United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—*Monday, July 13, 1970*

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

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

Almighty God, who hast made all things for man, and man for Thy glory, consecrate us at the beginning of this new week, that what we think or speak or do may be for the betterment of this Nation, the improvement of all mankind, and the hastening of Thy coming kingdom. Deliver us from self-seeking and self-serving, from impure motives and unworthy actions. Keep us pure in motive, fair in all our dealings, and firm in our faith in Thee.

Teach us, O Lord, what the past has to say to the present about the future. May we cherish all that is holiest in our heritage, and welcome all that is healthiest, redemptive, and wise in the present. Guide us through the vexing problems of these perilous days to an era of lasting peace and world brotherhood.

In the name of Thy Servant-Son who went about doing good. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I make any requests, I am sure it is with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) and the Republican leader that I express my gratification, my happiness, and my delight that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) is occupying his chair as the President pro tempore this morning.

He adds light and substance to this Chamber.

He looks exceedingly well. I cannot tell you how happy we are that you are back, sir.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield, I should like to concur. I agree so often with the majority leader but never more heartily than in the sentiments he has just expressed.

The distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate adds the qualities of judgment and balance to this body which are often needed.

We are immensely pleased to see him back, looking so well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, may I add, with grace and dignity as well.

Mr. SCOTT. Grace and dignity, indeed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). The Chair would like to thank the majority and minority leaders for the kind and gracious statements they have just made.

He is greatly touched, and only wishes that he deserved such encomiums.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 10, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a time limitation of 3 minutes therein.

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

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair now recognizes the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) for 20 minutes.

LET SANITY PREVAIL—BRING THE BOYS HOME

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, nearly 20 years have elapsed since there was need for American combat troops to remain in South Korea.

Many months ago I began speaking out in the Senate in favor of withdrawing all American combat troops from Korea. On June 29, less than 2 weeks ago, for the last time I urged in this Chamber that all of these GI's be returned to the United States without further delay. The fact that the Pentagon will remove one of the two U.S. divisions—about 25,000 of the 60,000 American soldiers, airmen, and other combat troops—is a sign of a step in the right direction. Any influence that my statements may have had on this decision is a source of pride to me.

However, even after these troops have been withdrawn from South Korea, approximately 35,000 American combat troops remain there. This represents some 60 percent of our current strength.

Pentagon officials have not gone far enough. Except for a few advisers and observers, all of our troops should be withdrawn from South Korea as soon as possible. By that I mean before the end of the present year.

Twenty years have passed since American soldiers and soldiers of Turkey and other friendly nations were engaged in combat in Korea. Today, there are more than 60,000 American fighting men stationed in South Korea, most of them along the demilitarized zone close to the 38th parallel separating South Korea and North Korea.

Mr. President, in the first 5 or possibly 10 years following the Korean conflict there was some justification for our continuing a strong military presence in South Korea. It was obvious that the armed forces of South Korea at that time would by themselves have been unable to repel a second attack from the north.

At this time the situation is entirely different. Were the North Koreans to launch an attack against South Korea the armed forces of our client or satellite country—South Korea—should be able to repel that invasion and without additional aid from our Government.

We have continued our presence in Korea far longer than necessary. The

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

South Koreans are now capable of defending themselves.

The fact is that today South Korea has a regular army of 550,000 men, the fifth largest standing army in the world. North Korea has a standing army of but 350,000 men. There are 17,000 men in the South Korean Navy and only 9,500 in that of North Korea. South Korea has 30,000 men trained as marines while North Korea has none. In addition, the reserve forces of South Korea number more than two million men who drill at least twice a week. North Korea has a reserve force of but 1,200,000 men. The Republic of Korea—ROK—standing army and reserves are well equipped with the most modern weapons.

The only category of arms in which North Korea excels South Korea is in its air force of 25,000 men and 590 combat aircraft. The South Korean Air Force is composed of 23,000 men with 215 combat aircraft. Officials of the South Korean Government have stated that plane for plane and airman against airman they have the power to defend their country.

Mr. President, South Korea is the only nation in the world that provides substantial armed forces to assist us in Vietnam. More than 53,000 Republic of Korea soldiers are now fighting in Vietnam alongside our forces. According to our military experts, they have fought well and hard. Many have been killed and wounded in combat. The famed ROK Tiger Division has earned the respect of its allies and foes as have other units in the ROK armed forces now in combat in South Vietnam.

