates that urban renewal programs help cities help themselves.

And finally, Mr. President, there are those who will contend that the administration may not release any of the funds we may add to the budget request.

That possibility should not affect our course of action.

Congress has a responsibility to help determine national spending priorities.

Congress has a responsibility to live up to commitments it has made to the Nation's cities when it established the urban renewal program.

To refuse to add to the budget request is to foreclose any chance that the administration will change its priorities. To refuse to appropriate the full authorization is to break our commitment to our cities.

Mr. President, during last year's floor debate on adding $600 million in urban renewal funds, I said there were four strong reasons for appropriating the full authorization.

Those reasons are as valid today as they were then.

First, the demand for even more than the full authorization is clear.

Second, in establishing urban renewal programs the Congress made a commitment to help rebuild cities. City residents have better reason than most to question the value of such commitments. We should not go back on that commitment now. If we do, we can add urban renewal to the long list of promises that the Federal Government makes but never fulfills.

Third, the level of appropriations controls the number of new starts, whether or not the money is spent the same year.

And fourth, by appropriating the full authorization the Senate can greatly strengthen the hand of its conferees when they meet to settle differences between the House and Senate versions of the bills.

Mr. President, I hope very much that we would appropriate the sum which we

have authorized for urban renewal. I know that there are competing demands for various programs. However, as I came in by plane this morning, I happened to read in the current Newsweek magazine of July 13, 1970, a rather dramatic 2-page color advertisement promoting the sale of Caterpillar tractors.

That advertisement showed an urban renewal project in the city of New York captioned "He's Tearing Down New York's Crime Rate."

The advertisement made the point that 591 American cities have picked up the challenge to fight crime by attacking frustrated dreams and hopes in which crime breeds. In fighting crime through urban renewal, we fight the cancer in our midst, the cause of which crime is a symptom.

The advertisement makes the point that we must recognize that crime is a consequence of urban decay.

I urge the Senate to appropriate in full the amount we have authorized to make that fight.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1970.

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Appropriation Subcommittee, Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: We urge that the urban renewal program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development be funded at its full authorization of $2,287,500,000 for fiscal year 1971.

As you know, late last year 28 Senators joined you in a letter asking Secretary Romney to detail what the total demand for urban renewal funds would be through June 30, 1970. Mr. Romney responded that the demand would total $3 billion after utilizing all funds available.

The urban renewal appropriation for the current fiscal year was $1 billion, which was $587.5 million less than the full authorization. The unused authorization is still available.

On July 1, 1970, a new authorization of $1.7 billion will become available for urban renewal.

If the full authorization were to be appropriated ($2.3 billion), the program would still be $700 million short of the demand on hand at the start of the fiscal year, a short fall which would be increased as new applications are received during the year.

However, the budget request for fiscal year 1971 is once again only $1 billion.

In order to start meeting the tremendous demand for urban renewal funds, we request that the Subcommittee approve the addition of the sum of $1,287,500,000 to the 1971 budget request of $1 billion for urban renewal. The urban renewal program is very important to many communities, both large and small, throughout the country. Indeed, 1000 communities have or are participating in the program. It is most essential that important projects in these communities be funded to the extent possible within the authorization limits.

Sincerely,

Jacob K. Javits, Philip A. Hart, Birch Bayh, Edward W. Brooke, Clifford P. Case, Alan Cranston, Thomas Eagleton, Charles E. Goodell, Mike Gravel, Fred R. Harris, Vance Hartke,

Ernest F. Hollings, Edward M. Kennedy, Walter F. Mondale, Joseph M. Montoya, Edmund S. Muskie, George S. McGovern, Gaylord Nelson, Abraham Ribicoff, Joseph D. Tydings, Richard S. Schweiker, Stuart Symington, William B. Saxbe,

Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Stephen M. Young, Harold E. Hughes, Daniel K. Inouye, Quentin N. Burdick, Thomas J. Dodd, Albert Gore, Howard W. Cannon, J. W. Fulbright, Jennings Randolph.

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

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I agree with everything that the Senator from Michigan has said. I dare say that no one in the Senate has seen the merit of this program more than the senior Senator from Rhode Island. No one in the Senate has fought harder for it not only in the committee but also on the floor and especially in the conference.

It was agreed that we should offer an amendment on the floor, because I carried out an agreement with the Senator from New York. My colleagues will confirm what I say. When we went to conference, we hit a stone wall, so much so that they wanted us to agree that we would delete the amount because they said that was not the proper place to bring it. They said that just because the money was authorized did not necessarily mean that it had to be funded.

I insisted and insisted and insisted. I would not agree to a compromise. Nor would I agree to the deletion. I insisted that they take it back in disagreement, hoping that if they took it back in disagreement, it would come up for a vote on the floor of the House and that in the meantime the mayors would get to work and come down and talk with their Representatives.

We had telegrams sent out to these mayors. We used the telephone to talk with these mayors. The upshot of it all was that we suffered a tremendous disappointment. When the vote came up on the floor of the House, they sustained their conferees by a vote of 236 to 136. By a margin of 100 the House said no to $587.5 million. What is the Senator from Rhode Island driving at? I have talked with my colleagues, colleagues who are not so sympathetic to this program but who are very understanding of the problem. We inserted in our bill $300 million over the amount allowed by the House which was $1 billion. We made it $1.3 billion. But they gave me a promise that if I hit a stone wall in conference on the $587.5 million they would go along with me on the total authorization for fiscal 1971, which is $700 million.

I do not want the Senator from Michigan to retreat. I do not want him to compromise. I merely want him to understand that when we get through on the floor of the Senate that is only the beginning of the task. The job is in that conference and the job is in the House. I am imploring the Senator from Michigan. I know the problem and I know every nickel of it can be spent. But I have to be reasonable.

I do not know how we will make out in conference. I must say to the Senator from Michigan that if he insists on his increase of $987.5 million in addition to the $1.3 billion already voted, not only do I think there is a possibility we could lose it on the floor, but it might damage our chances for getting $700 million. So I am imploring my good friend from Michigan, for once in his life, to have an understanding of the problem we are up against and agree to modify his amendment to make it $1.7 billion. I think we can get a vote on the floor and get it to conference. In the meantime I hope that he picks up the telephone and calls up all of the mayors in Michigan who talked to their Representatives because I am going to do the same thing with my mayors in Rhode Island, and ask them to come to Washington to talk to Senators as they did to Representatives.

I think we will get the job done. The need is not completely understood in the House, for some reason which I cannot comprehend. The fact remains they threw it down completely; they rejected the $587.5 million by a majority of 100 votes. Do not make me take that back again and hit that stone wall again.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes, if all the time has not been exhausted.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator my time if he will agree.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Rhode Island does not contend that if I did agree it would be the first time I ever understood his position.

Mr. PASTORE. No, no, no.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if I may respond, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I will give the Senator 5 minutes from my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we do understand, first, the deep concern the Senator from Rhode Island over the years has taken in the problem of trying to rehabilitate urban centers. We do understand the problem he had in conference with the House in mid-June. I wish to explain some of my problems. Thirty-two other Senators have urged us in writing to do what this amendment seeks to do. For that reason alone I would feel under an obligation not to "retreat."

Second, the issue was presented in the House so late in the fiscal year that I can interpret the House vote, to which the Senator from Rhode Island made reference, as accepting the strong concern of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations when he said that with just 8 days remaining in the fiscal year, the 1971 bill is the appropriate and orderly place in time to decide the funding level for urban renewal.

He continues:

> The other body will provide whatever form it decides to provide.

Parenthetically, I hope we provide them with the full amount authorized.

The chairman said:

> Then, we will go to conference with the Senate to determine the final figure for the fiscal year.

The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations was basing his statement on the fact that the supplemental

bill was being considered 8 days before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. PASTORE. The language is there and the authorization is there.

Mr. HART. The point is that the 1971 bill was the appropriate place to do it.

Mr. PASTORE. He was not talking about the full amount.

Mr. HART. He was talking to his colleagues who voted as the Senator indicated.

Mr. PASTORE. But I called up the mayors and told them the right story and they could have contacted Representatives.

Mr. HART. The mayors had 2 days to get the message to the House. They were geared and they are now geared to insure the message gets to them because they anticipate, as the chairman of the House committee was urging, that this is the bill on which to make the fight, and we do make the fight and the plea.

I told the Senator from Florida I would yield to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding.

First, I want to say I have never seen a more combatant head of an effort in conference than the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island in the item of $587.5 million on the supplemental bill. I do not mean he was pugnacious to the extent of being offensive because he was not; but he was completely unyielding.

I want the RECORD to show that every member of the conference committee of the Senate stuck with him on that position. I am one Senator who told him at that time if it were reported in disagreement and if it were turned down by the House I would stand by him to get the $587.5 million on this bill—not the $700 million. I still feel that way.

I hope other Senators will realize what a courageous fight the Senator from Rhode Island put up and I hope Senators will realize what a terrific problem it is that you ask conferees to take on if you add too heavily to the amount to be placed in the bill. As a matter of fact, I thought that the Senator had done a splendid job when he got his committee to agree to add $300 million on to the $1 billion which came over from the House. I have nothing but admiration, respect, and affection for the Senator from Rhode Island, because I saw him under fire. I know he is telling the truth when he told the Senator from Michigan what the situation is.

Mr. HART. I do know without being told that no man in this body would fight more vigorously to obtain moneys for urban renewal than the Senator from Rhode Island. I am sure all of us know that.

I suggest he and his fellow conferees would have their hand strengthened enormously if we sent them there with the full figure and they could bargain down from that if they must.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of this amendment and it has my strong support. We have a backlog of $3 billion in applications for urban renewal funds. The amount in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would still not meet the demand.

Urban renewal is a creature of urban neglect. As we have fouled the quality of the air and water around us, as we have desecrated our countryside with a kaleidoscope of neon and billboards, so have we permitted the destruction of our cities. We have rendered them lifeless and decaying in the wake of unemployment, poverty and deterioration.

Now, with the new awareness of environmental quality, we know our resources, both human and natural, are by no means limitless. We realize that we cannot continue to pollute air and water and move on to cleaner air and water. We cannot continue to let our cities decay and deteriorate for there is no escape from this death.

With this emphasis on conservation and restoration of our environment, the urban renewal program has become our most effective weapon for eliminating urban blight and providing a better urban environment.

The urban renewal program provides financial assistance to local communities for the purpose of redeveloping slums and blighted or deteriorating areas. In turn, the local communities must obligate one-third the cost of the project and present a comprehensive plan for the redevelopment of the area. Since the program is highly flexible and dependent upon local initiative, cities are able to undertake a variety of methods to restore and revitalize themselves including the production of housing, commercial development and the construction of public facilities such as schools, libraries, parks, water and sewer lines. The locality may choose any improvement it feels will best help create a decent living environment.

The principal goal of this restoration is to direct the reshaping of urban communities so that they are fit, once again, for human habitation.

It is not difficult to understand that urban renewal funds are much in demand by the mayors of our cities. Since 1949, when the program was enacted, the Federal Government has approved over $8.2 billion in grants to over 1,000 communities participating in the program.

The need for funds continues to increase. Secretary George Romney of the Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that by the end of June 30, 1970, total demand for urban renewal funds, including projects in model cities, will be approximately $3 billion, after present fiscal year 1970 appropriations have been spent.

Of this $3 billion backlog, HUD records as of March 31, 1970, show actual applications pending from some 500 cities totaling $2.1 billion. In conventional urban renewal alone, there is a backlog of approximately 425 applications, but HUD estimates it can fund only 53 of these next year if the present funding level of $41 billion is continued.

In my own State of New York, there are 75 pending or proposed applications totaling approximately $356,497,000. Without additional funds many cities in New York and other States will be forced to curtail, postpone, or cancel needed community improvement projects.

I have received telegrams and letters from many leaders in New York including the mayors of several cities including Peekskill, Utica, Amsterdam, Syracuse, Ogdensburg, and Rochester regarding the urgent need for urban renewal funds. Understandably, they all support full funding of the program at the $2.3 billion level. The Governor of New York State, Nelson A. Rockefeller, wrote to the distinguished chairman (Mr. PASTORE) expressing this same opinion. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask that these messages of support be included at the end of my statement.

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

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, against this background of need what funds are available? Congress has authorized, but not appropriated, a total of $2.287 billion, which is made up of: $400 million authorized for fiscal year 1970 in addition to the $1 billion already appropriated; $187.5 million authorized for renewal in model cities areas; and $1.7 billion authorized for fiscal year 1971.

The appropriation of funds, however, has been inadequate. The administration has asked Congress for a $1 billion appropriation for fiscal year 1971. The House approved this request. The $1 billion is totally insufficient. It is $1.287 billion short of what Congress itself has said is needed, as reflected by amounts it has authorized; and $2 billion short of what is needed, as shown by the backlog in pending, unfunded applications.

In addition, since the $1 billion is the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1970, the administration and the House have made no allowance for increased costs due to inflation. In terms of 1970 dollars then, the fiscal year 1971 appropriation is worth less than the fiscal 1970 funds.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has responded by recommending $1.3 billion for urban renewal. This amount does reflect the realities of inflation with a $300 million increase over last year's appropriation. However, it provides little funding for the tremendous increase in new renewal applications, which I understand are received at a rate of $200 million a month at HUD.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which would increase the appropriation by $1 billion to $2.3 billion.

This request for an additional $1 billion is a result of a yearlong struggle in the Senate, which I have supported every step of the way, to increase the funds for urban renewal. In the fiscal 1970 appropriations bill $1 billion was recommended by the administration and Senate committee for urban renewal. An effort was made on the floor to increase the appropriation by $587 million to its authorization level. The amendment was defeated by three votes.

In view of the support for increased urban renewal funds, 29 Members of this body signed a letter to HUD Secretary George Romney, in which he was asked to detail what the total demand for urban renewal funds would be through June 30, 1970. Secretary Romney responded that the demand would total $3 billion after all available funds had been obligated.

Because of this funding backlog 33 Members of this body appealed to the distinguished chairman of the HUD Appropriations Subcommittee to recommend the remaining available authorization of almost $600 million and fiscal 1971 urban renewal authorization of $41.7 billion for a total of approximately $2.3 billion. Even at this much expanded funding level for fiscal 1971 we would be $700 million short of the demand already on hand. The committee's recommendation, as we know, is $1.3 billion.

A successful amendment was introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) to include the remaining fiscal year 1970 authorization, $587 million to the second supplemental appropriations bill. Although this amendment passed overwhelmingly in the Senate by a vote of 70 to 12, it was not accepted by the House.

The additional appropriation of $1 billion, as provided for in the amendment, should be accepted by the Senate.

I believe it makes economic sense to fully fund the program. If we do not, our expenses will be increased in the future. As long as the program goes underfunded, urban blight will continue to spread unchecked. As it does, the price tag for urban restoration will be greater for two reasons; first, the scope and level of funding will have to be substantially expanded to meet the need and, second, the costs of redevelopment, including labor, land, and materials, will have increased independently because of inflation.

In the past, the urban renewal program has created some disruptions among the affected communities. When the program was first created in 1949, adequate provision for the relocation of people displaced by the renewal activities were not made. As a result, the influx of homeless families compounded the problems of the already overcrowded ghettos. The problem has been largely remedied by legislation and administrative measures which provide more generous reallocation funds and priority for displaced families in publicly assisted housing.

Another problem has been that the housing stock within the urban renewal sites has decreased. Many municipalities, stuggling under a decreasing tax base, have favored construction of commercial and industrial sites which can be assessed at a higher tax rate than residential sites.

The result has been an acute shortage of housing for low- and moderate-income families. This problem was attacked last year with a requirement that whenever a dwelling unit occupied by a low- or moderate-income family is demolished in an urban renewal program, that unit must be replaced on a 1-to-1 basis somewhere within the community.

In addition, one of the major criticisms of the program has been the redtape and delay. During the uncertain planning phase community residents and businessmen have no incentive to maintain or improve their property. This neglect further degrades the neighborhood environment.

After the program begins and the city blocks are leveled, they produce no tax revenues for the municipality. The longer it takes to complete a project, and this often takes 10 years or more, the greater the financial drain on the communities.

Many of these problems are being corrected by Secretary Romney and the HUD staff. They are to be commended for their efforts. The major problem, however, remains—a shortage of funds.

I believe the additional appropriations will help eliminate this delay and redtape. Assistant Secretary Lawrence Cox, Director of Renewal and Housing Management, has stated that inadequate funding lies at the root of the problem. In a recent report, he stated:

> Again, there are many external factors that contribute to these delays. Perhaps most serious are the uncertainties of the Congressional authorization and appropriations process, and the sheer shortage of funds.
>
> A project that spends three years in planning may spend nearly half that time awaiting approval by HUD. But often a large portion of waiting time is due to lack of federal funds to carry out projects that have increased substantially in cost above the initial, preliminary estimates.

I agree with Secretary Cox—the funds have not been available to do the job. The Senate, however, has voiced strong sentiment in the past for higher funding. We do not want the urban renewal program to stifle under the uncertainties of our actions.

We have demonstrated our commitment to this program before by voting for increased appropriations. I urge my colleagues to once again express this commitment by supporting this amendment to provide a total fiscal year 1971 appropriations of $2.3 billion for urban renewal.

EXHIBIT 1

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The crisis in the nation's cities requires a federal financial commitment commensurate with the problem if state and local governments are to successfully halt the spread of urban decay and provide a suitable environment in which to live and work.

Adequate funding of the Urban Renewal Program is essential to meeting these objectives. Since 1961, the State of New York has committed more than $100 million to 60 communities to pay one-half of their costs under the urban renewal program. In recognition of the need to cut red tape and to speed up the building process I recommended to the State Legislature the creation of the Urban Development Corporation which was enacted in 1968. Many states have expressed an interest in this agency and I understand that several are planning to create similar organizations. In less than two years of operation the UDC has signed agreements with over twenty cities and communities in the State for the creation of approximately 29,000 units of housing, nine million square feet of commercial industrial space and a variety of civic facilities. Many of these agreements are for rebuilding urban renewal areas which lay barren for several years due to lack of sponsors from the private sector which the UDC has been successfully able to attract.

I support the Javits-Hart proposal and strongly urge the Subcommittee to approve and recommend to the full Committee that the urban renewal program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development be funded at its full authorization of $2,287,500,000 for fiscal year 1971. The State of New York has the need and the ability to utilize its share of these funds.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

June 22, 1970.

PEEKSKILL, N.Y.,
May 25, 1970.

Senator CHARLES GOODELL,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOODELL: As the mayor of Peekskill, New York, a city deeply involved in urban reconstruction having completed two years of a significant urban program I strongly urge your support of full appropriation of 2.3 billion dollars authorization previously approved by the Congress. Without such funding our urban program simply cannot be brought to successful conclusion.

With three billion dollars worth of renewal now awaiting HUD approval in Washington the one billion dollars appropriated by the administration for fiscal 1971 falls far short of needs.

The city of Peekskill will be grateful for any assistance you can give in this most serious matter.

MICH DIBART,
Mayor.

UTICA, N.Y.,
May 25, 1970.

Senator CHARLES GOODELL,
Urban Renewal Funding Rally, Senate Office Auditorium, Washington, D.C.:

Due to heavy calendar, regret inability to attend nationwide urban renewal funding rally. Due to rising costs Utica strongly feels the urgency for more realistic budgetary commitment for urban renewal. Respectfully request you use your utmost effort to obtain maximum funding in excess of amount presently contemplated in national budget for urban renewal.

Mayor DOMINICK ASSARO,
Chairman, Urban Renewal Agency.

AMSTERDAM, N.Y.,
May 22, 1970.

Senator CHARLES H. GOODELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Maximum funding in excess of the amount presently contemplated in the national budget for urban renewal is desperately needed. Without additional funding by Congress of urban renewal funds, Amsterdam's urban renewal projects will be in jeopardy. I urge you who represent us in Washington to do everything possible to secure full funding.

JOHN P. GOMULKA,
Mayor.

CITY OF SYRACUSE,
May 22, 1970.

Senator CHARLES GOODELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOODELL: I wish to express to you my personal and deep concern regarding the funding crisis on the federal level which not only threatens the effective continuation of the urban renewal program but also will result in serious consequences for the future of the nations' cities, most certainly including my own.

Syracuse, typically, is beset with a wide range of problems—from the provision of new low and moderate income housing, to creating new jobs for the unemployed and underemployed, to providing land for parks, schools and health centers, to the improvement of declining neighborhoods, to the need for increasing essential services. A strong program of urban renewal is vital to the solution of these problems—which otherwise can only become more serious and acute.