In October 1965 in Korea the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) and I had the honor to visit the Tiger Division in the field and observe them march in review shortly before they left for Vietnam. Of course, these troops were transported to South Vietnam on American ships and planes and are maintained there entirely at the expense of American taxpayers. South Korea, in reality a client nation of the United States, was given hundreds of millions of dollars in addition to military and economic assistance as a quid pro quo for helping maintain the Saigon militarist regime of Thieu and Ky in power.

Since 1951, the United States has given more than $3 billion in military assistance to South Korea. In addition, we have given $4.6 billion in economic aid to that country. Its increasing prosperity is in large part a result of our help.

Mr. President, I had the opportunity to visit all areas of South Korea. I visited with our officers and men along the 38th parallel near Panmunjom, and elsewhere, and saw for myself the hard conditions under which they live during their tour of duty. At that time nearly 5 years ago I expressed my views that we should not have such a sizable number of American fighting men defending the border separating North Korea from South Korea.

Furthermore, South Korea with 31,200,000 people is twice as populous as North Korea with its 13,300,000 people. Its economy is now booming and the degree of its economic growth is tremendous as compared to that of North Korea, a poverty stricken, backward nation.

President Nixon has pledged to withdraw another 50,000 American troops from South Vietnam in the next few months. Hopefully, all U.S. troops will be out of Southeast Asia within a year and our involvement in that civil war in Vietnam will be ended.

At that time, and it should be much before then, the 53,000 South Korean troops in South Vietnam will also be returned to their homeland. There cannot be any justification whatever for our continuing to station thousands of young Americans in South Korea. They should be returned home immediately even before the return of ROK forces from South Vietnam.

South Korea undeniably has now sufficient military, naval, and air power to defend itself against any possible attack from the North Koreans. In the very unlikely event of that occurring, our warplanes stationed in Japan and Okinawa but a few minutes flying time distant from North Korea could readily come to the assistance of the South Korean Air Force, if that assistance were required.

Mr. President, surely it cannot be claimed that the United States has a mandate from God to police the entire world. Now, after all these years, we should bring out all of our Armed Forces from South Korea. It is a form of foreign aid that we have maintained this huge force in Korea throughout all the years from the end of 1950 to the present time.

We should withdraw all our Armed Forces from South Korea this year and at the same time proceed without delay to end our involvement in all areas of the Indochinese empire. Southeast Asia is 10,000 miles distant from our sphere of influence. May sanity prevail at the White House and Pentagon. May we bring the boys home from Southeast Asia—all of them within a year at most. Then give top consideration to our grave needs at home which have been neglected.

MORE MADNESS IN MAINTAINING THIEU AND KY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on July 6 the Nixon administration announced a new aid program to the south Vietnamese military regime of General Thieu and Air Marshal Ky. This new program will supply 47,300 tons of canned food as well as materials for the construction of 100,000 housing units for South Vietnamese soldiers and their families to be completed within 5 years. This expenditure will total $100 million. Sweat on, American taxpayers.

That South Vietnam is facing serious economic problems is undeniable. Morale in the South Vietnamese Army has gone down and further down due to the critical shortages of dwellings for soldiers and their families. Already the streets of Saigon have been marked with violence from disabled veterans seeking housing and other aid, and the veterans have begun erecting miserable shantytowns on private and government property. The cost of living during 1969 rose 50 percent.

Mr. President, no one denies that these problems are indeed serious. However, President Thieu demanded $212 million from the United States and without delay. He hinted that the policy of Vietnamization would fail if such aid were not forthcoming immediately. Apparently the Thieu-Ky dictatorship claims that the United States is a bottomless well of giveaway programs for their regime. Apparently they feel that we have not yet done enough for them, that any demand they make cannot be refused.

How much more can we do for this military regime, Mr. President? In fiscal year 1970 the Saigon government received $365 million in economic aid from the United States through the Agency for International Development. That represents 20 percent of the total amount of this country's foreign aid for that fiscal year, and is greater than the total amount of foreign aid since 1946 to 87 different countries in the world—including 15 in Latin America. Furthermore, in the last 6 years in addition to economic aid the United States has spent $115 billion on the war in Southeast Asia to support the Saigon militarist government. In 1969, that was $600 from each American family to support the war, 23 cents out of each tax dollar. This is not counting the 50,000 American GI's who have died in battle or the nearly 300,000 wounded, many maimed for life.

Is it to maintain General Thieu and Air Marshal Ky in power and to uphold their imprisonment of political prisoners crowding them in stone tiger cages in Con Son, and brutally torturing them, that 50,000 Americans have been killed?

No one can justly claim that the United States has failed to aid the South Vietnamese. No one can say we have not gone the extra mile in South Vietnam. We have given more of ourselves than anyone could have or would have expected.

President Nixon vetoed appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and he vetoed appropriations for hospital construction. He did so because he said these expenditures would be inflationary. The administration requested funding for the food-stamp program far below what is necessary to fulfill the promise of that vital program. The administration calls for sacrifices, patience, and asks that programs of crucial interest be curtailed or canceled. Why, then, this new $100 million giveaway of our taxpayers' money for the Thieu regime? The Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that the United States will need 26 million housing units in the 1970's in order to provide decent houses for all Americans, and $100 million would pay for more than 10,000 units here at home, but is $100 million given to the Thieu dictatorship less inflationary than the same amount used on desperately needed programs in this country?

Very definitely, Mr. President, this new giveaway to the Saigon regime represents an expense that the American people should be spared at this time. This should not be tolerated. No one is suggesting that the United States run from those who need our help or return to isolationism. However, the time has come to begin to exercise careful control over giveaway programs such as this one. Domestic priorities and the state of our own economy require that this type of assistance be denied.

Mr. President, it is particularly important to note that many of the U.S. officials in our embassy in Saigon were opposed to this new economic grant. They regard this proposed gift as a move aimed toward insuring the reelection of the Thieu-Ky dictatorship next year. Soldiers on active duty and veterans constitute the largest single voting bloc in South Vietnam, and Thieu and Ky could gain many votes from this bloc by building houses for them. Certainly the housing shortage is critical, but why should the U.S. Government use its foreign assistance programs to help insure the election of its own chosen dictators? General Thieu and Air Marshal Ky had the support of our CIA when they overturned the duly elected civilian government in Saigon.

Furthermore, this new $100 million gift is being made with absolutely no conditions attached, another reason many officials in our embassy in Saigon opposed it. No requirement is being made that the Thieu government make any attempt at economic reforms. In the past 2 years, economic assistance to Saigon has been linked to the willingness of the South Vietnamese Government to increase taxes and make urgently needed reforms to bring their lopsided economy into balance. Suddenly, this policy developed by the Agency for International Development and carefully followed by our own officials has been abandoned for direct, no-strings-attached gifts.

Mr. President, the Thieu-Ky regime proclaims loudly and at some length their willingness to institute the needed reforms. They now say, however, that they will have to wait until next year, after the election, because the undeniably harsh measures required might lose some votes. Apparently, the Nixon administration has decided to help the Thieu regime avoid working to solve the serious economic problems facing South Vietnam. Perhaps the reforms will be made next year, perhaps not.

The needed reforms will not be popular and it will take courage to institute them. The Saigon government needs to increase taxes on the rural population; it must control the large number of imports of luxury goods; it must increase the reliability of its own tax base—the income tax is now being almost totally ignored and avoided. In addition, the Government must institute stringent measures to control the staggering escape of domestic capital—already between $1.5 and $2 billion has been surreptitiously taken from South Vietnam and has been deposited in Swiss banks in unlisted accounts, and more is removed every day for secret bank accounts in Hong Kong and Taiwan.

Mr. President, the economic crisis is rapidly becoming the most serious threat facing South Vietnam. The Saigon government must make the necessary economic reforms if it is to avoid a slide into total chaos and anarchy. Apparently, the Thieu regime will avoid making the reforms as long as possible, and now it seems clear the Nixon administration is willing to permit this in order to insure the reelection of that regime. It is not the officials of the Thieu-Ky dictatorship who are being hurt by the shortage and inflation in South Vietnam; it is the peasants, the soldiers, the working people of the towns and cities. The ultimate success or failure of a democratic, non-Communist government for South Vietnam rests with these people, not with the Thieu-Ky military clique. Encouraging the Thieu-Ky dictatorship to avoid meeting the economic challenges facing South Vietnam is a sure guarantee that South Vietnam will continue to be a source of instability in the future.

It is evident that this militarist Saigon regime would be overthrown within a week if the United States, including our CIA, would withdraw altogether the support which all along has maintained them in office. The present serious rioting of disabled soldiers and clashes with the military in the streets of Saigon offers evidence that the Thieu-Ky regime lacks public backing and support. It has just about run its course.