It is our present estimate that some $30

million of federal funds will be needed locally over the next 2–3 years, both to complete existing projects now in execution and to successfully and meaningfully carry out those programs anticipated to result from Model Cities planning. Looking ahead over the decade of the 70's to 1980, a total of some $70 million in federal grant funds may well be required. We believe these estimates are conservative and represent the minimum amount of federal support necessary to supplement state and local financial efforts to meet the basic and essential needs of this city's residents.

It is my belief that sufficient national resources can and must be made available to assure resolution of our urban problems, if necessary by redirecting our national priorities to reflect the urgency of the crisis facing our cities.

I have asked our Urban Renewal Director, John W. Hildebrandt, to represent me and contact you in Washington on Monday and Tuesday, May 25–26, to convey to you the necessity for Congress to meet the critical need for federal committment by appropriating the full amount of urban renewal funds authorized, $2.3 billion, and to ask for your support in this effort.

Sincerely,

LEE ALEXANDER,
Mayor.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
May 26, 1970.

Senator CHARLES GOODELL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Essential that city of Rochester and other urban centers receive not only current level of urban renewal funding but also increased assistance. This city has entered into execution phases of several programs that are revitalizing our community by providing new housing, new commercial construction, new tax base (and new and more federal tax revenues) and has others in survey and planning and in the HUD pipeline. Without adequate federal supports, these programs—and this city—will not survive. We are at the virtual limit of money we can raise through local real property taxes. We are beset by monumental socio-economic problems not of our own making. I urge the President, the Congress and HUD to understand our problems and to respond accordingly.

STEPHEN MAY, *Mayor.*

OGDENSBURG, N.Y.,
May 22, 1970.

Senator CHARLES E. GOODELL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urban renewal in the United States will be seriously hampered and damaged if maximum funding in excess of presently contemplated amounts in the national budget is not done at once. Our cities are in direct need of complete repair and cannot wait for any reason. People priority must be put ahead of money priority.

JOHN F. BURNS, *Mayor.*

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Right after we passed it, I talked with the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). It was a Member of Congress from the Senator's own State who moved that they go back to the figure. He explained on the floor what it was all about. He could have refuted anything Representative MAHON said. He was knocked down by a majority of 100 votes.

Let us be practical. Everybody talks about the merits. I do not question the merits, but I am talking about the practical situation. I am the one who has to be there.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I served for 10 years in the House and I know the Representatives who serve on the committees. I respect the fact that the Senator from Rhode Island had this problem. Some of those Members do not appreciate the potentials of the urban renewal programs as the Senator from Rhode Island understands it. But we do not deal with conferees by giving in ahead of time in the Senate. The Senator has to take the ammunition there. We are trying to strengthen the hand of the Senator from Rhode Island when he goes to conference. We recognize that he will have a difficult time. But we ought to vote the money necessary, and then go back to battle with the conferees.

Mr. PASTORE. What if the amendment fails on the floor? How strong is my hand then, or have we not thought about that?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes; I am sure the Senator from Michigan and I have thought about it. I think we might then go back with a substitute amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Then God knows what is going to happen to the substitute. That is the point I am making.

Mr. GOODELL. Perhaps we should go for the figure we have now, and then we will go for a compromise if we do not have the votes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor, I rise to support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan and I add my voice to those who have lauded the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, the urban renewal program created under the Housing Act of 1949 has done much to clean up slums and improve the general living conditions of millions of Americans. The program has helped many small communities as well as the larger urban areas. It is estimated that at least 40 percent of urban renewal funds have gone to cities of 100,000 population or less.

In creating the program in 1949, the Congress committed itself to helping cities rehabilitate blighted areas. Over a period of 20 years—1949–1969—urban renewal contributed substantially to the rehabilitation of our cities. For example, the program has demolished more than 460,000 substandard dwelling units; relocated approximately 270,000 families and 141,000 individuals from grant assisted areas; it has begun or completed 257,000 new or rehabilitated housing units. In addition, urban renewal has generated over 500,000 permanent jobs.

In Oklahoma City the property redeveloped downtown has doubled the real estate tax base. During the 6-year span projected for completion of redevelopment, urban renewal will have generated a $500 million impact on the local economy. This in turn has had and continues to have a twofold effect on the community: first, living conditions of the city's residents are being improved; and second, in a time of high unemployment and inflation, jobs have been produced.

The Oklahoma City urban renewal program is the largest program west of the Mississippi. The three projects involve 12,577.8 acres. In the medical center project alone, the urban renewal program is expected to generate jobs for approximately 10,000 persons by 1975.

Over the years, however, many problems have plagued urban renewal programs, often resulting in needless delays in the completion of programs according to projected timetables. A large portion of the waiting time results from a lack of Federal funds to carry out projects the costs of which have increased above initial preliminary estimates.

It is my understanding that the Department of Housing and Urban Development expects at least 400 projects to reach the funding stage in fiscal 1971. In its budget proposal HUD requested $1 billion for urban renewal with $400 million for existing programs; $300 million for the neighborhood development programs; $125 million for other existing programs funded by urban renewal appropriations; and $175 million for new programs. It is important to note that the $400 million proposed to be allocated to existing programs for amendatories is $300 million short of the need.

The problem and need, however, is more clearly demonstrated by the testimony of Mr. Lawrence Cox, Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Management, before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, in which he stated:

> After the $1 billion appropriated for fiscal year 1970 is spent, the Department will have a backlog of urban renewal applications totaling approximately $3 billion.

Therefore, Mr. President, even if the Congress were to appropriate the full authorization of $2,287,500,000—$1.7 billion available July 1 and approximately $600 million carried over from fiscal 1970—the urban renewal program would still be at least $700 million short of the funds needed to meet the demands at the beginning of fiscal 1971.

Spokesmen for the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors told the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that at least $2.3 billion was needed and that "never before have so many city officials and community spokesmen—of cities large and small, North and South, East and West—came together for such a commanding purpose as the adequate funding of urban renewal." It was further stated:

> Frankly, we can't go on much longer without your fullest help. It is possible under urban renewal to revitalize, restore, and rehabilitate an entire downtown area—to energize business, to expand a tax base dramatically, and to provide new urban space and buildings to satisfy both the eye and soul.

For these reasons, Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the pending amendment, I strongly urge its adoption. I will have to be absent from the Senate this afternoon and tomorrow in order to be in Oklahoma. I hope this vote will come soon enough for me to vote for it. Otherwise,

I will attempt to secure a pair, because I want the amendment to be adopted, and I certainly hope that, if it is adopted, it will be retained in conference.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we are now a week into the new fiscal year, and it is appropriate that we take note of the status of the budget. It is especially appropriate that we do this prior to taking any action that would increase the budget deficit.

Further, it is doubly important that we do this prior to voting yet another unanticipated alteration in the budget for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. President, the full and alarming facts about the status of the fiscal year 1971 budget can be found in a report produced by a congressional committee universally respected by all Senators. I am referring to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, and to the joint committee's staff report No. 6 which was published last week.

The three-page introduction to that report tells the story and the story is that Congress may be in the process of adding—by action and inaction—as much as $7 billion to the budget deficit for fiscal year 1971.

The joint committee's report tells the story in tables of figures. We all know the story in component parts.

The Congress has voted several expenditures beyond those anticipated by the President when he put together the budget for fiscal year 1971, but the Congress has not acted upon many of the proposals which the President has made in an attempt to raise revenues sufficient to hold the line on the deficit.

Let me give some examples.

First. The Congress has voted a pay raise for Federal employees. This expenditure, which resulted from unexpected difficulties with the postal service, was supposed to be partially matched by revenues raised from increases in postal rates. These increases are supposed to include an 8-cent first-class rate, and are supposed to raise $1.6 billion. Thus far we have not had a chance to vote on this matter, one way or another.

Second. In another effort to offset the cost of Federal pay raises, it has been proposed that the Government speed up the collection of estate and gift taxes. The bill that would effect this has not yet come to a vote, and this is a serious matter because the speedup would net an estimated $1.5 billion.

Third. Another projected $1.6 billion in revenues is at stake in the President's proposal to impose a tax on the lead in gasoline. It has been widely rumored that this proposal is encountering rough sledding in the Congress. However that may be, it is incumbent upon us to bring the matter to a vote, up or down.

Mr. President, just considering these three measures we have $4.7 billion in projected revenues that have not been acted on by the Congress. And these three measures do not tell the whole story.

For example, we should all bear in mind the minitempest occasioned in the Federal teapot when the President suggested the clear and present expendability of the Federal teatasters. This suggestion was made in connection with the President's comprehensive series of suggestions for abolishing or altering various programs. The changes the President suggested would save the Federal Government an estimated $700 million.

All of this takes on special importance when we realize the changes that have been made in appropriations bills and other laws having an impact on fiscal year 1971. These changes include increased expenditures of $500 million already enacted and $1.5 billion in changes that are in progress through the Congress.

Mr. President, these remarks are not meant either to assign blame or to voice a plaintive mea culpa. We all know how hard it is today to exercise efficient and careful control over the massive Federal budget. We all know that this becomes doubly difficult in times of economic uncertainty, and especially when a runaway inflation is being cooled. In circumstances such as these, it is very hard to make projections about revenues.

Still, it is clear that part of our problem stems from a human weakness that is aggravated by a political fact. The human weakness is that we all find it easier to spend money than to raise it. The political fact that aggravates this weakness is the fact that this is a year divisible by two, and that means that there are going to be elections in November.

The last thing our economy needs, and the last thing the American people want, is for the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1971 to be treated like political footballs. We must not allow any partisanship to control our actions on these matters.

There is some speculation in the press these days to the effect that the Congress and the White House may be heading for a series of collisions whereby the Congress passes appropriations bills that exceed the President's anti-inflation guidelines, and then the President vetoes the offending bills, and much political speechmaking is done by all sides.

I very much hope this will not come to pass. I hope that those who criticize the President's tactics in the war on inflation, and especially those who suggest the need for wage and price controls, will talk less about restraining others and more about exercising restraint right here—spending restraint.

Mr. President, I hope I may have the attention of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART). In what I am about to say, I do not doubt the sincerity of any Senator, but the Senator from Florida stated the case very well a few minutes ago, as did the chairman of the committee. The chairman of the committee and I do not look at this problem in the same way. That is a fact, and we do not mind admitting that fact. But he has not expressed too strongly at all the situation he found himself in when he was in conference on the supplemental bill, and he had the support of all the Senate conferees present at that meeting.

In view of that fact, and in view of the fact that it was pending, I told the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island in committee, when we were marking up the bill, that if he got $300 million or $400 million, whatever it was, out of that bill—and we thought he would get a compromise at that time—we would put in some money here, which would bring it up to the $700 million point.

I have a commitment that I would go, if we got to it on the floor here, to the $700 million point, and I will go to that point with him.

I ask the chairman if those facts are correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. The practicalities of the situation, in my opinion, are that if we go to conference with the amendment the Senator has offered, we will literally be laughed out of the conference and, in my opinion, we will have a worse bargaining position than we would have had if we had accepted the suggestion that the Senator from Rhode Island, chairman of the committee, has made. The way he fought for this item was not exaggerated by the Senator from Florida at all.

I do not have enthusiasm for the program. I think it high time that our committees looked into a reformation of the urban renewal program. It has done much good, but in some places a lot of things have gone wrong, also, and it is time for that active legislative oversight which we need so badly in many of our programs.

However, if the sponsor of the amendment is not willing to accede to the proposition made by the chairman of the committee, we will just have to vote, and I shall have to vote against the amendment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I think I will take the point the chairman of the committee made, that we look at the merits, and leave to others the problem of so-called practicalities. I would much rather vote for it on its merits.

Now I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as a cosponsor, I urge passage of the amendment to add $1 billion to the appropriations for urban development. The program is basically sound, and the need is overwhelming.

At the present time, there is a backlog of $3 billion in applications for urban renewal. And new applications during the coming year are expected at the rate of close to $200 million a month.

Yet the bill itself now calls for only $1.3 billion in appropriations.

The proposed amendment would bring Federal spending for urban renewal to a total of $2.3 billion for fiscal 1971—the authorized maximum, but still far short of demand.

Mr. President, in all of our major cities overcrowding, underdevelopment, lack of services, shortage of jobs, filth, pollution, poor schools, inadequate health facilities—these and other problems are becoming more serious every day.

Garbage fouls the air that people breathe;

Endless columns of automobiles rush at each other day after day, helplessly

ensnarled in traffic, while slumdwellers wait hours for a bus;

Teachers discard the challenge of learning and become human custodians;

And perhaps worst of all, men and women in countless brick and mortar hovels turn off the lights each night and pray they will not hear the sound of rats moving across the floorboards.

These are facts of life today in this Nation. They are not immutable. They can be changed. But it requires a President and a Congress willing to follow through on our commitment to the rebuilding and rebirth of our urban area.

Mr. President, in my own State of Massachusetts, the backlog of applications for urban renewal is close to $200 million. Yet far less than half of these applications can be funded at present. Passage of this amendment would mean perhaps $60 million more for Massachusetts alone.

Yesterday morning in Boston I met with 35 mayors, planning officials, and other representatives from cities and towns in Massachusetts to discuss urban development. They confirmed that the need for Federal funds is desperate.

The mayor of the city of Boston pointed out that in 1968 the city applied for $76.2 million in additional funds for ongoing projects. Already the delay in funding has added $20 million more to the need, as interest rates and construction costs continue to rise.

The mayor of our smallest city, Newburyport, said that his city's hopes for revitalizing the commercial area have been constantly dashed by the failure of the HUD regional office even to forward the application to Washington.

A representative from Lowell noted that 5 years ago that city's Hale-Howard urban renewal project was announced. The area has since deteriorated, with buildings abandoned and the land useless, while the city cools its heels waiting for Federal funds.

A spokesman for the Massachusetts' selectmen pointed out that towns and smaller communities have serious housing and other problems but get almost no help at all. Officials discourage them from even filing applications.

The mayor of Fitchburg conveyed the depressing psychological effect on citizens when the Federal Government fails to follow through on its promise of urban assistance. Citizens become involved in facing up to their development problems and planning for solutions. The Federal Government holds out the promise of assistance. The city and its residents develop detailed applications and start working through the Federal red tape.

But then, as the mayor pointed out:

> By the time the application is funded, it is often only 50 percent of what is needed.

People foresee the problem, but then are frustrated by late and inadequate funding, if the application is approved at all.

The conclusion of those at my meeting was unanimous: Adequate funding of urban development is vital to the quality of life in our cities for the 1970's and beyond.

I ask unanimous consent that the following material be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks: A list of participants in the July 6 meeting; a city-by-city breakdown of unmet pending or proposed applications from Massachusetts; several letters given to me at the meeting describing urban needs; and a statement which I issued in connection with the meeting.

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

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the record shows that, when Federal development funds have not been too little and too late, the benefits have been substantial.

First, urban development is anti-inflationary. It helps to meet the critical shortage of housing at a time when costs and interest rates are at an alltime high, and it generates over $5 in local private and public investment for every Federal dollar spent. Moreover, the $2.3 billion which I hope the Senate approves today would be spread out over the life of the projects involved, often as much as 10 or 15 years.

Second, urban development lessens the rise in taxes. I was impressed with the statement made by one mayor of a city in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who has been in office for several years, and who has taken advantage of the urban renewal programs. He showed to this group a comparison of what has happened to the taxpayers over the period of the last 10 years, and compared the tax base there with that of communities in surrounding areas that have not taken advantage of those Federal funds.

The significance is that he was able to show that, as a result of the increase in the base of the taxable property, with the increased jobs, with the increased businesses that came into the city, the tax rates have been dramatically reduced in comparison with those in effect in surrounding communities.

Nationally, the tax base of land developed with Federal assistance has increased by an average of 240 percent.

Third, urban development creates jobs. In Boston, it has meant 12,000 new permanent jobs in the last decade. Nationally, there will be over 2 million new jobs when present projects are completed.

Fourth, urban development supplies badly needed housing. In Boston, it has meant over 13,000 new or rehabilitated housing units worth $170 million. In 1968, Congress set a goal of 26 million additional housing units by 1978. On the basis of funding to date, we are proceeding at less than half the necessary pace to achieve that goal.

Fifth, urban development attracts business. A refurbished downtown commercial area, an industrial park, or simply the availability of attractive housing—all of these bring new business into an area and give a strong boost to the economy.

Sixth, urban development offers new public services—schools, libraries, health facilities, water and sewer facilities, new streets, and so on.

In short, Mr. President, federally supported urban development offers new hope and new opportunity to millions of citizens. It brings life and vitality to deteriorating neighborhoods and troubled cities. It opens the door for expansion and prosperity in the decades ahead.

Certainly the program is not perfect. It still does not concentrate enough on low- and middle-income housing. Despite recent regulations that any housing units destroyed must be replaced, we are behind on this. And there still are some problems concerning adequate community consultation and representation in urban renewal decisions. Congress must follow these matters closely, and make appropriate changes when required.

But by and large urban development has been a success.

Ultimately, Mr. President, the amendment we are considering today raises a broader question: Does the Federal Government intend to help our cities at a time of urban crisis, or are we willing to write them off?

One expert on cities described the problem this way:

> The policy of the public authorities of never taking an initiative, and always waiting to be urged to do their duty, is obviously fatal in a neighborhood where there is little initiative among the citizens. The idea underlying our self-government breaks down in such a ward. The streets are inexpressibly dirty, the number of schools inadequate, sanitary legislation unenforced, the street lighting bad, the paving miserable . . . The older and richer inhabitants seem anxious to move away as rapidly as they can afford it.

That paragraph was written nearly 80 years ago by Jane Addams to describe the slums of Chicago. Yet today it is a strikingly accurate description of ever larger sections of every major American city.

Small wonder that one of the mayors I spoke with Monday said:

> People are losing faith in the ability of the government to act.

Frustration at the lack of urban renewal funds is turning to a pessimism about whether the Federal Government really cares.

Mr. President, another mayor I spoke with perhaps summed up the situation best when he said:

> Our cities are deteriorating and our towns are deteriorating and we must reorder our national priorities in Washington.

I fully endorse that sentiment. And I am deeply concerned that in a whole range of areas vital to cities and urban areas alike, the administration is holding back rather than moving ahead.

Education is the key to advancement; school districts are more badly strapped for funds than ever before. Yet the President vetoes education spending.

Health facilities and services are still wholly inadequate. Yet the President vetoes the Hill-Burton health bill.

The backlog of urban development applications is over $3 billion. Yet the administration requests only $1 million.

Water and sewer facilities are the necessary first step to developing new neighborhoods. Yet the administration discourages applications, and asks for only one-third of the needed funding.

Drug abuse pervades our cities. Experts and laymen alike agree that we must make a comprehensive attack—stressing education, rehabilitation, and research, covering the medical, social, and psychological factors underlying the turn to drugs. Yet the administration pushed a very narrow bill which deals only with law enforcement.

Mr. President, today we have the opportunity to take a great formal stride in at least one of these areas: The revitalization of our cities. Today millions of Americans are living in dilapidated houses, infested with rats, with no heat in the winter and scorching heat in the summer, buried in the ghetto, struggling to eke out a minimum standard of living. Less than half the demand for Federal funds for low-income rental housing is being met.

Yet the headlines this morning proclaim that the administration plans to build 100,000 new houses over the next 5 years for the families of Vietnamese soldiers. The administration says we cannot spend on housing at home, because of our heavy military expenditures abroad; and then it turns around and spends money on housing in the very country we are destroying in an unwanted war.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I feel that the mayors from Massachusetts whom I talked with made a very powerful argument in terms of the urban renewal programs and other Federal assistance programs to the cities. In hearing from the mayors of the Commonwealth about their experiences, about the increasing job opportunities that have been made available because of urban renewal programs, about the new sites for housing programs which have been provided, about the beneficial impact on taxes, and about other accomplishments, I thought that they effectively rebutted arguments against these funds, including the argument which is made so often that this is an inflationary expenditure of funds.

They pointed out only too well that unfortunately by the time many of these communities get the funds in order to complete their programs, anywhere from 2 to 3 years or more have passed.