Within the very near future I predict that this flamboyant Air Marshall Ky will suddenly leave the country and rendezvous with his unlisted Hong Kong and Swiss bank accounts.

NIXON: NO RETREAT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, that Presidential decision to invade Cambodia, President Nixon's recent statements regarding Indochina, our extended involvement in fighting in Southeast Asia, and increased bombing in Laos and Cambodia dramatize the dangers of permitting this immoral, undeclared war to drag on with no end in sight. Americans must face the serious risk that another horrendous mistaken effort, similar to the invasion of Cambodia, will be attempted in order to achieve a decisive military victory. Who knows what the Joint Chiefs of Staff who seem to be running things will advise next.

President Nixon has done no more than pay lipservice to the idea that diplomatic negotiations and withdrawal of our GI's lead to the paths to peace in Southeast Asia. His main concern appears to be the achievement of victory in a war that is really unwinnable. He appears to like to display a tough posture. The President has warned that he would proceed with "strong and effective measures" if Hanoi does not lie down and play dead now that American combat troops are out of Cambodia.

President Nixon and his military advisers should have learned by now that escalation simply does not work. We have dropped more tons of bombs on North Vietnam and Laos than we dropped on Germany and Japan in World War II. This bombing served only to strengthen the resolve of the North Vietnamese.

Incidentally our bombing has devasted more than one-fifth of the entire area of Vietnam and has killed more than 300,000 civilians, most of them women and children, and maimed many thousands of others.

We invaded Cambodia to drive the North Vietnamese from the border sanctuaries and principally, it was proclaimed, to find and destroy COSVN, the so-called huge headquarters of the VC and North Vietnam forces. When this was not accomplished Nixon administration leaders said this headquarters was mobile, and was moved away due to advance intelligence that was leaked to the VC. Hence it eluded them, they alleged. Now the VC and North Vietnamese control more than half of Cambodia. Escalation will not end the Indochina war. The way to end our involvement in that war is to bring all of our fighting men home now.

Mr. President, an outstanding journalist, Clayton Fritchey, has written an enlightening column regarding President Nixon's recent foreign policy announcements. This column, which appeared recently in the New York Post and other leading newspapers, deserves the attention of Senators, and of all those who are concerned about our expanded involvement now throughout all Indochina. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

NIXON: NO RETREAT

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon has had his say about his Cambodian action. And, in rebuttal, his critics have had theirs. So now the question is: where do we go from here?

It is a sobering question, for in all probability the answer—based on past performance and on conditions, just restated by the President—is that the worst is yet to come. The signs suggest that the next major development in the broadened Indochina war will be another dangerous escalation, this time perhaps beyond the point of no return.

This may sound ominous, but it is no more ominous than the exposed position which Nixon has consigned the U.S. to in the months ahead, for, as he implies, our future military action will be determined more in Hanoi than in Washington. Under Nixon's terms the initiative will rest with the enemy.

This is the policy that got us into Cambodia. Last Nov. 3, and on subsequent dates, the President, in discussing his plans for troop withdrawal over an indefinite period of time, put himself on the spot by warning Hanoi that if it made any new moves he would "take strong and effective measures to deal with the situation."

Thus, when the President determined that the enemy was making threatening moves in Cambodia, he felt compelled, as he said, to make good on his ultimatum. Else, he insisted, the U.S. would seem like a "pitiful, helpless giant," and become "a second-rate power." So, showing Hanoi and the rest of the world that he couldn't be trifled with, he sent the troops into Cambodia.

On the basis of his latest television appearance, it must be concluded that Nixon has learned little or nothing from that experience. He has appointed David Bruce as the new Paris peace negotiator, but this is a gesture. Like Harriman and Lodge before him, Bruce is an able diplomat; but what matters are his instructions and the real intent of the President.

On his recent appearances on the tube, it was only too apparent that Nixon's pockets, so to speak, were bulging with pearl-handled pistols, a la Gen. Patton. And again he made himself the prisoner of a fresh ultimatum when he warned that he would strike again if Hanoi stepped up offensive operations after the U.S. left Cambodia.

So now the future depends on whether Hanoi lies low and does nothing for the next few years, or whether like any normal foe, it exploits opportunities that may arise, such as, for example, seizing most of Cambodia, overrunning Laos, or reactivating the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam.

It is a good guess that the U.S. reaction will not be another invasion of Cambodia, but a new bombing offensive against North Vietnam, with no holds barred, including knocking out the port of Haiphong, regardless of hitting Russian ships.

Those who believe that Nixon is engaged in a "great retreat" (an "elegant bug-out") camouflaged by alleged feints like Cambodia, have not been listening to him carefully. It is true he oftens talks about peace, but the dominant theme in nearly every speech is that he is "going to end the war." Not end U.S. involvement, mind you, but end the war, which is a very different matter.

The President, of course, could end U.S. involvement tomorrow, but there is no evidence that he has the power to end the war itself in the foreseeable future. It may go on for 20 years, with or without U.S. participation, but mostly with, if Nixon remains President.

At the time U.S. troops were sent into Cambodia, Admiral Smedberg quoted the President as saying, "I am not going to let Cambodia go down the drain." Since then, Vice President Agnew has said that "America's cause" is a "non-Communist future for Southeast Asia."

And Nixon himself says he would rather be a one-term President than "accept the first defeat" in U.S. history. In short, his real aim is not disengagement, but some kind of a "win," no matter how long it takes or how much it costs in men and money.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 30 minutes.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Last Wednesday afternoon's Washington Daily News contains an item on page 7 which reads as follows:

SENATORIAL WRATH

Senator Barry M. Goldwater publicly chided Senator William Proxmire for lowering the wall of secrecy surrounding a new Pentagon weapon which uses electronic sensors, *laser* beams and computers to direct enemy movements.

The story appeared in other newspapers, as well.

The original source of that news item is a statement which the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) made on the Senate floor last Tuesday in supporting an amendment which would abolish the draft.

This is what the Senator from Arizona said as it is printed on page 22902 of the RECORD for July 7, 1970.

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 on 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.

IMPROPER INFERENCE

The clear inference from the statement of the Senator from Arizona is that I had made public or released what was previously secret or classified information. After referring to the electronic battlefield as "so highly classified that even the Armed Services Committee has not been able to hold hearings on it," the Senator from Arizona stated that I had "sprung" the information. I think there is no other inference that can be made from that statement but that I had improperly made public what was otherwise secret and classified information.

The Washington Daily News certainly reported it that way. On the basis of what the Senator from Arizona actually said, I cannot gainsay the Daily News for the way it reported the statement.

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S STATEMENT WAS INCORRECT

But I am here to say now, that the statement was wrong and that the Senator from Arizona was wrong. I did not "spring" any classified or secret information. I did not "lower the wall of secrecy" surrounding the electronic battlefield. The Senator from Arizona was entirely incorrect in his statement and the inference which the press drew from his statement.

NO SECRET OR CLASSIFIED SOURCES

Not one single word I uttered was from any source other than open public sources. As a matter of policy, I refuse to receive or to accept classified documents and information. And I can say truthfully that no member of my staff who worked with me in developing the data for the speech I gave last Monday on the electronic battlefield, either saw or used any classified information about that project.

I think that both the statement which the Senator from Arizona made on the floor of the Senate, and the inferences which not only can be drawn from it but which have been drawn from it, are so serious that I have notified him of the speech I am giving now and I will ask him when I finish my speech today to make a public withdrawal of his statement and to deny the inference which has been drawn from it.

Not only do I want to make this statement denying that any classified documents were used for my speech, but I want to detail precisely where I got the information which formed the basis of my speech.

SOURCE WAS GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S PUBLIC SPEECH

First of all, there was the speech which General Westmoreland made before the Association of the U.S. Army last October 14. It is a gold mine of information. Not only did I use it as a basis for my speech but numerous reports and quotations from it appeared in the public press. They were in the January 31, 1970, issue of Business Week and the February 16, 1970, issue of Product Engineering.

The Business Week article quotes General Westmoreland as saying that—

The Army has undergone in Vietnam a quiet revolution in ground warfare—tactics, techniques, and technology. This revolution is not fully understood by many.

The February 16 issue of Product Engineering quotes General Westmoreland as follows:

On the battlefield of the future, enemy forces will be tracked and targeted almost instantaneously through the use of data links, computer-assisted intelligence evaluation, and automated fire control.

Thus, the "automated battlefield"—which is the term General Westmoreland uses, or the "electronic battlefield," by which it is popularly called—has been mentioned repeatedly in public sources as a result of a public speech made by no less than General Westmoreland himself.