I thought they were able to meet very well what I think have been the long-time objections to these increases in a most important and convincing way. So, Mr. President, I hope that the pending amendment will be adopted. I feel, as has been stated here, that with the backlog which exists, and with the new applications totalling some $200 million a month that are coming into HUD at the present time, there is an extraordinary need for these programs by the cities and the smaller communities around the country. I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

EXHIBIT 1

MAYORS AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS IN JULY 6, 1970, WITH SENATOR KENNEDY ON URBAN RENEWAL

Rev. James J. Bretta, Funding Coordinator, Somerville.
S. Lester Ralph, Mayor, Somerville.
James F. Silk, CDA Administrator, Lowell.
William A. Kealy, CDA Director, Lowell.
Louis Sinclitico, Chairman NARA, North Adams.
Joseph R. Bianco, Mayor, North Adams.
Alan Marden, Ex. Dir. NARA, North Adams.
Henry Z. Horn, Asst. Exec. Director, New Bedford Redev. Authority.
Kevin H. White, Mayor, Boston.
E. William Richardson, Dep. Commissioner DCA, Boston.
Elliott Friedman, Boston Redevelopment Authority, Boston.
Thomas J. Conry, Jr., Mayor's Adm. Assist., Fitchburg.
Dixie Swanson, Mass. League of Cities and Towns.
William G. Flynn, Mayor, Fitchburg.
Larry Duffy, Assessors Chairman, Waltham.
Thomas F. Sullivan, Mayor, Melrose.
Arthur J. Clark, Mayor, Waltham.
Byron J. Matthews, Mayor, Newburyport.
John Blake, Jr., Administrator, Malden.
Walter J. Kelliher, Mayor, Malden.
Gerald Gallagher, Mass. Mayors Assoc., Malden.
Frederick C. Conley, Mass. League of Cities and Towns.
Earl Riley, Chairman PRA, Representing Mayor Mavroulas.
Kenneth Pickard, Mass. League of Cities and Towns.
Thomas A. Piggott, Mayor, Attleboro.
Robert P. McManus, Asst. to Mayor, Lynn.
Robert E. Donelan, Administrator, Lynn Redevelopment Authority.
Paul Levenson, Esq., Special Counsel, Everett.
Sean Dunphy, Mayor, Northampton.
Joseph Ferrecchiu, Marlboro Redevelopment Authority.
Peter Panagone, Marlboro Redev. Authority, Exec. Director.
Henry D. Hersey, Alderman, Needham.

URBAN RENEWAL NEEDS IN MASSACHUSETTS

The Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns has been a strong proponent of full funding of the $2.3 billion authorization for urban renewal for fiscal year 1971. In various publications, it has reported Congressional action in this regard, as received from the National League of Cities and other sources, and urged action among the State's mayors, managers and selectmen in obtaining Congressional recognition for the additional $1.3 billion necessary to reach that amount.

In the course of this effort, the League has found that apparently no agency of government in the Commonwealth has a tabulation that readily provides a state-wide summary of project needs, both existing and planned . . . which is valuable information for Congressional debate. It has had to resort to its own interpretation and analysis of certain computer printouts of urban renewal project data, which for the most part, provide only a sketchy summary of the actual dollar needs.

However, for what it is worth, the League can report that an apparent $206,734,000 is needed to complete existing projects in the Commonwealth. Boston alone needs $80,000,000, as is indicated in the attached document, which shows the amounts for all municipalities with urban renewal programs. Obviously, projects planned but not submitted to HUD are absent from this tabulation, as are existing projects without dollar amounts reported.

Regardless of whether actual needs are $206,734,000 or something greater, the fact remains that necessary projects stand incomplete and vulnerable to economic factors which will only raise their costs, such as tight money and construction prices that are currently increasing ten percent annually, some $20,000,000 per year in this instance.

Without a doubt, full funding is indeed necessary.

A LISTING OF URBAN RENEWAL FUNDING NEEDS IN MASSACHUSETTS BY MUNICIPALITIES AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROJECTS REPORTED BY HUD AS OF FEB 28, 1970

Community	Type of program	Dollar amount
Adams	Urban renewal	2,838,000
Beverly	do	4,559,000
Boston	No breakdown	[1] 80,000,000
Brockton	Urban renewal	6,425,000
	do	4,422,000
Brookline	do	6,409,000
	do	3,333,000
	do	163,000
Cambridge	Community renewal	186,000
Fall River	do	80,000
	Urban renewal	9,174,000
Fitchburg	Urban renewal	3,731,000
Framingham	do	1,621,000
Glouchester	do	1,986,000
Haverhill	Neighborhood development program.	1,930,000
Holyoke	Community renewal	91,000
	Urban renewal	3,411,000
Hull	do	2,499,000
	do	28,000
Lawrence	do	2,155,000
	do	3,776,000
	Code enforcement	967,000
Lowell	Urban renewal	4,724,000
	do	6,572,000
	Demolition	95,000
Lynn	Urban renewal	668,000
Malden	do	5,232,000
	do	9,270,000
	do	454,000
Marlboro	do	3,470,000
New Bedford	do	6,334,000
	do	10,846,000
Newton	do	1,684,000
	Code enforcement	444,000
Peabody	Urban renewal	4,576,000
Quincy	Code enforcement	250,000
Springfield	Urban renewal	8,941,000
Woburn	Neighborhood development program.	2,134,000
Worcester	Urban renewal	1,256,000
Massachusetts total		206,734,000

[1] HUD printout provides no dollar amounts for many Boston projects. Total figure for that city, according to redevelopment authority, is approximately $80,000,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Locality Status Report, Feb. 28, 1970.

MARLBOROUGH, MASS.,
July 3, 1970.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
J.F.K. Federal Building,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: The status of the project Mass R-136 in our City is as follows:

The local public agency is preparing Part 1 for submission for the offices of Housing and Urban Development some time in July 1970.

This project has been funded for 3.5 million dollars and our nearest estimate at this time of additional funding reserve that will be required is 2.8 million dollars, placing our needs at 6.2 million dollars for execution of this project.

In attendance at this meeting, I shall send as my representatives, the Executive Director, Peter Panagore, and the Relocation Director, Joseph Ferrecchia.

If there are any further questions, please feel free to ask Mr. Panagore at this meeting.

Very truly yours,

FREDERIC A. COLE,
Mayor.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS.,
July 3, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: In response to your request concerning the City of New Beford's fiscal needs and requirements concerning urban renewal activities within our City, I have been informed by the Execu-

tive Director of the New Bedford Redevelopment Authority that the below listed amounts will be necessary to fulfill this City's present programs:

South Terminal (Mass. R–96)	$2,700,000
North Terminal (Mass. R–109)	2,500,000
West End (Mass. R–143)	1,500,000
Model Cities Improvement	12,500,000
Total	19,200,000

In addition to the above listed $19,200,000 added to the $55,000,000 presently approved or reserved there are at least three other prime areas delienated in our Community Renewal Program (CRP) currently estimated at approximately $40,000,000 that will be necessary within the next few years.

We would consequently, endorse any and all efforts on your part to restore and add funds to the federal renewal budget at the best means available in solving the most serious physical environment problems that this City and other urban communities cannot undertake without federal assistance.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE ROGERS,
Mayor of the City of New Bedford.

NORTH ADAMS REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
North Adams, Mass., July 6, 1970.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
J. F. K. Federal Building,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: It is a pleasure to present the following account of the fiscal status of Massachusetts R–91, the Main Street Urban Renewal Project of the North Adams Redevelopment Authority.

The Authority is currently in the first quarter of the executive stages of Mass. R–91. This project has a total approved budgetary figure of $4,518,003.00, $2,965,332 of which has been expended to date.

It is the best estimate of the Authority staff, at this time, that it will require an additional $250,000.00 to complete Mass. R–91.

I would respectfully suggest, also, that the North Adams Redevelopment is expecting to make application for two additional urban renewal projects—both devoted to create and renovate housing units in and for the City of North Adams.

It is essential, both for the completion of Mass. R–91, and for initiation of sorely needed housing programs, that adequate federal funding be continued in the three-party governmental program—federal, state and local, which has proved so effective in curing the physical urban problems of our cities.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS R. SINCLITICO,
Chairman, N.A.R.A.
JOSEPH R. BIANCO,
Mayor.

FITCHBURG, MASS.,
July 6, 1970.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you for giving the City of Fitchburg an opportunity to personally bring our plea for assistance in securing an Urban Renewal Planning Grant to your attention.

For nearly two years, during the process of preparing our Urban Renewal Application, the citizens of the College Area Neighborhood have had to live in a state of uncertainty which has affected their personal and financial well-being. Since September of 1969 the city completed all the work that it could do to assist these people. During these past ten months the city fathers have been waiting for some sort of assistance from Washington. To this very day we have no real assurances that all of our efforts will bear fruit.

I have prepared for your examination a record of all recent developments pertaining to our Urban Renewal Application. With but just a quick reading you will be able to sense the frustration that comes with such a lengthy and involved process.

Senator, the citizens of Fitchburg are trying to improve their city, but quite frankly the lack of assurances of federal help, despite months and years of local effort, makes one wonder if it is all really worth it.

We respectfully ask for your personal efforts in behalf of our Urban Renewal Application.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM G. FLYNN,
Mayor, City of Fitchburg.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY URGING SENATE PASSAGE OF ADDITIONAL $1 BILLION FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

I am pleased to have the opportunity to meet this morning with mayors and planning officials from 30 cities and towns in Massachusetts to discuss urban development. And I strongly urge and hope that the United States Senate will pass the amendment which I have sponsored with 14 colleagues to add $1 billion to the urban renewal program. For full funding of the program is vital to any lasting solution to our urban crisis.

At present, there is a backlog of over $3 billion in requests to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. And new applications for urban renewal are expected at a rate of perhaps $200 million a month. Passage of this amendment would permit funding of $2.3 billion in fiscal year 1971—the authorized maximum, but still far short of demand.

In Massachusetts alone, about 40 communities have pending or proposed applications totaling close to $200 million. Yet at present, far less than half can be funded. The amendment I support would mean roughly $60 million more to Massachusetts.

Federally-supported urban development has a proven record of success. Especially here in the oldest part of our great nation, it has produced renewed progress and growth during a time of severe economic pressure on the cities. In communities across the Commonwealth, it has meant new hope and new opportunity for hundreds of thousands of citizens—attracting business, creating jobs, providing housing, holding down taxes, improving the quality of life.

Let us look at the record:

The record shows that urban development is a sound, anti-inflationary investment. It helps meet the shortage of housing which has driven costs and interest rates so high. And it generates an average of $5.30 of local private and public investment for each federal dollar spent.

The record shows that urban development holds taxes down. Nationally, urban renewal programs have increased the tax base of the land involved by an average of 240 percent. In Boston alone, they have raised the tax base by $36 million. In Malden, which has a vigorous development program, taxes in the last decade have risen at less than half the rate of the surrounding communities without active programs.

The record shows that urban development creates jobs. In the last few years, renewal programs have generated 12,000 new permanent jobs in Boston, 1,500 in Lawrence, and hundreds or thousands in each of the other participating communities. Nationally, there will be over 2 million new jobs when present projects are completed.

The record shows that urban development produces thousands of housing units for needy citizens, revitalizes business, improves public services, and brings a new life to deteriorating urban neighborhoods.

In the last 20 years, Massachusetts has received close to half a billion dollars for urban renewal. This has translated into critically needed housing for the elderly and for low-income and other families, commercial development, libraries, schools and health facilities, streets, sewer facilities, and other important facilities.

In Worcester, renewal has meant 800 new and rehabilitated housing units; 12 retail commercial facilities; a school, a library, a park; new water and sewer facilities worth $10.5 million; and other important developments.

In Boston, it has meant 13,000 housing units worth $170 million; 5 medical facilities; 5 libraries; 4 police and fire stations; 4 schools; 10 other public buildings; 13 retail commercial facilities; 20 manufacturing plants; 4 parks and playgrounds; and many other facilities.

In close to 40 communities in Massachusetts, it has meant a strong boost to the economy and improvement in the standard of living.

In 1949, this nation made a commitment to develop urban areas and help meet the housing shortage with passage of the first urban renewal act. In 1968, we reaffirmed that commitment in a broad new housing bill. We set a goal of 26 million additional housing units by 1978; yet so far we are proceeding at less than half the necessary pace. We pledged to follow through on programs to improve the urban environment; yet throughout Massachusetts and the nation projects are half-finished and idle because the Federal Government has held back on promised funds.

We cannot afford to give our cities second-class treatment any longer. With most of our population clustered in and around cities, continued development is necessary if we are to renew deteriorating neighborhoods, provide an adequate standard of living for urban dwellers, and end the one-way flight of residents out of cities and into suburbs.

Vigorous, active, prosperous cities were once the pride of America. Today, too often they are the working-day way-station for commuters; or worse, they have simply lost their industrial resources. In either event, they lack an adequate tax base or other resources to serve those who live in the core. As a result, crime is up; services are down; commercial business from surrounding communities has fallen off.

Cities are caught in a desperate vicious circle. We must pursue every effort to make them safe, attractive, profitable places in which to live and work.

Especially in this time of economic crisis, Congress has an obligation to reorder national priorities.

I support cuts in military spending—in the C5–A, in the ABM, in the Vietnam War, and in other padded pet projects. I support cuts in the several billion dollars a year the Federal Government pays farmers not to work. I support cuts in pork-barrel public works projects. I support cuts in a whole range of other wasteful, low-priority federal programs.

But I am not willing to renege on our commitment to cities and to urban dwellers here at home. I am not willing to leave neighborhoods torn up—with projects half finished because federal funds have been cut off. I am not willing to say that our cities are beyond hope, and therefore beyond help.

I support full funding of urban renewal as a major step towards solving the urban crisis. In the long run, we cannot afford a lesser effort.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. All I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts is that I will accept his strategy if I

must, but when I come back with a disappointment because he will not follow my strategy, I hope there will not be any gnashing of teeth.

URBAN RENEWAL—A MATTER OF STRICT ECONOMIC PRIORITY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate is presently considering an amendment to add $987,500,500 to the pending appropriations bill. The figure in the amendment does not represent an increase beyond authorization. It is not an increase in funding for a program whose tangible economic benefits are subject to any significant controversy. The administration and the Congress both agree on the unquestionable short- and long-term benefits of urban renewal. This amendment, which I support and cosponsor, would merely return appropriated funding to the authorized level—to the level which the Senate essentially approved in sending the supplemental appropriations bill to conference, with an urban renewal item of $587,500,000.

The issue seems quite clear to me, Mr. President. The Congress has already authorized funds at the level represented by the pending amendment. We did this, recognizing the ever more urgent need for housing starts, commercial construction starts, neighborhood development, model cities, pilot projects, and comprehensive program planning.

There is continued worried discussion about the state of the economy and what measures the Federal Government must take to control the price spiral, return interest rates to reasonable levels, restore high employment, and foster controlled-growth private investment in vital social and economic impact programs.

Mr. President, if anyone has eyes to see, it should be clear that urban renewal provides all these benefits. It also has the additional attraction of being an expenditure of Federal funds which provide noninflationary products and services.

Unemployment figures are at record highs, interest rates are at record highs, housing starts are at record lows, the cities continue to disintegrate, the move to the suburbs of both families and businesses continues to erode the urban tax base. But the one program designed to combat this catalog of economic ills directly and effectively at a time of general economic weakness, is being given short shrift. The national administration that will be held accountable for these ills and their worsening is ignoring this particular tool of controlled economic growth.

Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to the direct economic benefits of this program. These are figures based on data compiled by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. They are not, like so many projections with which we are regaled, wishful thinking on the part of program planners of exotic but economically barren mirages.

First. Over a quarter of a million new or rehabilitated housing units have already been started or completed—53 percent low- and moderate-income housing. When all redevelopment in programs approved through June 30, 1969, is completed, it will have generated nearly 1.3 million housing units—66 percent low and moderate income.

Second. Currently over 5,000 commercial, industrial, and institutional structures have been completed or are under construction. This activity has generated about half a million permanent jobs. When present planned redevelopment is completed, over 2.2 million jobs will have been generated.

Third. Approximately $5.30 of local private and public investment have been generated for each Federal urban renewal dollar.

Fourth. The assessed tax valuation of land and improvements has increased an average of 240 percent in completed renewal projects, thus expanding the local tax base.

Mr. President, these figures speak for themselves. I am truly amazed that this administration, which continually sees economic recovery just around the corner, has not requested at least the amount authorized. The economic impact of these programs is immediate. It goes to those very areas that are most in need of attention and there is a continuing multiplier and fiscal benefit for both Federal and local government.

The Congress has authorized $2,287,000,000. We should appropriate that same figure. The Congress, it seems to me, has a far more accurate feel for what this country should have as its priorities, and what its people more and more are beginning to demand from Washington.

Hopefully, the age of glorious boondoggles is drawing to a close. The increasing fiscal and program sophistication of Americans will no longer permit the expenditure of billions and billions of hard-earned tax dollars for the "nice-to-have." Priority is to be given to the "must-have."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors be inserted in the RECORD. The letter outlines the status of fund requests and what voting against this amendment would do to urban renewal projects in the State of every Senator here.

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

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
June 29, 1970.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to request your assistance in obtaining the full $2.3 billion authorized for urban renewal. We appreciated your vote in favor of adding $587.5 million for urban renewal to the FY 1970 Supplemental Appropriation bill. Unfortunately, the House deleted that item from the conference report.

The House has approved $1 billion for renewal for FY 1971, and the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended a FY 1971 figure of $1.3 billion. When the Independent Offices and HUD appropriation bill comes to the floor, Senators Philip Hart and Jacob Javits will offer an amendment to add an additional $987.5 million for urban renewal. We urge you to support that amendment.

Without this $2.3 billion, urban renewal faces a financial crisis which jeopardizes its orderly continuation. Since its inception in 1949, urban renewal has been the key element in the efforts of over 1,000 communities to bring about a renaissance in their deteriorating neighborhoods. Slum clearance, neighborhood rehabilitation, downtown revitalization, new housing, and industrial development have been the by-products of this program. In your state alone, there are currently 172 projects involving a grant reservation of $471,726,000. As you know, this program is not limited to large metropolitan areas, but is used by communities of all sizes; in fact, over half of all current projects nationwide are located in cities with a population under 25,000.

Without additional funds, many cities will be forced to curtail, postpone or cancel needed community improvement projects. Currently, there is a $3 billion backlog of applications, and funds for fiscal year 1970 have been exhausted. This $3 billion does not include applications from new cities, applications for new projects or amendments to existing projects which will be received during fiscal year 1971. In your state, for example, there are 77 pending or proposed applications totaling approximately $191,011,000. To begin to meet the national need. Congress must appropriate the nearly $2.3 billion presently authorized for urban renewal.

For your information, we are attaching a summary of pending or proposed projects in your state as of April 30, 1970, and an urban renewal fact sheet.

Sincerely,

PATRICK HEALY,
Executive Vice President,
National League of Cities.
JOHN J. GUNTHER,
Executive Director,
U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I fully support and have cosponsored, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), which would increase by almost $1 billion, the funds appropriated for the Nation's urban renewal programs for the next fiscal year.

Throughout our Nation, substandard housing is still a reality for millions of Americans. Today, our cities are in a state of general decay. Millions of Americans live and raise their families in the rat infested slums of our urban ghettos. The shortage of decent housing for all of our citizens is one of the major social problems facing the country today.

We cannot afford to ignore this problem or institute halfway measures. We must do all that is necessary to solve the problems now. The urban renewal programs currently on the books would, if fully funded, go a long way toward getting millions of Americans into decent housing. Unfortunately the $1 billion for urban renewal funds appropriated by the House falls short of the amount needed.

Although I applaud the Senate Appropriations Committee for increasing this amount by $300 million, I feel that the amount is still woefully inadequate.

The $987,500,000 increase proposed by Senator HART is certainly realistic in light of the demonstrated need.

Today we not only have the opportunity, but the resources to give new life to a program which will help provide every American with a decent home in which to reside and a decent city in which to live. Indeed, this is a stated national goal.

I call on every Senator to support the amendment. We in the U.S. Senate must

show the Nation that we are committed to solving a major social ill which has existed for too long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BENNETT (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty tc vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GURNEY (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is paired with the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS). If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) is paired with the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY). If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Bayh	Harris	Metcalf
Bible	Hart	Mondale
Brooke	Hartke	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Hatfield	Nelson
Cannon	Hughes	Pastore
Case	Inouye	Pell
Church	Jackson	Saxbe
Cranston	Kennedy	Schweiker
Eagleton	Mansfield	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
Goodell	McGovern	Williams, N.J.

NAYS—38

Aiken	Fannin	Prouty
Allen	Goldwater	Proxmire
Allott	Griffin	Randolph
Baker	Holland	Scott
Bellmon	Hollings	Smith, Ill.
Boggs	Hruska	Spong
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	McClellan	Talmadge
Cooper	McIntyre	Thurmond
Cotton	Miller	Tower
Dole	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Packwood	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Pearson	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—4

Bennett, against.
Ellender, against.
Gurney, against.
Long, against.