DATA PUBLISHED BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

That speech gives a great deal of information about the electronic or automated battlefield. Not only did General Westmoreland make that speech. Not only was it a public speech. But it was even published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It was introduced into the RECORD on October 16, 1969. And the Senate and the public may be surprised to know that it was none other than the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) who introduced that speech by General Westmoreland in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The heading read, "New Developments in Ground Warfare." It was introduced with the following words—and I quote the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, during the course of the hearing before the Committee on Armed Services, we learned of a number of new developments in ground warfare which were not sufficiently enough developed to be contained in this year's authorization.

I have seen a number of these devices in operation and I am very enthusiastic about what these will do for our ground forces and eventually, because the theory can be applied to all forces what we will accomplish in the field of intelligence of the economy (sic) for the entire military.

On October 14, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, addressing the Association of the U.S. Army, gave a broad brush of the impressing, interesting, and exciting possibilities in the new aproaches to intelligence and support. The paper, naturally, did not get into the subject in great detail, but I can assure Senators that if they are interested in what the Army of the next decade will look like and how it will function, they can get a fine beginning knowledge by reading the general's outstanding discussion. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 115, pt. 22, pp. 30348–30349.)

BIZARRE SITUATION

In these circumstances, Mr. President, it is not only wholly incorrect but somewhat bizarre that the Senator from Arizona should claim that the Senator from Wisconsin had "sprung," so to speak, the secret of classified data that there was such a weapons system as the electronic battlefield.

If anyone "sprung" this information about the electronic battlefield, it was the Senator from Arizona himself. It could be said that he sprang it last October. It was not because I "sprung" it that last Tuesday he was free to mention it, as he said on the floor. He was free to mention it because General Westmoreland had made a major speech about it last October, because the Senator from Arizona placed that speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and because of repeated and detailed references in nonclassified public sources to this weapons system.

NO IMPROPER USE OF INFORMATION

But in fairness to the Senator from Arizona, I do not charge, and I urge no one else to charge, that he has improperly revealed secret or classified information. That would be as unfair an inference about him as his statement was about me.

OTHER PUBLIC SOURCES

It may be that what the Senator from Arizona is really complaining about is that information originally developed for the use of the dues-paying members of the military-industrial complex has been drawn to the attention of a majority of the Members of the Senate.

In addition to General Westmoreland's speech, the two articles to which I have already referred give a vast amount of information about the electronic battlefield.

The Business Week article gives us information on the following subjects dealing with it. It tells us how much has been spent and the estimate for its total cost. It gives information about how the project has grown over the last few years. It mentions the kinds of sensors needed and the general components of the system. It lists the major contractors. It goes into the kinds of problems which are being encountered. It tells who was in charge of the project; namely, Lt. Gen. John D. Lavelle of the Defense Communications Planning Group. It gives data on early budgets. It gives details about the Army program, the Integrated Battlefield Control System (IBCS), and some details about the organization and problems it has faced. It gives data about testing, some of the Vietnam experience, and the Army's hopes to have more of the equipment in Vietnam by the end of the year.

BUSINESS WEEK, PRODUCT ENGINEERING—DMS

This is all public information. It is to be found in detail in Business Week for January 31, 1970. Similar information is to be found in Product Engineering for February 16, 1970. Even greater detail is to be found in McGraw Hill's DMS Market Intelligence Reports—a public document for November 1969.

An article by Lt. Gen. Harry W. O. Kinnard entitled "Narrowing the Combat Intelligence Gap," published in Army magazine for August 1969, gives a great deal of information, especially concerning STANO, one of the key components of the electronic battlefield. The Defense Industry Bulletin for March 1970 contains a seven-page article by Brig. Gen. Wilson R. Reed, USA, in which he discusses automation, the Army Computer Systems Command, and the electronic battlefield.

The fact is that there is far greater detail in these public sources than it was possible for me to use in my speech. I ask unanimous consent that these articles as well as the speech by General Westmoreland be published in the RECORD at the end of my speech.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. In addition, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech I gave in the Senate last Monday and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, also be printed in the RECORD along with these public sources in order that anyone can compare my speech with the information which General Westmoreland and others have made public.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

$2 BILLION SYSTEM—NO SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I repeat what I said on Monday. Here is a new weapons system on which at least $2 billion has already been spent. Its ultimate cost is estimated to be as much as $20 billion. Yet, no public hearings have been held on it. The Congress has never "authorized" it in any specific or deliberate fashion. It is not a line item in the authorization bill. Most Senators did not even know about it. When I brought it up, I was accused wrongly as I have shown overwhelmingly, of "springing" classified or secret information. It is a weapons system which must rely on the most complex electronic equipment—the cause of the overruns and delays in weapons systems and the shocking waste in weapons systems to date. In addition, it may well be an indiscriminate weapons unable to distinguish between friend or foe, combatant and civilian.