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Javits	Ribicoff
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Curtis	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Dodd	Mathias	Stevens
Ervin	McGee	Symington
Fong	Moss	Yarborough
Gore	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Gravel	Murphy	
Hansen	Percy	

So Mr. HART'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HART and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 21, after line 25, insert the following:

"Provided further, That not more than $3,019,303,000 of the appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be made available for all of the above programs during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not understand that the Senator from Michigan has another amendment on the same subject. I did not mean to get in between his last amendment and the next one, if he was going to offer it, because it is on the same subject.

Is that correct?

Mr. HART. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Therefore, I assume the vote would come very quickly. I do not wish to destroy the continuity, and I ask unanimous consent to temporarily withdraw my amendment and allow the Senator from Michigan to call up his next amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say that I shall take only a few minutes on my amendment. Therefore, it should not delay the Senate. But I withdraw it temporarily.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Meanwhile, may I express my appreciation to the Senator from Arkansas for his thoughtfulness. The discussion will be very limited on this amendment, and I anticipate a vote very quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 36, line 20, delete the figure "$1,300,000,000" and insert in place thereof the figure "$1,887,500".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the figure here represents the total of the figure recommended by the committee, $1.3 billion, and the figure of $587.5 million, which, by a vote of 70 to 12, the Senate adopted several weeks ago. I hope very much that we will send our conferees to the conference armed with this figure.

While I regret that we would not be able to persuade the majority that the full authorization is in order, at least the combination of the committee's action and the very recent action of the Senate itself would, to me, make very clear and good sense.

Mr. HART. I hope very much that this figure is agreed to, and I would hope very much that the Senator from Rhode Island will not be embarrased by the effort to meet this need. I hope that his support of the earlier amendment did not embarrass him, because it proves his recognition of the urgency of the problem, a point he has voiced to the country for many long years.

Mr. PASTORE. I tried very hard to be realistic and I implored the Senator that I had an agreement with those who did not have sympathy with the program

that if we went to the $1.7 billion we would not have any trouble but that I knew the Senator would meet with some defeat. I voted for his amendment because I believe there is merit in it. I do not believe in attacking this by dribs and drabs. The figure is $1.7 billion and if we agree to it, we can pass it.

Mr. HART. The figure is $1.7 billion if we do not try for more.

Mr. PASTORE. All right——

Mr. HART. I said that I would accept——

Mr. PASTORE. All right——

Mr. HART. The proposition of the Senator from Rhode Island that the merits called for the full authorization.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send a substitute to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The substitute will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, on page 36, line 20, strike the numeral and insert $1,700,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment will set the figure for urban renewal at the amount the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee referred to earlier. It was agreed, in committee, that if the amount for urban renewal did not exceed $1,700,000,000, some Members, who were not favorably disposed to increasing funds for this item, would support the position of the Senator from Rhode Island.

My substitute amendment accomplishes the objective sought by the Senator from Rhode Island and agreed to by certain Members of the Senate. I feel the position of the Senator from Rhode Island is a sound one, and therefore I urge the adoption of my substitute amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Did not this figure come about after I pleaded with members of the committee to realize the merits of the whole project and there were some who were rather reluctant?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. His argument was very persuasive.

Mr. PASTORE. Finally, what happened was they came along and they agreed. That is what I am trying to convey to the Senate today.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the substitute.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the figure we are about to vote on now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The $1,700,000,000.

All time on this substitute has now been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER).

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 30, as follows:

[No. 217 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Allen	Griffin	Pell
Allott	Holland	Prouty
Baker	Hollings	Randolph
Bellmon	Hruska	Scott
Bible	Inouye	Smith, Ill.
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Byrd, Va.	Long	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	McClellan	Stennis
Cannon	McGovern	Talmadge
Church	McIntyre	Thurmond
Cotton	Miller	Tower
Dole	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Packwood	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Pastore	
Fulbright	Pearson	

NAYS—30

Aiken	Fannin	Mansfield
Bayh	Goldwater	Metcalf
Bennett	Goodell	Mondale
Brooke	Gurney	Muskie
Burdick	Hart	Nelson
Case	Hartke	Proxmire
Cooper	Hatfield	Saxbe
Cranston	Hughes	Schweiker
Dominick	Jackson	Tydings
Eagleton	Kennedy	Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—27

Anderson	Harris	Murphy
Cook	Javits	Percy
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Dodd	Magnuson	Russell
Ervin	Mathias	Smith, Maine
Fong	McCarthy	Stevens
Gore	McGee	Symington
Gravel	Moss	Yarborough
Hansen	Mundt	Young, Ohio

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). The question now recurs on the Hart amendment as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, has all the time been yielded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a vote "aye" for the amendment as now amended means that it is a vote for the $1,700 million in the urban renewal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the effect of it.

Mr. ALLOTT. And a vote "nay" would revert to the committee recommendation which was $1.3 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay:" I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the Senator

from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is paired with the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS). If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 218 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Allott	Goodell	Muskie
Baker	Griffin	Nelson
Bayh	Hart	Pastore
Bible	Hartke	Pell
Boggs	Hatfield	Prouty
Brooke	Hughes	Randolph
Burdick	Inouye	Saxbe
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Schweiker
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Case	Kennedy	Sparkman
Church	Long	Spong
Cooper	Mansfield	Stennis
Cranston	McClellan	Talmadge
Eagleton	McGovern	Tydings
Eastland	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Mondale	
Fulbright	Montoya	

NAYS—22

Aiken	Fannin	Proxmire
Allen	Goldwater	Smith, Ill.
Bellmon	Gurney	Thurmond
Bennett	Holland	Tower
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Dole	Packwood	
Dominick	Pearson	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Hollings, against.

NOT VOTING—28

Anderson	Javits	Percy
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Curtis	Magnuson	Russell
Dodd	Mathias	Smith, Maine
Ervin	McCarthy	Stevens
Fong	McGee	Symington
Gore	McIntyre	Yarborough
Gravel	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hansen	Mundt	
Harris	Murphy	

So Mr. HART's amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators, as far as I know there are two amendments, one to be offered by the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT)—and I understand he will not take more than 5 or 10 minutes to explain it—and the other to be offered by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). I do not know of any other amendment. Then, I think we can go to third reading and pass the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I can assure the Senate I will not take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 21, after line 25, insert the following:

"Provided further, That not more than $3,019,303,000 of the appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be made available for all of the above programs during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the amendment is very simple. The principle has been debated. I shall not take very long.

Two things have happened since the vote on the Proxmire amendment which I think made it worthwhile for the Senate to have an opportunity to vote on this amendment. One is that the Senate has just now added $400 million to the bill. This amendment would subtract $300 million from the bill; not all of it but three-fourths of the amount which was just added by the last amendment.

The other matter is a dispatch reporting a conversation at the White House. I am sure all Members of the Senate are anxious to help the leadership, if possible. This is an AP dispatch which has just been handed to me a few minutes ago and it reads as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Republican legislative leaders accused the Democratic-controlled Congress today of being spendthrift in fiscal matters, but laggard in voting in the administration's bills to ease unemployment and cushion the transition from wartime to peace.

Sen. Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, Senate Republican leader, and Rep. Gerald Ford, of Michigan, House Republican leader, told reporters after a two-hour White House briefing that inflation was being dampened.

Ford quoted Chairman Paul W. McCracken of the President's Council of Economic Advisers as bringing encouraging news to President Nixon and the GOP lawmakers.

"He said we were in a period of transition from wartime to peacetime in the economy, doing it without a recession and hopefully achieving price stability," Ford reported.

But Scott said the President listed "five or six proposals in which Congress has been laggard"—improved unemployment compensation, emergency home financing legislation, job training, increased social security benefits for 30 million Americans, and the welfare overhaul providing a new family assistance program.

"Congress can legitimately be blamed for not acting quickly enough to help the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy," Ford said.

Mr. President, in view of the fact the President feels we are spendthrifts, I think we all should have an opportunity to help balance the current bill. This is a large item for NASA. This amendment is roughly a 10-percent decrease and will to some extent make up for the increase just voted on the bill.

I am sure we are all very anxious to get behind the President on these matters in the domestic matters as well as on Cambodia, Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I assign all time to the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), inasmuch as this is a Democrat-Republican matter.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, but I must say his logic escapes me. If what he said is true, the time to have voted on the suggestion that he is offering was the preceding rollcall vote and not now. He knows as well as all of us that the committee has gone into these items very carefully. What the Senate did in the rollcall before was to repudiate the committee and increase its figure by $400 million.

Now he is suggesting that we repudiate the committee again and cut $300 million beyond what the committee has recommended.

So I must say his argument is not matching his usual logical manner. I think it is specious and frivolous, and I regret that his statement was not made before the last rollcall vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this dispatch just came over the wires. Obviously the Republican legislative leaders are preparing to accuse the Congress of being a spendthrift Congress. That will be the issue, if I am any judge, in the congressional election. I do not wish to contribute to making this Congress a spendthrift Congress, and I think we ought to cut this appropriation back by $300 million.

Mr. MILLER. The time to make that was before the last vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This just came over the wire. It is an AP dispatch from the White House.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is not questioning the source of it. The time to have read that was a few minutes ago, when the Senator first received it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When?

Mr. MILLER. As I understand it, the Senator received the message before the last rollcall vote. That was the time to read it, rather than now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true, but the Senator from Michigan was already underway with his amendment, and I did not wish to contribute to the discontinuity of his argument. Obviously the Senate has made the decision to increase the appropriation by $400 million. If this Congress, especially the Democrats, do not wish to be accused of being a spendthrift, no-good Congress, as the

80th Congress was by a Democratic President, I would say they would wish to support this amendment.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is this an accurate report of what he said?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the time is under the control of the chairman.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania such time as he needs.

Mr. SCOTT. Three minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I must admit that I speak without information, which I would be glad to have had from the Senator in advance of his speech. Since I was not certain what the Senator would say, I would rather not surmise. I have been told, however, that he has taken some degree of umbrage at the fact that I said we had in the 1960's a spendthrift situation and that the Democratic Congress spent a great deal of money. If that is what he said, I repeat it, it is true, and the deficit during that period ran up to $57 billion. I do not know how long it will take to explain the $57 billion away, but I will be glad to give him the opportunity.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has yielded back his time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said I was prepared to yield back my time if the chairman was. I am not going to yield back my time if the Senator does not. If the Senator is willing to yield it back, I am willing to.

I am not going to go into the merits of the space program, which has been argued. We had a vote on it. Some Senators voted aganst a smaller cut perhaps on the thought that it was too small, and not enough. If they want to do something more significant, they can do it on this amendment, which is a cut of 10 percent in a program of $3⅓ billion.

I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I was reading a dispatch attributing to him a statement made by him after conferring with the President. I was not speculating about the Congress during the 1960's. I assume it is correct. If he wishes me to read it again, I shall be glad to do so. But the implication is that the Senator from Pennsylvania and Representative FORD accused a Democratically controlled Congress of being spendthrift in fiscal matters. That was all. I was not making an argument on the merits of the space bill. If the dispatch is incorrect, the Senator can correct it. This came off the AP wire. I took it off the ticker a few moments ago.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the count is 57 to 43. I think we can view it as a Democratically controlled Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not contest that. I would say it is fiscally irresponsible if it does not cut the NASA appropriation. Here is an opportunity for the Democratically controlled Congress to be fiscally responsible by cutting it. The amount appropriated as a result of my amendment would be just over $3.019 billion, which I think is ample under present conditions to support this agency.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I promised to yield to the Senator from Florida first. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. HOLLAND. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is really pleasant to see the workings of the mind of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who now tells us that because we have just stepped up the budget item for one project by $700 million——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. $400 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. $400 million from the committee report, $700 million from the budget, that we now should, therefore, use a broadax approach and knock down an appropriation—which we have had up three times on the merits, I think, and passed upon it rather finally—by 10 percent, or $300 million.

His mathematics are interesting. His tactics are simply marvelous. When I see them operate it makes me regret more and more that I did not get a chance to go over there on that Rhodes scholarship I almost got one time, because this is a marvelous way to see how one's mind can act. We just stepped up a budgeted item by $700 million, we just stepped up a reported item by $400 million, therefore, we should step down a committee item which is already more than $400 million—$415 million, to be exact—below the appropriation for last year and below the budget item for this year and below the authorization for this year, and step it down by $300 million in revenge for our own action just taken in this other very dissimilar matter.

I hope Senators will remember that we have passed upon the merits of the space program in three different votes already, and that we will allow the merits of that program to again govern us in knocking down this broadax approach that does not say where any reductions shall be made, which delegates the decision power of Congress to an agency to apply $300 million as it sees fit to the reduction of an already greatly reduced budget item.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself a few minutes.

I would seriously hope that we have all had our turn the Republicans having had their turn in making their accusation, the Senator from Florida having had his turn in refuting it, and I would hope we could come to a third reading of the bill and that the Senator would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will take my own time. I cannot let the sarcasm from the Senator from Florida pass. He is very generous in his sarcasm, as some other Members have been.

What is involved in this is in an effort by Congress to reorient our priorities. There is nothing in the Constitution which requires the Senate to accept priorities set by the budget.

Of course, I realize the Senator from Florida comes from a State which has billions of dollars invested in it. As I said earlier, if had in my State interests comparable to what the Senator from Florida has, I probably would fight for it and defend it. I am not at all sure I would insult my colleagues who are trying to exercise an independent voice in the matter because they do not have a Cape Kennedy in their States. If I had a Cape Kennedy in my State, as I have already admitted, very likely, in order to assure my reputation and the good will of my constituents, I would get up and plead for it longer than all the other Members together and defend this as a great program on its merits. I would say this is the salvation of this country and of the world and humanity.

All we were trying to do on the last vote on the urban renewal is to reorient the impact of spending in this country from going to the moon, as the Senator from Rhode Island said so well, to doing something here on this earth.

We voted for sewers. Certainly sewers, I would think, are more important than rocks from the moon. That is what this Congress is trying to do—change our priorities; and I think the Senate, in that vote, exercised very good judgment.

I recognize that the sewer companies are not as well organized or financed as the space companies. And, of course, the space companies take people on junkets to Cape Kennedy; they offer to pay their hotel bills and entertain them. There is no organization of sewer companies comparable to it.

Everyone has to judge the matter on its merits, but there has been a good deal of indication that sewage and its disposal is important—quite as important as getting another rock from the moon and putting it in the Smithsonian Institution.

Have Senators seen it? It invokes a great thrill—not as great a thrill as to smell the Potomac, however. You can go down there and smell it tonight, if you like.

The Senator from Florida thinks it is shocking and terrible for me to suggest that it is more important to put more money into our festering cities for sewer plants than into Cape Kennedy in Florida. I congratulate him on his influence in keeping money in this bill. Probably no one else could do it better than the Senator from Florida—with the aid, of course, of the Senators from Texas, California, Mississippi, Arizona, and one or two other places.

But what of people who do not have that kind of constituency pressure, under conditions in which the largest transportation company in the world has already gone bankrupt, and the President is talking about the switch to peacetime? What about the judgment of our capitalistic leaders in markets in New York? You may not have stocks yourself, but what is it doing to the whole business outlook of this country?

I do not understand, frankly, I say to the Senator from Florida, why he thinks it is not important to give some priority to business on this earth, here in the United States, rather than to continue to spend our substance on going to the moon. That is all this is about.

The argument about what is in this NASA program has already been made. But this is a serious amendment. I am serious about trying to change the priorities of this country, and trying to do something for the people in my State. I have towns in my State—I put the list in the RECORD—which want a sewer system. I think that is just as important for my people as sending another rocket to the moon. And I did not learn that at Oxford.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to make it very clear to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I meant, under no guise at all, to insult him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A little gentle sarcasm is all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very fond of the Senator. I am fond of noticing the way his mind works.

I wish to call to his attention that not only did our committee step up the sewer fund from the $135 million of last year to the $200 million which we recommended, but that, in the agriculture bill, which I happened to handle, and which has a similar program, there is an even larger step-up in exactly the same field; and there is a third program still, I think it is under the Department of Commerce, for this field. We are all for it, and we all support it.

But my whole point is that I see no connection at all between an action of the Senate in stepping up one program by $700 million over the budget and by $400 million over well-considered committee action, in an effort now to undo what has been done in three very serious votes, after arguments on the merits of the space program.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point I am trying to make is that the building of sewer and water systems and urban renewal is of so much greater importance and significance to this country than continuing to go to the moon that there is no comparison. The question is that there is not enough money to do everything. This dispatch from the White House indicates that. I am quite certain that in this fall's election this will be an issue. It is a legitimate issue, I may say to the Senators from Pennsylvania—I do not complain that it is not a legitimate issue—to accuse us of being improvident. I think we are grossly improvident to continue to spend the kind of money we are on these moon shots, on the SST, and on the ABM and that kind of thing. We simply cannot afford it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is the only point I make. It has nothing to do with the action of the committee. We are trying, of course, to reorient those priorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am willing to yield further time to the Senator from Florida if he wishes it. But, Mr. President, I would like to say just a few words at this point.

We have been over the basic area of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas three times, I believe, in the last 2 days, and have had three votes. The first vote, I believe, was on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) to cut the bill by a little over $100 million. That was defeated. Then there was another one defeated. Now here is one to cut it $300 million. It seems the strategy is that if you do not succeed on a small figure, you try a big one.

I say to the Senator from Arkansas that I have been designated the responsibility, at least, for the control of this time by the chairman of the committee; that I have supported the space program; and I have no space installations in my State whatever—none anywhere. I do it because I still feel that in the whole scientific thrust, there is no effort in this country that matches the thrust, even in the field of pollution, of the scientific work that has been done in the space program. There are thousands, literally thousands, of fallouts—here is just one book on them—that have inured to the benefit of the whole Nation, and will contribute to our benefit for years to come.

If it were just a matter of financing more trips to the moon, I would probably join with the Senator. I have yet to be shown that there is great efficacy in repeated trips to the moon. There is one vehicle on the launch pad. The chairman of the Space Committee, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) who is a member of the committee, know that the trips can be stopped. They can be stopped very easily if we want to stop them.

But let us not rip up the space program under the concept that it is just another trip up to the moon to bring home some rock. There is another trip planned. There is a vehicle on the pad which will go up sometime after the first of the year.

Let us put this on the basis of what it has done for the country. I do not think there is anyone here who did not take great pride when the first vehicle landed on the moon. I did, even though I have been somewhat skeptical of the scientific benefits from just landing on the moon itself.

But in the whole space program, whether you take it in the medical field, the physics field, the metallurgical field, or whatever place you take it, the space program has provided greater thrust forward for scientific achievements and our excellence over any other country in the world than any other program in this country.

Let us not now dump it by voting for this amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. President, there have been few thrills in our lifetime to match the moment on Sunday night, July 20th of last year, when Astronaut Neil Armstrong made man's first footprint on the moon. There also have been few if any moments in our history when we have experienced greater pride in our Nation.

Since that time, our space experts have launched another successful Apollo mission to the moon, and safely returned a third mission which had to be aborted because of spacecraft malfunctions.

While most of the world has observed these facts in open-mouthed wonderment, our space program has forged ahead under increasingly stringent budget restrictions at home.

This year is no exception. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget request for fiscal year 1971 marks the low point in a budget which has been declining steadily for the past 6 years. Despite this fact, and the impressive fact that the agency's 1971 budget request was some $364 million less than the 1970 appropriation, I am concerned to note that several Members of this body seek to reduce the appropriation still further.

Let me review the NASA budgets of recent years, beginning with 1965 when spending for space research reached its peak:

[In billions]

1965	$5.250
1966	5.175
1967	4.968
1968	4.589
1969	3.995
1970	3.697

Those figures represent a reduction of $1.553 billion in the space of 5 years, quite a significant reduction for a new and progressive program. It might also be noted this is a reduction of almost 30 percent during that period. If each of our Federal agencies could effect a similar reduction in a similar time period, it seems fair to predict we would solve a good many of our fiscal problems.

As for the 1971 fiscal year, NASA requested a budget of $3.333 billion. The House of Representatives approved $3.319 billion. It is from this latter amount that an effort is being made to withhold further funds.

I oppose such a reduction, Mr. President. I do so in full sympathy and understanding with the argument of those who would reduce the appropriation, and those who ask why we continue to spend money on space programs when there are still hungry people in the Nation.

This is a valid question and it deserves thoughtful consideration.

I would like to summarize my answer to it by saying there are four important reasons why our space program must not be neglected:

First. Prestige. It is a most important weapon for maintaining U.S. prestige in a world where our prestige is urgently needed.

Second. Progress. The spin-off of space

technology into everyday products and processes is much greater than is generally realized and much more important to progress in every phase of our existence.

Third. Protection. Manned space flight capability bears importantly on our national security.

Fourth. People. The program has paid valuable dividends in demonstrating the ultimate in inter-disciplinary cooperation and has furnished peaceful employment to technically-oriented people.

Let me discuss each of these points briefly, Mr. President.

PRESTIGE

First, there can be no doubt that our major factor in maintaining U.S. prestige throughout the world. The fact is not lost on the world that not only are we far ahead of Russia in our technological feats, but we started far behind them and overtook them in a few short years, and within the time frame which we had publicly promised to fulfill.

If the results of our space programs were measured only in terms of prestige, it is my belief that the expenditure would have been more than justified. Who can forget the overwhelming worldwide reaction to Apollo 11, as the leaders of hundreds of countries paid tribute to the dynamic success of capitalism over collectivism, and the unmatched technological and scientific skill of the United States.

There is certainly a relationship between our international economic situation and our prestige, and the space program has also been helpful in this area. In a period when one of our continuing problems is our international balance of payments, which customarily is weighted heavily against the United States, the space program furnishes refreshing relief. In 1966, for instance, we received $1.32 billion from other countries for royalties, licenses, rentals, and manufacturing services in connection with our aerospace research and experimentation. This was approximately 10 times the amount of money paid out to foreign countries for similar items, a ratio which contributes effectively to keeping our balance of payments from being more unfavorable than it is.

PROGRESS

My second point, Mr. President, is the dramatic effect which space research is having upon our national progress in medicine, industry, and virtually every other aspect of our existence. These benefits are spinoffs of the program which would not have been possible if the pioneering work had not been performed by aerospace scientists, and the demanding jobs of existing and operating in the hazardous conditions of space and other planets had not furnished a most demanding testing ground.

Comprehensive documents have been composed about the byproducts of space exploration. For my purposes, let me cite very briefly some of the more interesting developments which have resulted from pioneer research performed by our space technologists:

Miniaturization—applied to smaller appliances, improved color television, intricate medical and surgical equipment and other fields—is perhaps one of the principal benefits.

Lubricants is another area in which industry and transportation are benefiting from space-oriented research. Our repertoire of lubricants now can withstand such extremes of temperature as 330° below zero or 260° above on a Fahrenheit scale.

Space research has taught us how to utilize energy generated from within the body to provide power for hearing aids, and for the direction and control of artificial limbs.

New alloys have been developed which, because of superior strength and ductility, will replace outmoded alloys.

Paints which resist temperature extremes, abrasions, and acids are being manufactured for general use.

Many electronic and telemetry developments are improving fire alarm systems, automotive controls and road signs.

Improved fuel cells now promise to supply total home power without pollution, and at some future time perhaps, will provide total waste disposal as well.

The flammability characteristics of hundreds of materials have been tested and made available to industry.

The astronauts' life-support system, composed of a compact life-giving backpack, will ultimately enable man to go anywhere in the universe. It is said eventually that its cost will be $1,000, and with it man can exist anywhere in the universe.

A new instrument called an oscillometer will detect life in one who seems to be dead.

The astronaut helmet has been adapted for treatment of asthmatic children, and a gadget designed as a lunar walker is proving helpful to paraplegics and other crippled persons.

A delicate sensor developed for moon photography has been programed to detect Parkinson's disease long before its onset, and permit early treatment.

The list goes on and on, Mr. President, but it should be obvious that from this sample which I have mentioned that the products of space research will be paying their dividends to our society and economy for years to come.

PROTECTION

My third point is the national protection factor which the program offers. While our space program is directed at peaceful goals, resulting developments have a great number of applications to our national defense defense structure. We pray they will not need to be called into use, but they are reassuring to have in our arsenal at any rate.

The President's aeronautics and space report of January 1970 called special attention to the national security aspects of the space program. The report stated:

The space programs of the United States are providing benefits to the Nation in the form of enhanced national security. These benefits derive from the applicability of space technology to those military programs that are consistent with our commitments as a signatory to the Outer Space Treaty.

The capabilities of space systems have a direct effect on our national defense posture through such areas as communications, navigation, surveillance, and mapping, and weather forecasting. During the past year, two new Vela satellites were successfully placed in orbit to detect nuclear detonations occurring at any place outward from the surface of the earth. In addition, this program has provided radiation data from manned lunar flights.

The Titan III family of launch vehicles, among other systems, is providing boosters for these military needs as well as a growing number of civil uses. The Titan IIIC launch vehicle research and development programs was completed in the past year with two successful flights.

The scientific knowledge and technical expertise of the United States were clearly displayed to an international audience by the successful lunar landings and Mars flybys in 1969, as well as by the long series of preceding missions. Apollo 11 and Apollo 12, whose television pictures were transmitted live around the world by means of communications satellites, were compelling examples of great accomplishment and peaceful purpose. The furtherance of world peace and our image as a strong and peace-minded people were directly served by these historic accomplishments.

Space offers both a medium for the protection of our freedoms and those of our friends, as well as an increasing opportunity to demonstrate our peaceful intent.

I also want to recall a statement made by the senior Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) before this body on May 6. He said—and I quote—

There is no question about one thing; namely, that our competition, the Russians, are deeply involved in the space program and have been for many years. They devote a good deal more of their national budget to space proportionately than we do. They place much greater emphasis on it.

I think it is extremely interesting that in the last issue of Newsweek magazine, under the item called Periscope, there is this observation about the Soviet Union:

The Soviet Union is pushing hard to orbit the first manned earth-resources satellite within the next two years. The vehicle would carry infrared cameras, microwave radar and high-resolution film to collect data on crops, mineral deposits, ocean currents and fishing grounds. The Russians also have a long-range project for orbiting an "institute in space" that would dwarf the three-man U.S. skylab planned for 1973: their "institute" would be manned by 24 pilots, scientists and technicians at a time. They would shuttle back and forth on six-month tours of duty.

Mr. President, there is no question where the competition is going. I remind this body that when the original sputnik went up years ago, and Russia beat us first in space, it was the greatest propaganda defeat in the eyes of the world that this Nation ever suffered. It took us years to come back from the defeat which we suffered at that time. We regained our position, I think, in world opinion, only when we landed a man on the moon.

PEOPLE

My fourth and last point is that the space program has spawned a gigantic industry of hundreds of thousands of space specialists—not simply a commercial industry, but a vast interdisciplinary network of governmental, industrial, and educational elements working closely together in behalf of an engrossing and rewarding peacetime goal.

This immense and far-flung space team has not only learned a valuable lesson in cooperation, dedication, and single-mindedness of purpose. It has taught the world the same lesson. It is a lesson which would stand us in good stead today if it could be applied to our

international ventures and achievement of a successful and rapid conclusion of the war in Vietnam.

This progress and these lessons certainly have not been easily accomplished or cheaply purchased. But neither can they be looked upon as an investment which is now behind us, whose dividends are now in the realm of history.

They continue to pay off daily, in improving our life on earth, adding to our knowledge of the universe and our ultimate ability to utilize it, adding to our arsenal for protecting our country against its enemies, and teaching the world a valuable lesson in capitalism's unlimited potential when it directs its unlimited talents to a common goal.

We have many responsibilities, Mr. President. Not the least of these is endeavoring to help people to find a better life on this planet. But in our concentration on this enduring task and enviable goal, let us not forget that space research is contributing at an increasing rate to the meeting of human needs, that it is performing a vital function in preservation of our international prestige and security, and that it can ill afford to be neglected just because we have gone to the moon and some members of this body think there is nowhere to go next.

LET US NOT DESTROY OUR WORLD LEADERSHIP

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, although the Russians have not been to the moon, they have continued to pursue a vigorous and ambitious space program. So far this year they have launched 14 unmanned scientific and applications satellites, while we have launched only five. And now, after several years of American supremacy in manned spaceflight, the Soviet Union has scored another first of their own. The flight of Soyuz 9 broke the endurance mark for space travel of 13 days and 18 hours set in 1965 by Astronauts James Lovell and Frank Borman aboard Gemini 7. The two Soviet cosmonauts landed safely after almost 18 days in orbit. And once again, the eyes of the world turned toward Russia.

It has now been 12 years since the Soviets awakened an overconfident United States by orbiting the first artificial earth satellite, Sputnik I. Nine years ago, in April 1961, Yuri Gagarin became the first man to orbit the earth followed nearly a year later by John Glenn. Last summer, when all of us watched Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin take the first steps on the moon, we knew and the whole world knew that the United States had recaptured the technological and scientific lead in a race that could have been so easily lost if our country had not responded in the proper fashion.

In Apollo, the United States developed a resource which never before had existed in the world. This resource was nearly a half million trained men and women who learned how to build a space transportation system. Such a force, it is said, could build anything designers could imagine. The Apollo 11 venture proved that this was true and the world took note.

There is no doubt that the success of the Apollo 11 mission did more to bolster American prestige abroad than any single event since the termination of World War II. Communications satellites made it possible for hundreds of millions of people in nearly all parts of the world to watch—to feel personal involvement in the lunar landing. The State Department missions throughout the world were nearly unanimous in reporting a massive and emotional response during that memorable day last July. Except in the Communist areas of East Asia, press reaction was overwhelmingly favorable. The visits of the Apollo 11 astronauts to many nations and the displays of moon rocks in nearly 70 countries have all been warmly received and have helped greatly in extending and deepening the sense of personal involvement of the peoples of the world in our space program.

The success of Apollo 12 in December was accepted as ample demonstration that the Apollo program is far more than a one-time spectacular and that it is a serious and continuing effort to expand man's scope, knowledge, and capabilities.

Even in the light of what has been termed a "magnificent failure," the flight of Apollo 13 demonstrated that total success is not a prerequisite for world admiration. Never have so many people of all nations thought together so intensely, shared an experience together so much, and never did they pray so fervently for the safe return of our astronauts.

These flights of Apollo convinced practically all nations except the U.S.S.R. that the United States was the indisputable leader in science and technology. They profoundly impressed the world's intellectual community, moving many to believe that a new stage in man's development had been reached. Government leaders and businessmen took it to mean that the Americans had developed new systems for management that might usefully be applied to earthly problems. To most people, the Apollo flights meant less the culmination of a space race than a unique achievement of earth men that hopefully could serve the cause of peace by giving humanity a new perspective of planet earth and its problems.

For ambassadors and U.S. missions abroad the success of Apollo meant a new flexibility in approaching a host of problems whose approaches were otherwise frozen. The good will and new avenues provided by Apollo were expanded by the visits of the astronauts to foreign nations. By their modesty, expertise, and warmth, the astronauts projected an image of the kind of Americans other nations would like us to be, that we would like to be, and that the astronauts actually are. On a bread-and-butter level, U.S. Embassy officers, even off the astronauts travel track, suddenly found doors opening and contacts available that had been denied for years.

No one could possibly hope or expect that this euphoric burst of enthusiasm felt by most of the world toward our country could be maintained at a high level for long—nor has it been. We are left, however, with a very substantial residue of admiration and prestige. While the benefits are difficult to measure in quantitative terms, these gains should be of very real value with respect to our posture in the world and our relations abroad for many years to come.

Our country is now faced with a decision as to what it will do next in space, and as to the kind of program it should have during the coming decade. These decisions will be as important for the 1970's as were those early decisions at the start of the 1960's. They will be crucial with respect to America's position of leadership in space exploration.

We have established what may be characterized as an initial foothold in space. But man will go farther. Will America continue to lead, or will some other nation build on what we have started?

The Soviet challenge is not trivial. The U.S.S.R. has a long list of impressive space firsts including the first man in orbit. Where the United States has led, it has been by virtue of vigor and industry as well as competence. The Soviet program has been expanding steadily for many years, and it is comparable in size and scope to our own. Although there had been a hiatus in Soviet manned space flight activity until the flight of Soyuz 9, it is clear from Soviet statements and from their rendezvous and crew-exchange dual manned flights, that the U.S.S.R. is preparing for significant advances in this area. For the last few years the Soviets have consistently launched more earth-orbital missions than we have. They achieved the first circumlunar, soft landing, and orbital missions to the moon and, from their own statements, continue to have a strong interest in lunar exploration. From the very start of the space program, their planetary effort has been many times ours, and is recently achieving spectacular successes. Although we developed space applications much earlier than the U.S.S.R., in recent years the Soviets have made a number of practical applications of space. The Soviets clearly regard the space program as of value not only in itself, but also as a means of maintaining the image of Soviet strength in the eyes of the world. It must be assumed that the Soviets will continue to strive for leadership for a variety of reasons, and especially to minimize both the current U.S. benefits of world standing and the future plaudits of history for America.

There is clearly no need for this to happen—and it must not happen. The appropriations bill before us today is the first step in preventing this from happening. The NASA budget has been trimmed to the point of pure austerity but it is a workable budget clearly oriented toward the future and clearly directed toward insuring that the United States maintains its position as the world's leading spacefaring nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not want to go into all of the merits or demerits of space again. The Senator from Minnesota and others made the argument on the merits. But there is a great question in the minds of the leading physicists of this country as to all this beneficial fallout. They would dispute the

statement of the Senator from Colorado. I certainly do not accept his statement as to this fallout effect. We have spent more than $30 billion on this program, and I do not think we have anything like the comparable results from it as could have been received from spending that amount here at home.

I do not want to further dispute the merits. The case has been made, and I think it is proper now to have a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). If he were present and voting, he would vote 'nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) is paired with the Senator from California. Mr. MURPHY). If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) is paired with the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS). If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 219 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Baker	Hartke	Pearson
Bayh	Hollings	Pell
Brooke	Hughes	Prouty
Burdick	Inouye	Proxmire
Church	Kennedy	Randolph
Cooper	McGovern	Smith, Ill.
Cotton	Mondale	Talmadge
Eagleton	Muskie	Tydings
Fulbright	Nelson	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	Packwood	Williams, Del.
Hart	Pastore	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Ellender	Miller
Allen	Fannin	Montoya
Allott	Goldwater	Saxbe
Bellmon	Griffin	Schweiker
Bennett	Gurney	Scott
Bible	Hatfield	Sparkman
Boggs	Holland	Spong
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Stennis
Cannon	Jackson	Thurmond
Cranston	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dole	Long	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	McClellan	
Eastland	McIntyre	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—3

Metcalf, for.
Mansfield, for.
Byrd of West Virginia, for.

NOT VOTING—28

Anderson	Harris	Percy
Case	Javits	Ribicoff
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Curtis	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Dodd	Mathias	Stevens
Ervin	McCarthy	Symington
Fong	McGee	Yarborough
Gore	Moss	Young, Ohio
Gravel	Mundt	
Hansen	Murphy	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Johnny Smith is 19 years old, a recent graduate from a New Jersey high school, and has enlisted in the Marine Corps to fulfill his military commitment. Six months ago he found himself on patrol through a free-fire area in I Corps tactical zone, Vietnam. The shell from an AK-47 hit him in the back, sending him spiraling face downward into the muddy water of a stream, critically wounded.

Fifteen minutes later, Johnny was aboard a medivac helicopter speeding toward a large hospital outside of DaNang. After a 4-hour operation demanding the highest skill, knowledge, and perseverance, a team of military doctors and nurses miraculously saved his life despite the severity of his spinal wound—a feat impossible to achieve less than 20 years ago during our Nation's struggle in Korea.

However, the damage to Johnny's spinal cord required that he be flown immediately to the United States for intensive care within one of our 166 separate VA institutions. And there began a story of frustration and shame for which all of us must share the burden of responsibility.

He arrived in one of the 43 VA hospitals without air conditioning, with a 1.02 staff ratio to service each spinal cord injury bed—less than half that required for satisfactory attention—with inadequate, outdated equipment serviced by overworked and undermanned staffs. After having been literally saved on the battlefield by unprecedented medical and surgical field procedures, he was evacuated to a veterans hospital which, by any standard, was less than that rightfully demanded by the American people for their returning sons and husbands.

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. One out of 10 wounded Vietnam veterans, over 27,000 men, would have died in a previous war if it were not for new techniques in lifesaving, high-intensity field procedures. But the tragic fact is that, while we have suffered over 275,000 casualties in Vietnam, half of them requiring some degree of immediate hospitalization, medical care once they returned to the safety of their homeland and the love of their families has been sorely substandard.

I wish to stress that this has not been the fault of personnel serving in the VA hospitals, as their dedication and ability have garnered for them international recognition. Rather, the fault lies squarely with the Federal Government: the administrations have not called for enough funds to meet adequately the growing crisis; and the Congress must take the initiative forfeited by the executive branch in resolving those critical problems now existent.

Under the extraordinary leadership of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), and the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. TEAGUE, Congress will this year meet head-on the challenge of giving superior care to our country's veterans who have sacrificed so much for the United States.

The committee bill fully recognizes the perilous conditions which the VA medical care and hospital construction programs confront. Specifically, $80 million more for medical care and $20 million

more for hospital construction have been recommended by the committee in addition to the funds provided by the House. As Senator CRANSTON stated:

> This $100 million, when added to the $25 million which Chairman Teague secured in the House, will permit significant improvements in the quality of care in VA hospitals around the country.

To resolve satisfactorily the crisis of understaffing, equipment, maintenance, and repair backlogs, tremendous dental caseloads, inadequate numbers of nursing care beds, and lack of research, training, and construction moneys the Congress must expeditiously provide sufficient appropriations. I believe that the committee has taken a significant step toward that goal, and we in the Senate cannot, must not, recede from insisting that the full amounts be appropriated.

We deplore deeply the situation found in our VA facilities, and we accept the responsibility for correcting the problems. It is absolutely imperative that we not ask our young men to make sacrifices on foreign battlefields and then hold back on giving them first-class treatment when they are brought home in wheelchairs and stretchers.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). Without objection, the further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is as follows:

> On page 23, line 2, strike out "$511,000,000" and insert "$538,500,000".
>
> On page 23, line 3, after the colon insert the following: "*Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for first-year graduate traineeships, and"

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment is extremely simple. It is introduced by myslef and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) who is a member of the Subcommittee on the National Science Foundation. It would increase appropriations for the National Science Foundation by $27.5 million.

Over the course of the hearings of the NSF Subcommittee we heard from four former science advisors to Presidents; Dr. Killian, and Dr. Kistiakowsky, Dr. Wiesner, and Dr. Hornig—all of whom gave impressive testimony that the various mission-oriented agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health, the AEC, and the Department of Defense, and NASA, have reduced their support for basic research by at least $60.

What we are trying to do here is to increase the appropriation for the National Science Foundation for funding of research projects by $18 million. The National Science Foundation will continue to use its own criteria to decide which research programs will get the funding.

The other part of the amendment provides for $9.5 million for the graduate traineeship program. The administration budget effectively cut out all new starts in the traineeship program for next year.

There are some 5,200 traineeship students now at 219 universities throughout the Nation. This has been one of the most popular NSF programs because it assists universities in every part of the country, unlike the fellowship program which goes directly to students who then tend to cluster at the elite universities.

This amendment would provide for the traineeship program to continue next year at the present level. If it is not put in, then all we will have in the traineeship program will be funds to assist those trainees presently in the program.

The four science advisers to our Presidents all agree that the traineeship program should be continued. They indicated that in their testimony. They think it has been an extremely important part of the whole effort to train scientists in this country.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for some questions.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my understanding that the committee recommends now $16 million above the House in order to take care of the research projects which were cut out of the Defense, NASA, and others, under the Mansfield amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The committee recommendation, which is the same as the administration request, allocates $10 million to cover research dropped pursuant to the Mansfield amendment and because of general budgetary reductions.

Mr. DOMINICK. $10 million, not $16 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. So, presumably, then, so far as the Mansfield impact is concerned, that has been taken care of by the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. The $10 million takes in the $8.8 million dropped under the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator referred to the impacts of other agencies. Is the Senator talking about a general cutback in other agency budgets for research programs?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. In other words, this is not an action that has been taken specifically. It is just a general cutback in the agencies on research.

Mr. KENNEDY. These are the cutbacks in the various agency programs in the fields of science and scientific research. Let me stress to respond fully to the Senator from Colorado, a point made by Dr. Killian, Dr. Hornig, and others. The programs which were cut back most quickly by the various Federal agencies were the long-range research programs, even though, in so many instances, it is the long-range research programs which are really the most important to the preservation of our standard of living, our health, and the quality of our lives.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, am I not correct that Dr. Killian and MIT came together to say that they did not want to have any more Government-oriented research programs going on there that might even conceivably be connected with defense?