For all these reasons it should be subjected to the closest public and Senate scrutiny. There is no reason why $2 billion should have been spent on it without proper and public authorization.

FOOT IN DOOR TECHNIQUES

It is a classic example of the Pentagon's foot-in-the-door technique. It personifies the reasons why the military budget is out of control.

This system may ultimately turn out to be a useful system. It may modernize warfare. But Congress and the public have a right to know what we are buying and what billions are being spent for. For that reason, without ever looking at or using any classified information, I raised that point in the Senate on Monday.

ASK SENATOR TO WITHDRAW STATEMENT

I ask the Senator from Arizona, whom I notified of this speech, to withdraw the statement he made last Tuesday and the inference attached to it that I had sprung any classified or secret information now making it possible for him to mention this subject.

In view of the circumstances, I believe that is a course of action which he should now take.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS BY GENERAL W. C. WESTMORELAND, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, ANNUAL LUNCHEON ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 14, 1969

I always welcome the opportunity to address those who support this Association . . . I know I am among friends who are vitally concerned about our Army.

Our Army today is a dynamic organization undergoing change to stay abreast of a rapidly changing technology and society.

In our adult lifetime many of us have witnessed change unequalled in history—the jet airplane, nuclear power, television, and the computer—to name a few. And the social change that *should have* come within the last century has been our legacy to accomplish in our generation—*now*.

As an integral part of our changing society, the Army has also been challenged to meet those demands. We in the Army accept the challenge . . . just as we have accepted and met all our challenges in the past.

Today our Army is weathering a period not too unlike others in our proud history.

Today once again the fundamental principles of our profession—the pillars of discipline on which an Army is built—the trust and confidence that have traditionally motivated the soldier are being questioned. We cannot this time wait for a call to action. The problems that we must address exist within our own ranks . . . we share them with the entire Nation. With our troubled society questioning the role of the Army more than ever before, each soldier in a position of leadership is on trial . . . both his character and his integrity are being tested. To meet the test, he must stand on his principles . . . his personal and professional code of ethics, his dedication, his leadership. These are the principles that resolve the crucial . . . these determine the worth of a man's life. These are the hallmarks of the professional soldier in his finest tradition.

The U.S. Army has served its country proudly. It continues to respond to legally constituted executive authority. But the American people also must understand that their Army does not exist to fight without something to fight for. Our Armed Forces on the international scene are as necessary for the security of our country as our domestic police forces are necessary for law and order at home. Our Army can only be as effective as the spirit of its soldiers. And certainly this spirit is sparked by public trust, support, and confidence.

The Army is as dedicated now as it has been for nearly two centuries . . . dedicated to the preservation of our way of life. In guarding this trust, we have never failed. What more could a country ask of its soldiers?

Recently, a few individuals involved in serious incidents have been highlighted in the news. Some would have these incidents reflect on the Army as a whole. They are, however, the actions of a pitiful few. Certainly the Army cannot and will not condone improper conduct or criminal acts—and I personally assure you that I will not. We will always regard the rights of the individual and acknowledge due process of law. But the Army as an institution should never be put on trial as we deal with the few.

We are a proud Army. We do have confidence in our officers, noncommissioned officers, and soldiers who continue to provide the Army and the Nation with the selfless devoted service that has always been our cherished tradition.

This year, I take special satisfaction in addressing this audience—for I know you are dedicated to the maintenance of a strong, modern Army through military-industrial-labor-academic-scientific cooperation. This team provides the Armed Forces with the best equipment science and technology can produce. This cooperative effort is an element of national power that must never be eroded.

For this reason, I will focus now on purely military matters . . . on developments that are of special interest to this audience.

I will proceed on the assumption that neither the Congress nor the Nation wants us to lay down our shield of armed readiness. On the contrary, our citizens continue to demand from us the best military forces possible within the resources made available to us. This is a fair and demanding challenge which we accept.