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator is referring to the report made at MIT by a group of students, faculty, and trustees as well, recommending a phaseout of defense research at Lincoln Laboratories, a report that received widespread support, I believe he is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. So now he is coming here to say that they do not want that kind of money, but they do want some other kind of money. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not know Dr. Killion's personal view on the Lincoln Laboratories issue. I do know that he is a great and distinguished educator who feels that if we as a nation are going to move out of defense-oriented research, we have a compelling need to expand research in a lot of areas of domestic need.

If what is being suggested by the Senator from Colorado is that MIT is feeling the pinch, I would agree. And so are many other universities and colleges that are participating in National Science Foundation programs.

Mr. DOMINICK. One more question. The $27.5 million, what does the Senator expect that will be used for?

Mr. KENNEDY. The traineeship program would account for $9.5 million.

There were no funds at all for new trainees for next year. There are some for some individuals who already are studying at 219 universities around the country. But it cuts off the trainee program for the future.

That would be $9.5 million and, together with the $18 million for research, makes a total of $27.5 million.

The criteria for use of the $18 million would be exactly the same as those established for all research applications to NSF. This amendment would not attempt, nor should it, to use those resources automatically to try to aid the particular colleges and universities around the country that have lost DOD or other contracts. The $18 million would be spent on whichever of the various research programs the NSF feels are particularly deserving.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Dr. McElroy appeared before our committee and testified to a budget estimate of $511 million. The House cut it to $495 million, a reduction of $16 million.

It was my understanding that in the allocation of these funds—because this is not a line item—that if we did not restore the $16 million, the Foundation would delete the program for trainees.

I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts that possibly what would be more desirable would be to write some language in here to the effect that no less than "*x*" number of dollars should be used for the training program.

When they appeared before our committee, the one program—the most dramatic of all—was the trainee program. They said that if we cut out the $16 million, they would cut out the trainee program.

As I stated there is no line items for the trainee program. And if we include

the money, there is nothing that says they have to use it for the trainee program, as I understand it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the amendment, we provide that of the foregoing amount, not less than $9.5 million shall be available for first year traineeships.

Mr. PASTORE. That has not been in the law before.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. And that is supplying the money for the trainee program. My argument is that they can do the trainee program within the $511 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point is that they cannot support the trainee program under the administration budget.

Mr. PASTORE. That is why we ought to write it into the law.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call attention to page 11 of the committee report. It reads:

> The committee has received several requests to earmark specific programs, which the committee is reluctant to do, preferring instead to leave the funding of programs to the better judgment of the Director and his assistants.

There is an Advisory Board to the National Science Foundation. It consists of some very prominent scientists and scholars in the United States. I believe that the Board is composed of about 20 or 25 members.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. We felt that in marking the bill up we should leave it to them. And we felt that we were being very generous in raising this to that amount.

If the Senator wants to leave the language in, personally I would still feel as the committee felt, that it would be better to leave it to the judgment of the Director and the assistants to the National Advisory Board.

They certainly are very capable people. They are as capable as any people in the country. That would be my suggestion.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). The Senator will suspend until we get complete order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there would be no training programs under the Budget Bureau recommendations.

I would like to point out that the Chairman of the National Science Board, Mr. Philip Handler, when asked to comment on traineeships, said:

> In my view, it is shortsighted in the extreme to tamper with the national system for the production of scientists based only on current fiscal considerations or projections of science support in the next few years. The productive life of scientists is limited to 20 to 30 years at most. Our country is currently in the process of revising its national philosophy with respect to science, but one fact remains clear: Science remains the most powerful instrument we have for shaping the national future. No vision of that future is rational without an expanding body of scientists engaged in increasingly difficult investigative endeavors. The graduate students supported today will not be independent working scientists for almost ten years. If, a decade hence, it is clear that we shall wish to substantially expand the scientific endeavor—a projection which I cannot doubt—we will have foreclosed that option if funds are not provided today for the training of young scientists. It is not inconceivable that we will wish to rethink the mechanisms by which such support is to be provided. But until a decision is clearly rendered, I would be much disturbed if we were to compromise the national future and foreclose our future options for lack of an adequate cadre of trained scientists.

What we are attempting to do is to insure continuation of the traineeship program because the Bureau of the Budget was really quite clear in turning this program down.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not recall the testimony. I think the Senator from Rhode Island put his finger on the problem. If we say we have to cut anywhere, they say that they will cut the most popular program. That has always been the insistence of the House committee, the Senate committee, and the Senate itself in supporting the training programs.

I hope that we will continue, but I think that it is unwise to do it in this way. I think we ought to leave it to the National Science Foundation Advisory Board and its Director. In that way we would get a better balanced program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am delighted, because they support the traineeship program. It was the Budget Bureau that cut the program out. But the National Science Board does not want to finance the program if it means sacrificing research programs.

It is the attempt of this language to provide a continuation at the present level of the traineeship programs at least for next year, but not at the expense of any research programs.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator would withhold, I should like to yield some time first to the Senator from Vermont and to the Senator from New Hampshire. I will then be glad to respond to the Senator.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). The Senator has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to lend my full support as a cosponsor to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). This amendment would increase the appropriations for the National Science Foundation by $27,500,000; $18,000,000 of the extra funds would be used to augment the Foundation's support of basic academic research projects dropped by mission-oriented agencies and $9,500,000 would be used to fund the graduate traineeships, dropped in the administration's budget request.

Last Wednesday the Senate passed H.R. 16595 as amended in the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare. The Senate version of H.R. 16595 authorizes appropriations in the amount of $548,000,000 for the activities of the National Science Foundation in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. The House-passed version of H.R. 16595 authorized appropriations of $525,630,000 for the same period. It is significant to note that both the House and Senate concurred in the need to increase the authorizations for the NSF above the $498,000,000 budget request.

Studies by the House and Senate NSF subcommittees revealed an urgent need to bolster Federal support for basic scientific research.

Both subcommittees estimated that the Department of Defense, NASA and the AEC have reduced their support for basic academic research by at least $60 million in fiscal 1970.

These cutbacks have not been carried out with a disregard for basic research, but rather with a view to the budget restraints on the mission oriented agencies. In its budget request, the administration has recognized the need to support worthwhile projects dropped by the mission-oriented agencies and has provided $10 million for this purpose. This amendment will provide an additional $18 million for the NSF to support such worthwhile projects. If this amendment is adopted $28 million will be provided to support projects dropped by the mission-oriented agencies.

Mr. President, even with this amendment we will still support only one-half of the projects which have been curtailed. In this regard the amendment which I am cosponsoring with the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the National Science Foundation (Mr. KENNEDY) is a modest and reasonable response to the need to continue Federal support for basic academic research.

In addition to the extra $18 million this amendment would provide for basic research, in the amount of $9.5 million for the Foundation's first year graduate traineeships. In the authorization bill—H.R. 16595—both the House and Senate reinstated this program.

The NSF supports graduate students through fellowships and traineeships. The fellowships are awarded to individuals, who tend to cluster in the major university complexes while the traineeships are awarded to universities throughout the country.

Thus the traineeship program strengthens all our universities and provides for a geographical balance to scientific education and research.

Mr. President, I realize the great and urgent demands on our limited resources. I am painfully aware of our need to tighten our belts. However, I contend in this instance the $27.5 million provided by this amendment is essential to prevent a serious disruption in scientific education and research. This is seed money, which will help us reap a bountiful harvest.

I hope very much that the amendment will receive the approval of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I rise briefly today to support the amendment

offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The purpose of the amendment is to increase the budget of the National Science Foundation by $27.5 million, in order to offset cuts made during fiscal year 1970 in the research budgets of the Defense Department and other mission agencies.

I am concerned about this amendment primarily because of its relationship to cuts in defense research and especially to section 203 of last year's military procurement authorization bill, which provides that no defense funds are to be used for research which lacks "a direct and apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation."

Passage of this amendment is essential if section 203 is to have the effect intended by its sponsors last year.

In explanation of this point, and as background to the debate on this amendment, I would like to say a few words at this point as regards the Armed Services Committee's position on section 203 as far as this year's military procurement authorization bill is concerned.

The committee recommends the reenactment, as section 515, of section 203 of last year's bill.

This section was intended to alter what was viewed as a serious structural imbalance in the Government's support and encouragement of scientific research. It was hoped that it would lead to significant reductions in Department of Defense research programs and that these reductions would be offset by corresponding increases in the research budgets of the National Science Foundation and domestic oriented departments and agencies.

To date it has not had the effect intended.

In the first place, a Department of Defense review of its entire 6.1, basic research program resulted in the identification of only $8.2 million worth of projects which did not meet the standard of section 203, an amount far less than the $64 million reduction in the 6.1 research program as the result of direct congressional cuts in last year's budget.

At the same time, this $64 million cut has itself had unfortunate consequences in many universities and other research centers across the Nation. Because the cut has not been offset by increased funding in other areas, many investigators have found themselves cut off from the funds needed if their research efforts are to continue.

Finally, the section has been interpreted by some in a manner not intended either by its principal sponsors or by the members of this committee when they accepted it as a floor amendment last year. It has been suggested, for example, that the section flatly prohibits the Department of Defense from funding any basic research on our Nation's campuses. In recommending retention of the section in this year's bill, the Armed Services Committee firmly rejects this interpretation. The Department of Defense must have the advice and criticism of experts in the academic community in making the difficult policy choices which confront it.

The committee recommends the reenactment of the section, notwithstanding its lack of effect to date, because it strongly endorses its underlying intent. Ever since the first days of the cold war, Department of Defense requests for research funds have been warmly received, while other agencies and departments, strained generally for funds, have found room for few research dollars in their budgets and have had many of those dollars trimmed by the Congress. As a consequence, and as the breadth of its own activities has increased markedly, the Department of Defense has often undertaken research of equal or greater relevancy to other departments and agencies.

The Armed Services Committee believes that the section can best be implemented, not by another review of the "direct and apparent" relevancy of individual projects, but by executive branch action in the preparation of the fiscal year 1972 budget. It is the hope of the committee that the Bureau of the Budget will take steps in that regard to reflect the desire expressed by Congress for a restructuring of the channels of research support by giving greater recognition to the research needs of domestic mission agencies and the National Science Foundation within an undiminished overall program of Government support for research in this country.

In its review of the fiscal year 1971 Department of Defense research budget, the committee has purposely kept its reduction in the 6.1 area at a modest level, in an attempt to avoid complicating the already rather harsh effects which prior reductions in funding have had on the research community.

This restraint, coupled with executive branch action next year, can insure in the future that our research programs continue at a responsible overall level.

It is only through this amendment, however, that we can offset the effects of previous cuts and effectuate the intent of section 203. Accordingly, I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the purpose of this amendment. During the years I had the privilege to serve in the House on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices when the National Science Foundation was in its early years and I came in touch with the needs of this basic research.

It has been suggested here that because of the reluctance of colleges and because of the policy of the Department of Defense, colleges would be suffering because of the lack of contracts for research. Without reflecting at all on the distinction of basic research and its necessity, before we decide on this amendment it should be brought to the attention of the Senate or the Senate should be reminded that last year the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare was compelled to reduce the research features in the various institutions of health—medical research—that go out by contract; and the place where the committee reluctantly tightened up was on research training which is so important in order to produce future scientists in the field of health research such as cancer, stroke, heart, and all the rest of these problems.

In addition to that, because of the Presidential veto, we again slightly reduced this appropriation for medical research. I think every member of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, including its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington, knows that this year the committee must replace, insofar as it can, the funds for medical research which will go out to the colleges, and particularly that aspect of medical research goes to produce scientists to keep alive future research.

With respect to the suggestion which has been made that one reason for adopting this amendment is to keep our colleges and research activities in colleges going, let me predict to you, Mr. President, that not only will the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare be obliged to come in with more liberal recommendations than last year, but unless my experience over the years is proven entirely in vain, that amount will be raised again when it gets to the floor of the Senate. So in deciding on rejecting that recommendation and making this increase, please bear in mind that research for the colleges and universities—and the type of research that will not offend their tender sensibilities about national defense—will be before the Senate again, and I think the amounts will be far greater than this suggested amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am inclined to vote for the amendment, but I cannot help but note the inconsistencies of a large number of Senators.

I am looking at page 324 of the booklet entitled, "Space Program Benefits," which shows a picture of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Beneath the picture it is stated:

CENTER FOR SPACE RESEARCH

This building accommodates the Institute's effort in multidisciplinary space-related research and flight experiments. It is interconnected with other science and engineering facilities on campus where research efforts include plasma and cosmic ray probes, exploration of the solar corona, heat transfer under zero gravity, optical and infrared masers, radio astronomy, and re-entry physics. Twenty-nine predoctoral trainees working in these and related areas have been awarded doctoral degrees.

Yet just a few moments ago we came very close to disallowing $319 million to be spent proportionately in all these programs which we find in 37 colleges across the country.

I might be able to vote for the amendment, but I think many Members should realize they came awfully close to cutting off studies at their own universities, as in the case of the Senator from Massachusetts who voted with the Fulbright amendment which would have hurt the MIT studies.

Mr. PASTORE. In the supplemental bill we took the $8.8 million suggested by the Mansfield amendment and there

again we ran into a stone wall. The argument made by committee members was that they had interrogated the National Science Foundation about what contracts they had taken over from the Department of Defense, and they were not prepared to be specific. Because of the Mansfield amendment some of these contracts in basic research which have been within the jurisdiction of the Defense Department will now have to go to the National Science Foundation, but it is a question of what they can allot according to what they get.

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) and I felt in subcommittee that the $511 million was sufficient. It was mainly a matter of allocation.

It is true that if many of the basic programs which have been heretofore under the aegis of the Department of Defense are shifted to the National Science Foundation, and they embrace them all, there is no question we will have to increase their funding, but for the time being I do not think that process has started.

I would suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts two alternatives. I do not think my counterpart will subscribe to the first alternative that rather than $27 million we take back the $9 million, with the traineeship provision over and above the $511 million. As an alternative if my colleague does not agree, we write language that within the $511 million no less than $9 million shall be used for the traineeship program, because the Senator from Massachusetts is correct in stating that the traineeship program for next year is on ice.

They are making a study to see if they can develop a loan program, but in the meantime, the traineeship program for this year has come to a halt. How damaging that will be and what the result will be I do not know.

My personal opinion is that $511 million, with the limitation we put in, would be sufficient for them normally to carry on the National Science Foundation and take care of this program.

If that will not do, I suggest, it is the feeling of the Senate, that rather than $27 million, we take that part for the traineeship program and add it to the budget estimate of $511 million. That is merely a suggestion.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would take the second portion of what the chairman suggested and I would think that would be satisfactory. We had extensive hearings on this matter. We do not have the witnesses before us in the Senate now. We did go into these matters thoroughly.

In 1960, which I believe was the first year—the second year I was on the committee—I was the one who with Dr. Allen Waterman and the former Senator from Massachusetts, Leverett Saltonstall, first raised the amount for the National Science Foundation over $100 million. That jumped to $175.8 million in 1961; by 1965 it had jumped to $420 million; last year it was $438 million; and this year it is $511 million plus $2 million more in foreign currency.

Frankly, I do not think we do ourselves a service, after the committee met and spent so much time on this, to jump over the budget on an item like this. As far as the language is concerned, I have no objection to that, and I would hope the Senator from Massachusetts would put that in the language. Certainly it would be acceptable to me. He would leave it in where it is, which is the budget figure, which is the difference between $538 million and $513 million, which is quite a substantial increase in 1 year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, of course, we are up against the practical proposition that the House cut it by $16 million. If we do not put it in there, we are going to have to compromise the $16 million, cut it in two, and compromise other programs.

I wonder if the Senator would not be willing to confine it to the traineeship program and allow us to take it to conference. The $16 million is in conference. I doubt if the House is going to give us all of that. If we put a limitation on that, we will constrict the other programs.

I hope the Senator from Colorado would agree to that. I also hope the Senator from Massachusetts would agree to it and let us get it over with.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to say just a couple of words in response to what the Senator from Colorado has suggested.

First of all, I think there is a movement, as the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) mentioned, to switch support for basic research from the Department of Defense to the National Science Foundation. That movement has started. But if we want this to happen, we are going to have to provide the necessary resources.

I would like to quote Dr. Hornig:

> In my view, the present budget for the National Science Foundation is inadequate to the needs of the country. It cannot take over the high-quality projects which are being abandoned by the Department of Defense or the National Institutes of Health. Nor can it act as the organizational center of scientific development and be the agency to grasp new opportunities as they appear. It can at best hang on, and I predict that in a decade we will pay dearly for these economies now.

Dr. Killian said at our NSF hearings:

> I believe, sir, that the $50 million increase—

We are talking now about $27.5 million; he is referring to a proposed $50 million increase—

> Is a minimum amount that we should really get to prevent the kind of baneful effects we have been trying to delineate here. Of course, it depends on what happens to other agencies, too. The situation will remain unstable and uncertain without order of increase.

So those who have dealt with this problem of scientific research in the period of the buildup following Sputnik realize that there is an extraordinary need for additional resources. The $18 million for research is a significant sum, but as compared with what has been outlined as a basic need, it really is not extraordinary.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would like to ask two questions. Does the Senator realize that the figures he has quoted have been exceeded considerably by the committee already, in that we have provided $73 million over last year's budget? Many of these research projects never pick up that money. Does the Senator realize it has been exceeded by the committee already?

Mr. KENNEDY. As Dr. Hornig pointed out, the last 2 or 3 years they had expenditures considerably in excess of appropriations.

Mr. ALLOTT. They had no right to do that.

Mr. KENNEDY. We should compare the $511 million for 1971 with the $480 million for 1966.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am looking at the committee print of the bill. It shows $438 million for last year. The Senator must be using some carryover figures.

Mr. KENNEDY. The $480 million is for 1966.

Mr. ALLOTT. The $479,999,000.

Mr. KENNEDY. The $480 million is for 1966 as compared with $511 million in 1971. When one considers the inflation since 1966, one realizes there has actually been a decrease since then.

Mr. ALLOTT. I just want to take this out of here out of any other context: 1968—was the year when the budget of 1969—the appropriations being made in the National Science Foundation was dropped from $480 million to $400 million. Then it was picked up last year to $438 million. This year it was picked up to $511 million, plus $2 million in foreign currencies.

Is it the position of the Senator that he would not want to earmark the $9 million within the $511 million for the traineeship program

Mr. KENNEDY. We are talking about adding $9.5 million now.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator says, no, he would not?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; I would not take the position that we just earmark it under the present funding level. The amendment is to add $9.5 million plus $18 million. If the Senator is proposing what the Senator from Rhode Island suggested, that is different from what the Senator from Colorado has outlined here.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, when Dr. McElroy was before our committee, he said that $511 million was needed to finance all the ongoing programs, which excluded the traineeship program. So if funds were earmarked for that program it would have to be derived from the $511 million. Why do we not add the $9.5 million and earmark the amount for the traineeship program and let us take it to conference, because we are going to have a job, anyway?

Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Massachusetts is ready to modify his amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while the manager of the bill and the ranking minority member are consulting, I would like to state that the estimate of the overall cuts in basic science governmentwide this past year has ranged between $48 million and $60 million. It is my understanding that the National Science Foundation has screened the projects and found that $33 million are of such high

quality that they would be picked up by the National Science Foundation if the funds are made available. To get to the $8.8 million mentioned as directly attributable to section 203, the Senate acceded to adding this modest amount to the supplemental appropriation bill, but the amount was eliminated by the House; however, I must emphasize that the $8.8 million was the direct effect last year of section 203. It is the estimate of the Department of Defense of the amount eliminated last fiscal year. It does not account for the general budgetary squeeze on funds nor does it account for the effects in the coming fiscal year of projects that will be eliminated.

What is its status now in view of the fact that it was knocked out in the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. PASTORE. When we were before the conference committee on the supplemental appropriation bill, Dr. McElroy was not prepared to give the names and types and character of the programs. That is all they are waiting for. Dr. McElroy ought to go before the authorization and appropriation committee of the House and explain the projects that are being shifted. They have not done that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But did the Senator not promise it would be done in this bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. We did.

Mr. PASTORE. That is why we put the $16 million back.

Mr. ALLOTT. We did. I want to make my position very clear, because when we accepted Senator MANSFIELD's amendment that night—and I have the colloquy here—I said to him:

I shall not oppose the amendment, but since it does take up certain things that have been considered in the request that is being made by the National Science Foundation, I think it is only fair to say that we ought to adjust and will attempt to adjust the National Science Foundation appropriation accordingly when the subcommittee meets tomorrow.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished chairman.

The Senator promoted me inadvertently there .

Then he continued:

As I say, I think it is very fair. It allows us to meet a need for this fiscal year.

So we did. At this time, we were faced with the figure 495 from the House of Representatives. After discussing it with the chairman, we recommended the full budget, which more than took care of the $8.8 million of the Senator from Montana. This was my intention, and this was my understanding, that I promised him we would do, and we did do it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the manager of the bill and the ranking Republican member. I would like to read the rest of the colloquy which I had with the distinguished Senator from Colorado last year. The Senator correctly quoted me as saying:

As I say, I think it is very fair. It allows us to meet a need for this fiscal year.

I continued:

And, to keep faith with the representations that were made last year when section 203 became the law. The general level of funding of the National Science Foundation should consider not only the direct effects of section 203, but also the reduction in the Federal contribution to the sponsorship of basic science generally, caused primarily by the budgetary squeeze throughout the Federal Establishment. The level of basic research sponsored by the Federal Government should not be reduced but the emphasis for channeling these funds should be shifted from Defense to the National Science Foundation.

I wanted that in the RECORD, so that the intent of the debate last year will now be reinforced at this time, and made more plain, both as to the supplemental and now as to this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Montana for 1 minute. Under this appropriation bill, the research cut out by the Mansfield amendment is going to have to compete with all of the other projects which the distinguished Senator from Montana has mentioned here—the $33 million worth of research projects.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. KENNEDY. So it should be perfectly understood that by allocating an additional $10 million for research, you are not going to be taking care of the $8.8 million worth of research projects dropped because of the Mansfield amendment. You are not, because these projects are going to have to compete with all the other projects which have been dropped.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator not think the House is entitled to know what these programs are before they fund them?

Mr. KENNEDY. Sure.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what we are waiting for. We are trying to get some information. I mean we are all talking in a bag, for the most part. The fact remains that once these programs are shifted, analyzed, and studied, some of them will be discarded and some accepted. Those accepted, we will have to put the money in for. But they take the position in the House that "we want to know what they are and what they do before we fund them." I think that is a reasonable position.

Mr. KENNEDY. What about the traineeships?

Mr. PASTORE. The traineeships, if the Senator will modify his amendment, I think we are ready to accept.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us take it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) in support of this amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as Senators know, I previously served as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Senate Government Operations Committee. In that capacity, in past years. I conducted extensive hearings on national needs in the field of science and social science education and research, basic and applied. I have been very much disturbed about the tightening of funds available for these purposes, which are so fundamental to so many aspects of our national life.

Two decades ago, the Congress determined that the future of this Nation was very much bound up with a strong and sustained Federal investment in the various aspects of basic and applied science and research. This determination subsequently led to the establishment of the National Science Foundation.

Prior to the creation of the National Science Foundation, there were no more than twenty colleges and universities in the country which could be considered outstanding scientific centers, and a majority of these institutions were concentrated in the Northeast and western coastal regions.

Today, there are perhaps two hundred or more institutions throughout the country which have the potential for making major contributions to the nation's scientific capabilities.

The significance of the National Science Foundation goes beyond any single project or program. It involves all science research and education in America. We are moving into a period in which continued life on this planet will depend largely upon our capacity to control our environment, to recycle the by-products of society, and to understand and to increase our knowledge of how to effectively deal with the complex social problems of our time. In this latter connection, a matter of special interest to me, Dr. Philip Handler, Chairman of the National Science Foundation Board and President of the National Academy of Sciences, stated in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that "the Foundation is being looked to, beginning in fiscal year 1971, to expand its efforts to provide a base of fundamental knowledge more directly applicable to solutions of problems of our society."

To this end, I have strongly urged the passage of S. 508 which I introduced with 33 cosponsors to establish a National Social Science Foundation to deal specifically but not exclusively with social science research and education. I hope this bill will be passed, but, in any event, I hope that the National Science Foundation will be able to do more in this vital field as well.

In the last half of fiscal year 1970, I am glad to note that the National Science Foundation, among other things, awarded a $320,000 grant to the Council of State Governments for a project to assist states in organizing and using science technology, provided international travel grants to eighty young scientists to attend thirty-nine NATO Advanced Study Institutes in Europe this summer and provided grant support to more than six thousand graduate students studying for advanced degrees in science, mathematics and engineering, and supplemental training for approximately sixteen thousand secondary school teachers and supervisors of science training.

In order to keep pace with the growing needs in science education and research, federal support in the form of increased appropriations is necessary. Otherwise, we could experience a chain reaction, producing results just the opposite of what the National Science Foundation has been trying to accomplish for the last twenty years. I am also greatly interested in seeing sufficient and increased funds for the development of institutional excellence on a much more extensive basis throughout the entire United States.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I support the pending amendment to increase the National Science foundation appropriation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I modify my amendment in the following way:

To provide in effect that the appropriation would be increased by $9.5 million, and not less than $9.5 million shall be available for first-year graduate traineeships.

Mr. KENNEDY's amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 23, line 2, strike $511,000,000 and insert $520,500,000 and on page 23, line 3 after the colon, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for first-year graduate traineeships, and."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand the yeas and nays have not been ordered. We are prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which I have at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) (on behalf of himself and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY)) proposes an amendment as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following:

"Loans for housing and related facilities for elderly or handicapped families.

"For loans authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (42 U.S.C. 1701q), $25,000,000."

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with the financing of housing for the elderly. HUD has been in the process of shifting the financing of housing for the elderly to sections 235 and 236 of the Housing Act. In the meantime, the program is financed by the "revolving fund" created by Congress some years ago through the appropriation of $455 million.

The program financed from this fund totaled $60 million in fiscal year 1970 and the committee has been informed that $27 million will be used out of the revolving fund in fiscal year 1971. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. President, it is with a sense of urgency that I offer an amendment to H.R. 17548, the independent offices-Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

My amendment would provide much-needed funding in the amount of $25 million for the highly successful section 202 housing program for the elderly and handicapped.

At this time when low-cost housing is such a critical problem for practically all Americans, it is usually out of the reach of the elderly, who live on limited, fixed incomes.

In the past, nonprofit sponsors have been able to make use of the low-interest loans under section 202 to provide pleasant housing units at a relatively low cost for older Americans.

Last year in the Housing Act of 1969, the Congress enthusiastically supported the extension of the section 202 program by authorizing $150 million for this purpose.

Congress should follow up this commitment, I believe, with funding to carry out this mandate through this fiscal year.

However, this is the second consecutive year that the administration has refused to request appropriations for this program—in spite of its proven success.

The administration has in effect abandoned the section 202 program and placed its emphasis on the section 236 interest subsidy program for rental housing.

This means a less flexible response to the critical housing needs of the aged.

In addition, section 236 rental housing is more costly in the long run for the Federal Government than units under the 202 program. For example, in testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last year, Rev. Richard Fullerton, representing the American Institute of Housing Consultants, Inc., pointed out that the Federal outlay for interest under section 236 can cost the taxpayer 3½ times more than a 202 loan.

At a time when housing is such a scarce and expensive commodity, we should use the most economic means possible to build critically needed units.

Last year we made a commitment to continue the 202 program. And, I believe that the intent of Congress should be carried out, particularly because the housing needs of older Americans are so desperate.

Today many elderly homeowners are being forced to sell their houses because prohibitive property taxes and other rapidly rising costs make it impossible to live in their homes.

But, without suitable rental housing at reasonable prices, the elderly may find themselves in an impossible situation. They cannot remain in their homes because it costs too much to continue living there. Yet, they cannot move to alternative units because present programs are inadequate for their needs.

My amendment for $25 million—the same amount as appropriated in fiscal 1969 for section 202—would help to meet this critical problem.

Mr. President, the need for the 202 program is well-documented in hearings by the Senate Committee on Aging and in letters to its members.

The most recent evidence was provided on June 8 at a committee hearing on "Sources of Community Support for Federal Programs Serving the Elderly."

Our original purpose had been to explore ways in which churches and other nonprofit sponsors could make constructive use of existing or potential Federal resources on behalf of older Americans.

At the June 8 session—which dealt only with housing needs—it soon became obvious, however, that the major topic of the day would be the apparent abandonment of the 202 program over the protests of would-be and actual sponsors of projects under that program.

Several clergymen who have been associated with individual projects told us of the high quality of housing made possible under 202.

Typical of their concern was this statement from the director of a 202 project in Miami, Fla.:

Limited incomes that are in our inflationary society have made adequate housing for senior Americans a catastrophic problem. These people are prevented from getting decent, dignified housing, so they rot away in the hovels and slums without hope, without being found by their community to see what the community could do for them, without their knowing how they can meet these problems.

Obviously, senior housing could bring these people together, to be identified, to be made productive. Section 202 was a crown of achievement for creative federalism. Red tape, though considerable, was much less than through other programs.

The 202 government agencies have the attitude of family, that they were not there to dictate but to help find answers.

The 202 programs turned out to be highly successful, strongly motivated by nonprofit sponsors. They continue to be highly successful, beating all laws of average. This type of nonprofit sponsorship guarantees more service, less cost for buildings and management, and great dedication.

Mr. President, the reasons are compelling to continue appropriations for the 202 program, and I urge favorable consideration of this amendment.

I might add that I am well aware that the appendix to the budget for fiscal year 1971 reports that $27 million in 1971 is expected to be reserved for 202 loans to provide 1,900 housing units.

This statement fails to convince me of the intentions of the administration as regards the 202 program, for the following reasons:

First. For one thing, it is less than half of the $60 million reserved for loans in fiscal 1970. If the administration is really serious about coping with the housing needs of the elderly it should at least equal its 1970 commitment.

Second. The money for such loans is provided from a revolving fund in which new loan reservations are made from authority released by cancellations of previous loan reservations, and not from actual new appropriations. Even though the budget appendix makes it appear that these loans are provided to sponsors under the 202 program, I am informed that the recipients of such loans are required to convert such loans almost immediately to loans under the 236 program. Within the past 24 hours, I have been told that as of June 30 HUD will not even bother to go through this formality.

In view of the overt resistance to the 202 program, I think it is more important than ever that the Congress continue to express its intention of support for that program.

For that reason I offer this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we will take this to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield very briefly?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The House Appropriations Committee in its report on the independent offices bill earmarks $23,300,000 for the National Science Foundation's summer institutes program. This is the present support level.

On page 11 of the Senate committee report the committee recommends adding "and other programs of supplementary training" to the earmarking of funds for summer institutes. Concern has been expressed in my State that this means almost all of the earmarked $23,300,000 or at least a very substantial part of it could be spent on programs other than summer institutes. Would the Senator from Rhode Island give me his thoughts on the meaning of this Appropriations Committee language?

Mr. PASTORE. As expressed in a letter from the Director of the National Foundation, the intended effect of the language is as follows:

> The effect of this language change, as written by the House Committee, gives the Foundation not the $16.0 million reduction but actually a $24.0 cut because it introduces a programming inflexibility by line item when considered in light of our budget request as submitted. The language as proposed by the House Committee reads as follows:
>
> On page 22, lines 11 through 15: "until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than $23,300,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of summer institutes for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: * * *."
>
> The Foundation's request for summer institutes in the appropriation request was $15.44 million—the House Committee action would require obligations of a minimum of $23.30—an increase of $7.86 million which will have to be provided by curtailment of other planned program activities in other Foundation education or research programs.
>
> The summer institutes are but a single segment of the Foundation's past, present and planned broad based program to improve secondary school science education.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I take it the Senator is saying that while some of this $23,300,000 might be used for other purposes, most of it—I presume $16 million or more—would continue to be used for summer institutes?

Mr. PASTORE. I would say that is the interpretation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, this bill contains an appropriation of $9,127,000 for a new courthouse, customhouse, and Federal office building to be built by the General Services Administration in Wilmington, Del.

This building is the oldest authorized and unbuilt GSA structure in the country. It was authorized in 1959. Now—11 years later—the building has not been started.

The need, recognized so long ago, is much greater now. Much of the east side of downtown Wilmington has been leveled as part of an urban renewal project, and much of the west side has been removed for a limited-access freeway. The result has been severe economic and housing dislocation.

The governmental, economic, and civic leaders of the State of Delaware and the city of Wilmington are committed to a revitalization of downtown—an effort to bring business back to the center of the city and to provide employment opportunities for those who live in the inner city.

A number of things have been done on the local level, but the key to this revitalization remains the Federal building. Upon its construction hinges an entire complex which will revamp Wilmington's skyline, improve the economic opportunity it can provide its citizens, make it attractive as a shopping and business center, and—most importantly—bolster confidence in Government's ability to meet its obligations.

I believe it is vitally important at this juncture that the Federal Government take action to back up its 10-year-old obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time on the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) would each vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Aiken	Fannin	Mondale
Allen	Fulbright	Montoya
Allott	Goodell	Muskie
Baker	Griffin	Nelson
Bayh	Gurney	Pastore
Bellmon	Hart	Pearson
Bennett	Hartke	Pell
Bible	Hatfield	Prouty
Boggs	Holland	Proxmire
Brooke	Hollings	Randolph
Burdick	Hruska	Saxbe
Byrd, Va.	Hughes	Schweiker
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Scott
Cannon	Jackson	Smith, Ill.
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Church	Kennedy	Spong
Cooper	Long	Stennis
Cranston	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dole	McClellan	Tower
Dominick	McGovern	Tydings
Eagleton	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Miller	

NAYS—4

Cotton	Thurmond
Goldwater	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—28

Anderson	Javits	Percy
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Curtis	Magnuson	Russell
Dodd	Mathias	Smith, Maine
Ervin	McCarthy	Stevens
Fong	McGee	Symington
Gore	Moss	Yarborough
Gravel	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Hansen	Murphy	
Harris	Packwood	

So the bill (H.R. 17548) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House,

and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Chair appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO EARL W. COOPER, PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER ON THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I already said this at the beginning, but I should like to repeat it for the benefit of Senators, that this is the last appearance of Earl W. Cooper the clerk to the subcommittee. Earl has been a faithful public servant for many years and served on the Appropriations Committee with distinction and honor. He is retiring at the end of this month.

The Senate and the country owes Mr. Cooper a debt of gratitude for his valuable service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in what the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the committee considering the measure which just passed the Senate, has said.

I look back with fondness, affection, and respect over the years that I have served with Earl Cooper.

I am personally very much indebted to him for the great work he did in helping to save the veterans' hospital in Miles City, in Montana, when a Democratic President undertook to eradicate it, liquidate it, and do away with it.

So when it comes to "Coop," he has my undying affection, admiration, and respect.

I am very sorry that he is leaving us so soon.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, may I join in the sentiments just expressed by the majority leader and the chairman of the committee, about the man who will soon retire.

Earl Cooper has served here for a long time. He has rendered untold valuable service not only to the Senate and to the membership at large but also from personal testimony, I can say that he takes unto his bosom the younger, inexperienced Members who come to the Senate and he properly indoctrinates and orients them as to proper procedures here. He has been doing that for a long, long time.

Everyone in the Senate will miss Earl Cooper. We all wish him well in the future and many years of good and solid health.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, men such as Earl Cooper serve in the Senate for a long period of time and work without the kind of acclamation Members receive. But they make our task here a great deal easier.

I know by reputation the splendid service that Mr. Cooper has rendered and I should like to be included among those who are paying tribute to his great contribution to the Senate and to the country.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1001 and 1003.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LAND HELD UNDER COLOR OF TITLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5365) to provide for the conveyance of certain public land held under color of title to Mrs. Jessie L. Gaines, of Mobile, Ala., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "to", strike out "Mrs. Jessie L. Gaines" and insert "Miss Adelaide Gaines".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public land held under color of title to Miss Adelaide Gaines of Mobile, Ala."

UNAUTHORIZED MANUFACTURE AND USE OF THE CHARACTER "JOHNNY HORIZON"

The bill (S. 3838) to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Johnny Horizon," and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3838

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may establish and collect use or royalty fees for the manufacture, reproduction, or use of the character "Johnny Horizon," originated by the Bureau of Land Management and announced in the July 3, 1968, issue of the Federal Register (33 Federal Register 9677) as the official symbol for a public service antilitter program to maintain the beauty and utility of the Nation's public lands.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall deposit into a special account all fees collected pursuant to this Act. Such fees are hereby made available for obligation and expenditure for the purpose of furthering nationwide antilitter campaigns.

SEC. 3. Chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding a new section to be known as section 714, as follows:

"§ 714 .'JOHNNY HORIZON' CHARACTER OR NAME

"As used in this Act, the name of character 'Johnny Horizon', means the representation of a tall, lean man, with strong facial features, who wears slacks and sport shirt buttoned to the collar (both green, when colored), no tie, a field jacket (red, when colored), boot-type shoes (brown, when colored) and who carries a backpack, which was originated by the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, as the official symbol for a public service antilitter program to maintain the beauty and utility of the Nation's public lands.

"Whoever, except as authorized under rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior, knowingly manufactures, reproduces, or uses the character 'Johnny Horizon', or any facsimile thereof, or the name 'Johnny Horizon' as a trade name or mark, or in such a manner as suggests the character 'Johnny Horizon', so that such use is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive, shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"This section shall not make unlawful the use of any such emblem, sign, insignia, or words which was lawful on the date of enactment of this Act.

"A violation of this section may be enjoined at the suit of the United States attorney, upon complaint by the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 4. The analysis of chapter 33 immediately preceding section 701 of title 18 is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"714. 'Johnny Horizon' character or name."

SEC. 5. The rights in the name and character "Johnny Horizon" shall terminate if the use by the Secretary of the Interior of the name and character "Johnny Horizon" is abandoned. Nonuse for a period of two years shall constitute abandonment.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON CAMPUS UNREST TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE AND TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES AND PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolution 1284.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK) laid before the Senate House Joint Resolution 1284, authorizing the President's Commission on Campus Unrest to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for its immediate consideration.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 991, H.R. 17923, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business. I do this so that it will become the pending business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). The clerk will state the bill by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 991, H.R. 17923, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, which was reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

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

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

SENATE DOCUMENT 91–94

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1971 FOR CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS (H.R. 17923)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since the agricultural appropriation bill for fiscal 1971, H.R. 17923, was reported to the Senate on June 29 there has been transmitted directly to the Senate, budget amendments providing for additional financing during fiscal 1971 of the child nutrition programs. The total increase requested in the amendments is $216,579,000. The bill as reported to the Senate and which will be debated tomorrow provides the full amount of the budget estimate of $323,753,000 for the direct appropriations for the child nutrition programs. The additional amounts recommended bring this total to $540,-332,000.

At the appropriate time during consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, I have been authorized by the committee to recommend adoption of the amendments to the budget proposed in Senate Document 91–94.

Mr. President, I request that Senate Document 91–94 be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter dated July 6 from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clifford M. Hardin, to which is attached a summary explanation of the requested budget amendments. I also request that the justifications submitted to the committee by the Department be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 1, 1970.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I ask the Congress to consider an amendment to the requests for appropriations in the budget for fiscal year 1971 in the amount of $216,579,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the Child Nutrition Programs to carry out Public Law 91–238.

As I stated on approving this legislation on May 14, "This legislation will help the Administration achieve its goal of expanding the school lunch program for all children and providing free or reduced price lunches for every needy child."

Further details of this proposal and the necessity therefor are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and recommendations I concur.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1971 in the amount of $216,579,000 for the Department of Agriculture as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

Budget appendix page 144, Child nutrition programs

Request pending	$323,753,000
Proposed amendment	$216,579,000
Revised request	$540,332,000

(Delete the paragraph under this heading and insert in lieu thereof the following:)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1751–1761; *Public Law 91–248*) and the applicable provisions other than section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1773–1785; *Public Law 91–248*), [$252,441,000] *$476,007,000,* of which [$129,941,000] *$174,033,000 shall be derived by transfer* from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided,* That of the foregoing total amount there shall be available [$44,800,000] *$204,747,000* for special assistance to needy [schools] *school children,* [$10,000,000] *$12,000,000* for the school breakfast program, [$10,000,000] *$15,000,000* for the nonfood assistance program, [$750,000] *$1,500,000* for State administrative expenses, and [$15,000,000] *$12,000,000* for special food service programs for children [to remain available until September 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year]: *Provided further, That funds provided herein shall remain available until expended in accordance with section 3 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended: Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That an additional $64,325,000 shall be transferred to this appropriation from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), for purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities and other foods pursuant to section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended: *Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.*

This amendment to the budget is to carry out H.R. 515 (Public Law 91–248) amending the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts. This amendment will permit the administration in partnership with the States to develop a program before the next school year to assure that every needy child in school receives a lunch free or at a reduced price.

I recommend that this amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1971 be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1970.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: We have furnished your Committee the justifications to support the additional $216,579,000 requested by the President on July 1 for Child Nutrition Programs. There is attached a summary explanation of this estimate.

Public Law 91–248 significantly amended the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts in several respects. Among other new provisions, it establishes priorities for school food service to needy children and actions to be accomplished by specified dates during the 1971 fiscal year.

The new law provides for the establishment of a national minimum eligibility standard for free and reduced price meals, and authorizes Federal funds to be used to assist schools that need such assistance in financing all or part of the operating costs of a school lunch program. It also provides for increased emphasis on nutritional training. The Act emphasizes that access to the school lunch program shall be available to children in all schools.

Additional Federal funds are needed to carry out the intent of the new Act. In order to meet the requirements by the dates specified in the law, the additional funds should be provided in the regular 1971 Appropriation Bill. State educational agencies must be given assurance of increased funding to meet the goals established for fiscal year 1971.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary.

SUMMARY EXPLANATION OF REQUESTED BUDGET AMENDMENT

On May 14, 1970, the President signed P.L. 91–248 to strengthen our National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Programs. The Act emphasizes that access to the school lunch program shall be available to all children in all schools. It establishes a priority goal of reaching needy children with free or reduced price lunches. To meet these goals the new law provides for the establishment of a national minimum eligibility standard for free and reduced price meals, establishes a maximum price that may be charged children for reduced price meals and authorizes State agencies to use Federal funds to assist schools in financing all or part of the operating costs of a school lunch program.

Public Law 91–248 creates an immediate need for increased Federal funding of the school lunch program. Consequently, a budget amendment has been submitted by the President which will provide funds to permit the USDA, in partnership with the States, to develop a program before the upcoming school year. This program will assure that at least 6.6 million needy children in schools receive a lunch free or at a reduced price daily.

An increase of $216,579,000 is needed to finance the additional costs of a lunch program which will provide lunches daily to 25 million school children. This includes an average of 6.6 million needy children. The increase would be used as follows:

For section 4, an additional $55,279,000 would be used to provide an average of 5¢ per lunch for all lunches served regardless of whether they are served free, at a reduced price or at the regular price. In other words, the total available under section 4, $225,000,-000, would provide a Federal contribution of 5¢ a lunch for 25 million children. The previous budget request did not provide section 4 financing for needy children receiving section 11 special assistance financing. These children *will* receive the section 4 contribution of 5¢ a meal. They will also be entitled to their share of State and local lunch funds.

An increase of $156,400,000 will be used for the Section 11 Special Assistance Program. It will provide an average of 30¢ per free and reduced price lunch (in addition to the 5¢ under Section 4) to a daily average of 6.6 million needy children. This makes a total of 35¢ Federal cash contributions for free and reduced price meals. This cash would be supplemented by approximately 7¢ worth of donated commodities to provide an average Federal contribution of 42¢ per free and reduced price lunch. Children's payments averaging 4¢ a lunch for the reduced price meals plus State and local contributions would provide the remaining funds to cover the cost of about 60¢ to serve a lunch. The previous budget provided a reimbursement rate of 20¢ in Federal cash under the old legislation which is not adequate to meet the needs under the new Act.

An additional $2,500,000 is requested for nonfood assistance grants. These funds would provide for equipment assistance to about 250 more schools than were planned for in the original budget. Our new legislation requires access to a lunch program be provided for all children. The pace of getting

schools equipped must be stepped up to meet this requirement.

An increase of $750,000 is needed to provide assistance to State educational agencies in fulfilling the many new requirements under P.L. 91–248. This increase would provide about one employee per State.

An increase of $750,000 is needed to finance nutritional training and studies and surveys of food service requirements. The Act gives increased emphasis to nutritional training for workers, cooperators, and for participants, with particular emphasis on the training of managerial workers, at the supervisory, school system and local levels.

An increase of $900,000 is requested for Federal operating expenses. The Department must provide leadership, guidance and monitoring for the many new requirements in the new Act. In addition it must conduct the program in many private schools not administered by State educational agencies.

These estimates are based on the best current information available. Section 8 of P.L. 91–248 provides for adjustment between programs if necessary to meet developing program needs.

These are the uses, in summary, that will be made of the $216,579,000 that is requested in this budget amendment. These funds will make it possible to achieve the goal that was contemplated when this law was enacted—to make increasingly effective use of the facilities of the school food delivery system as a means to improve the health and well-being of all of our children, and particularly of those who suffer the disadvantage to come from a family whose resources are limited.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

Child nutrition programs, 1971 budget amendment

Budget appendix page 144.

Child Nutrition Programs	
Request pending	$323,753,000
Proposed amendment	+216,579,000
Revised request	540,332,000

(Delete the paragraph under this heading and insert in lieu thereof the following:)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1751–1761; *Public Law 91–248*) and the applicable provisions other than section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1773–1785; *Public Law 91–248*), [$252,441,000] *$476,007,000*, of which [$129,941,000] *$174,033,000* shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That of the foregoing total amount there shall be available [$44,800,000] *$204,747,000* for special assistance to needy [schools] *school children*, [$10,000,000] *$12,000,000* for the school breakfast program, [$10,000,000] *$15,000,000* for the nonfood assistance program, [$750,000] *$1,500,000* for State administrative expenses, and [$15,000,000] *$12,000,000* for special food service programs for children [to remain available until September 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year]: *Provided further, That funds provided herein shall remain available until expended in accordance with section 3 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended: Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That an additional $64,325,000 shall be transferred to this appropriation from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612), for purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities and other foods pursuant to section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended: *Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment, under 5 U.S.C. 3109.*

EXPLANATION OF LANGUAGE

The proposed language would provide an increase of $216,579,000 for fiscal year 1971 to meet necessary costs of providing food services to school children in accordance with the intent of P.L. 91–248 of May 14, 1970. The language also inserts reference to P.L. 91–248 and changes the wording under special assistance to reflect the new provisions contained in P.L. 91–248 which provide for serving free or reduced price lunches to needy children regardless of the type of school they attend.

The proposed language also would delete the wording providing availability of funds until September 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year under the special food service programs for children. Public Law 91–248 provides that any funds appropriated to carry out the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts shall remain available until expended, and this is included in the proposed appropriation language.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR BUDGET AMENDMENT

The increased funds requested would enable the Secretary and cooperating State agencies to implement the revised requirements of the new Act. The new law provides for the establishment of a national minimum eligibility standard for free and reduced price meals, establishes a maximum price that may be charged children for reduced price meals, and authorizes State agencies to use Federal funds to assist schools in financing all or part of the operating costs of a school lunch program. The Act clearly establishes that priority shall be given to reaching needy children. It also provides for increased emphasis on nutritional training as related to workers, cooperators, and participants. The Act emphasizes that access to the school lunch program shall be available to children in all schools.

P.L. 91–248 creates an immediate need for increased Federal funding for child nutrition programs. The requirement that needy children shall be served free school meals means that the Federal contribution to each State's school feeding program should enable that State to meet that legal obligation. The new legislation is also expected to increase the number of children eligible to receive free and reduced price meals. The estimate provides for 7.3 million such children with an average of 6.6 million participating daily. Total participation is expected to rise from a previously expected year end total of 24.4 million to year end figure of 26.0 million, with the average participation for the year runing at about a 25 million level.

The revised budget estimates will allow every State to meet its obligation to provide free and reduced price meals for every needy child by using special assistance funds available under Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act together with a share of Section 4 funds and donated commodities proportionate to the number of needy children to be fed, and a like proportionate share of State and local school lunch funds. In areas where State and local funding for school lunch programs falls below the national average, the free and reduced price lunch obligation created by P.L. 91–248 can be met by applying more than a proportionate share of Section 4 funds and commodities to the use and benefit of needy children.

This revised budget estimate also provides for the initiation of the program of nutritional training called for by P.L. 91–248, an increase in the level of equipment expenditures, and increased State and Federal operating expenses.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

JUSTIFICATION OF BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR "CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS"

Project	Request pending 1971	Proposed amendment 1971	Revised request 1971
1. Cash payments to States:			
(a) School lunch program	$169,721,000	+$55,279,000	$225,000,000
(b) Special assistance	48,347,000	+156,400,000	204,747,000
(d) Nonfood assistance program	12,500,000	+2,500,000	15,000,000
(e) State administrative expenses	750,000	+750,000	1,500,000
2. Nutritional training activities		+750,000	750,000
3. Operating expense	4,110,000	+900,000	5,010,000
4. All other	88,325,000		88,325,000
Total	323,753,000	+216,579,000	540,332,000

Public Law 91–248 passed by the 91st Congress became law on May 14, 1970. This Act amends provisions of the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts related to the providing of free and reduced price meals and preventing discrimination against children; revises program matching requirements; provides for revised apportionment formulas to States; strengthens the nutritional training benefits of the programs; and otherwise amends the basic Acts to strengthen food service programs in schools and service institutions.

The provisions of PL 91–248 raise the expectation that Federal support for free and reduced price lunches will allow participating States to meet their mandatory obligation under the statute. The previous average reimbursement rate of 20 cents per meal for free and reduced price lunches is not adequate for this purpose. A revised average reimbursement rate of 30 cents per lunch will allow States to meet their obligations under the Act when combined with a share of other funds available for child feeding from Federal, State and local sources proportionate to the number of needy children being fed. The increase requested of $156,400,000 above the previous estimate would provide a total of $204,747,000 for the Section 11 appropriation. Including the $151,653,000 available from the Section 32 Special Feeding Program, a total of $356,400,000 would be available for free and reduced price lunches.

Under previous law only children in designated needy schools were eligible for Section 11 assistance and Section 4 funding was not budgeted for 5.5 million needy children in Section 11 schools. Under the new legislation, needy children are eligible for Section 11 assistance wherever they attend school and also a share of regular Federal, State and local lunch funding proportionate to their numbers. Making Section 4 benefits available to 5.5 million needy children not covered by the previous request and for an estimated increase in total program participation of .6 million will require an additional $55,279,000 in Section 4 funds above the $169,721,000 previously requested.

The increased Section 11 and Section 4 funds described above will allow States to receive amounts averaging 30¢ under Section 11 and 5¢ under Section 4 per meal for every needy student currently estimated to be eligible as defined by the Secretary pursuant to PL 91–248. These amounts when combined with the approximately 7¢ per meal worth of commodities will provide an average Federal support level for every free and re-

duced price lunch of 42¢. In addition State and local administrators will be expected to allot needy children their proportionate share of the State and local funds which for FY 1970 is estimated at a total of $575 million or 14.5¢ per lunch. If 20% of lunches are served at a reduced price of 20¢ (the maximum price permissible under the new law), this will provide an average of 4¢ per lunch. These available monies will allow States providing average support for school lunch programs to serve every needy child. Decisions as to how to allocate money within each State will be left to that State. States providing less than average support for their school lunch program can meet their legal obligations by applying more than a proportionate share of commodities and Section 4 funds to providing free and reduced price lunches for needy students.

The amended budget would also provide for some additional funds for equipment assistence to schools, for initiating a program for improved nutritional training for workers and necessary surveys of requirements for food service programs, and for State and Federal operating expenses.

An increase of 20% over the previous request is estimated for equipment assistance. This would provide funds to assist about 250 additional schools for a total of 1500, the same as estimated for 1970. PL 91–248 requires that access to the lunch program be provided for all children and the number of children in schools without service is a factor in the new apportionate formula. Therefore, the pace of getting schools equipped and operative needs to be stepped up.

The Act authorizes up to 1 percent of the total funds available to be used for nutritional training and studies and surveys of food service requirements. Use of $750,000 is proposed to begin these activities on a modest scale. The first area of concentration will be on managerial workers at the supervisory, school system and local levels to assure effective delivery of nutritionally adequate meals to children. This will be carried out primarily through grants to States for seminars, short courses, training materials, etc., or through contractual arrangements on a regional basis. This will be followed with outreach to other cooperators and participants.

The State educational agencies are faced with many new requirements under PL 91–248. These include obtaining semiannual statistical estimates from all schools of eligible needy children, developing detailed annual plans of operation for Federal approval, and follow through school by school, and practically child by child, to assure the program is initiated and carried out. The estimate of $750,000 will provide 50 to 55 manyears, or an average of but one additional employee per State.

An additional $900,000 is requested for Federal operating expenses. This will provide 60 positions. For the States to discharge their responsibilities, the Department must (a) develop new regulations and procedures, (b) establish criteria for State operations, (c) review and approve State plans for extending programs to reach all needy children, (d) provide technical back-stopping information to the States on nutrition, food service delivery systems, and program management, (e) monitor the several specific new program requirements. Also the Department must develop and conduct similar operations for private schools. It must provide executive secretariat and technical staff assistance to the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition established by the Act.

The increase requested was based on the following estimates:

1. Special assistance for needy children (section 11) calculated on basis of 7.3 million needy children at an average of 30¢ per lunch with a lapse of about 10 percent for absenteeism less amount available in original budget	+$156,400,000
2. General cash assistance (section 4) calculated on basis of average daily participation of 25 million children at an average reimbursement of 5¢ per lunch less amount available in original budget	+55,279,000
3. Nonfood assistance	+2,500,000
4. Nutritional training and surveys	+750,000
5. State administrative expense assistance	+750,000
6. Federal operating expenses	+900,000
Total	+216,579,000

To relate the available funds to the implied mandates in PL 91–248 requires flexibility in 1971 in allocating funds among the programs and activities authorized under the amended Acts. The minimum national standards for such eligibility, the State and local policies for implementation, and the required October 1, 1970, estimates of the number of eligibles are not yet developed and the impact of new apportionment formulas may require fund adjustments between programs. Therefore, the above calculations by program and activity would be subject to adjustment as authorized by Section 8 of PL 91–248. Also, no additional funds are estimated for other authorized activities such as school breakfasts. Practical means for meeting nutritional requirements of needy children may necessitate a part of the additional funds be used for such programs.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also request that the seven amendments pursuant to Senate Document 91–94, which has been printed in the RECORD, be printed in the RECORD at this point together with a brief explanation of each of these amendments.

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

AMENDMENT No. 1

Page 19, line 19, following "1751–1761)" insert "; Public Law 91–248."

The first amendment inserts the code citation to the recent amendments to the Child Nutrition Act, Public Law 91–248, approved May 14, 1970.

AMENDMENT No. 2

Page 19, line 21, strike ", $259,428,000" and insert "; Public Law 91–248, $476,007,000."

This amendment increases the total appropriation figure for the Child Nutrition Programs from $259,428,000 to $476,007,000, an increase of $216,579,000.

AMENDMENT No. 3

Page 20, line 2, strike "$48,347,000" and insert "$204,747,000."

This amendment increases the amount available by direct appropriation for Special Assistance to Needy Schools from $48,347,000 to $204,747,000, an increase of $156,400,000 over the original budget estimate and an increase of $159,947,000 over the amount available in fiscal year 1970. In addition, with transfers of $151,653,000 for the same pur- $356,400,000 represents an increase of $221,- pose from Section 32 funds, a total of $356,- 400,000 will be available for Section 11 assistance in fiscal 1971. The total funding of 600,000 over the amount available in 1970 of $134,800,000.

AMENDMENT No. 4

Page 20, line 3, strike the word "schools" and insert "school children".

This amendment relates to the clarification of eligibility under Section 11, to make it clear that all needy children are reached irrespective of whether they attend a school which is predominately a needy school or a more affluent school. The Committee is advised by the Department that in the past there has been some difficulty in the interpretation on this point and the amendment proposed would make it clear that it is the "needy" children that are to be reached, irrespective of the type of school they attend.

AMENDMENT No. 5

Page 20, line 4, strike "$12,500,000" and insert "$15,000,000".

This amendment increases the non-food assistance from $12,500,000 to $15,000,000, an increase of $2,500,000 over the original budget estimate and $2,500,000 over the 1970 availability, and $2,500,000 under the amount carried in the House bill.

AMENDMENT No. 6

Page 20, line 5, strike "$750,000" and insert "$1,500,000".

This amendment proposes an increase in State administrative expenses of $750,000, making a total of $1,500,000 available for fiscal 1971. With the transfer of $2,000,000 from the Section 11 Special Feeding Program, this will make a total of $3,500,000 available to meet these expenses.

AMENDMENT No. 7

Page 20, lines 7 and 8, strike "to remain available until Setpember 20 of the next succeeding fiscal year" and insert ": Provided further, that funds provided herein shall remain available until expended in accordance with section 3 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended".

This is the last amendment and it inserts a provision in the bill pursuant to Section 3 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, which would continue unused appropriations until expended in lieu of continuing them to remain available until September 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year. The broader provision on the availability of funds should enable the Child Nutrition Programs to operate on an orderly basis throughout the year, including special summer camp feeding programs and other specialized activities.

Mr. President, as previously indicated, following the adoption of the committee amendments on H.R. 17923, as reported from the committee, I intend to propose that the seven amendments referred to above be reported and adopted en bloc. I feel that the membership of the Senate should be on notice as to the content of the budget amendments submitted in Senate Document 91–94, together with the supporting information referred to which I have received as chairman of the subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business this evening, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PASTORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to make some well-deserved remarks about the distinguished senior

Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE).

It gives me an unusual amount of pleasure to have the privilege of commending one of the best—if not the best—floor managers of legislation in this body.

I refer, of course, to the giant from Rhode Island, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the man who knows his subject, who is able to answer all questions, who is always courteous in the extreme, and is always aware of what it takes to make the Senate run and what it takes to make the Senate accomplish things.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, with whom I have had the pleasure of serving for 18 years—but he has been here longer than that—has made a name for himself in the Senate which will not be surpassed by anyone anywhere, in his own State or throughout the Nation.

He has performed with remarkable sagacity and understanding. He has held high the standard of his great State of Rhode Island on all occasions. He has performed in a manner that many of the rest of us would like to emulate, but we do not have this man's integrity, his capability, his understanding, or his deep knowledge of the subjects which he is called upon to manage. He is a man who can keep abreast of the times—who realizes that the answers of yesterday are not necessarily tomorrow's solutions—who recognizes that changed circumstances demand fresh approaches.

If I had my choice of any one man in this body to manage a bill for me, that man would be the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). He has made his mark on the Senate down through the years. He has won the affection, the respect, and the great admiration of all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, a man whom I expect to see manage bills in this Chamber for many, many years to come.

In addition, Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), whose work and efforts within the subcommittee have made it possible to bring this bill to the floor and final passage in such an expeditious manner. To all Members of the Senate who have raised specific issues, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the leadership owes a special note of appreciation for the quality of the debate and the expeditious handling of amendments.

The Senate again has demonstrated that it can get the job done and still maintain the deliberativeness that marks the Senate as an essential but unique institution in our form of government.

The passage of this bill continues the fine accomplishments to date of the Senate this session of Congress.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, as a rather junior Member of this body in the minority leadership, I join the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) who has done such an outstanding job in managing the bill just passed.

I know that he would share my views if I were to add that the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the ranking Republican member, also did an outstanding job on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Michigan very much.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 16595.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK), laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16595) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2108

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor of S. 2108, to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2400

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of my colleague from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) be added as cosponsors of S. 2400, to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3137

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the names of the Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT and Mr. SCHWEIKER), be added as cosponsors of S. 3137, to cancel the indebtedness of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3546 AND S. 3687

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3546, the National Air Quality Standards Act of 1970, which would accelerate the designation of air quality control regions required by the Air Quality Act of 1967, and of S. 3687, the National Water Quality Standards Act of 1970, which would increase the Federal grant authorization for waste treatment facilities to $2.5 billion a year for 5 fiscal years and extend the standards program to all navigable waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3941

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3941, to provide civil penalties for the use of lead-based paint in certain dwellings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 762

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on Wednesday the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) on behalf of a number of Senators, submitted amendment 762, to H.R. 17548, to appropriate the full authorization of $2.3 billion for urban renewal.

Inadvertently the names of Senators BAYH, CANNON, GORE, HARRIS, HUGHES, and KENNEDY were omitted as original cosponsors.

On behalf of the Senator from Michigan, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, those senators be added as original cosponsors to amendment 762.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 8, 1970, at 10 a.m.