In meeting this challenge, the Army has undergone in Vietnam a quiet revolution in ground warfare—tactics, techniques, and technology. This revolution is not fully understood by many. To date it has received only limited attention. Analysis of the lessons from this revolution will influence the future direction of our Army both in fundamental concepts of organization and development of equipment.

When the first American units were committed in Vietnam, they were to a large extent a reflection of the organization, tactics, techniques, and technology of World War II, with one noteworthy exception. That exception, of course, was best demonstrated by the 1st Air Cavalry Division. For the first time, an Army unit of division size had been organized and equipped to free itself from the constrictions of terrain through the use of battlefield air mobility. The concept and resultant organization were logical outgrowths of the development of sturdy, reliable helicopters for troops carriers, weapons platforms, command and control, aerial ambulances, and reconnaissance vehicles and larger helicopters for carrying artillery, ammunition, and supplies. Even before the arrival of American combat troops, the effective use of the helicopter had been demonstrated in the support of the Vietnamese. I am confident that the vitality of air mobility is recognized and understood by this informed audience.

We learned that Vietnam posed a problem even more difficult than mobility. The enemy we face in Vietnam is naturally elusive and cunning in his use of the dense jungle for concealment. As a result, in the early days of the American commitment we found ourselves with an abundance of firepower and mobility. But we were limited in our ability to locate the enemy. We were not quite a giant without eyes, but that allusion had some validity. Whenever we engaged the enemy, we won the battle. Too often those battles were at enemy initiative and not our own. Too often battles were not fought because the enemy could not be found or because, after initial contact, he had slipped elusively into the jungle or across borders politically beyond our reach . . . or had literally gone underground.

Since 1965 a principal thrust of our experimentation, adaptation and development in tactics, techniques, and technology has been toward improvement of our capability to find the enemy. Each year of the war witnessed substantial improvement. In 1965, 1966, 1967, and early 1968 we increased the number of both air and ground cavalry units. We added a second airmobile division. As our troops arrived, we progressively organized special reconnaissance elements of all kinds, including long-range patrol companies and special forces teams. We found ourselves more and more using the infantry for the purpose of finding the enemy. When the enemy broke down into small units, we did likewise. We learned to operate skillfully at night. We mastered the enemy's ambush techniques. Technical means were reinforced and improved. Intelligence organizations were expanded and refined.

During this period, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering urged the scientific community to develop a new family of sensors and associated communications equipment to help locate enemy forces on infiltration routes. After proving these devices workable in test, we developed plans in 1967 to use them throughout the battlefield. In mid 1968, our field experiments began. Since then, we have integrated these new devices with the more conventional surveillance equipment and other intelligence collection means. As a result, our ability to find the enemy has improved materially.

Comparing the past few years of progress with a forecast of the future produces one conclusion: we are on the threshold of an entirely new battlefield concept.

Now let me briefly examine the past and relate it to the future.

The Napoleonic Wars are well documented in history texts. Firepower was limited. Mobility was limited essentially to the foot soldier. Support services were provided by contract or foraging. Cavalry, scouts and pickets provided intelligence. This chapter of military history is replete with numerous examples of battles that might have been . . . had the opposing forces known of each other's presence. But when forces made contact, they massed to do battle. At Waterloo, for example, over 140,000 troops crowded into less than three miles of front line contact.

A little over a century later, World War I brought trench warfare. The advent of the machine gun and massed artillery introduced sizeable increases in the firepower capabilities available to ground forces. Mobility and support efforts experienced little change. Maneuver on the battlefield was almost nonexistent. Only a few visionaries saw any real utility in the tank. Primitive aerial observation brought only marginal improvements in intelligence gathering. The density of troops in the front line, reduced from that of Waterloo, still remained high as soldiers crowded shoulder to shoulder in their network of trenches. Without mobility and information about the enemy, the newly acquired firepower served little purpose.

World War II saw the tank mature, and armies organized to capitalize on this capability. Mobility began to gain on firepower. While the Navy was developing sonar and air elements proceeded with intercept radars, Army target acquisition systems remained essentially at the World War I level. The wheeled vehicle improved our support effort. But we were still confined to the ground with our airlift capability remained minimal.

The increased mobility, however, did permit combat elements to disperse over a wider front, and the density of troops along the battle lines became smaller. Still, the absence of a refined intelligence capability permitted only small economies of force.

But the Vietnam War has seen a revolution in ground force mobility. We no longer assign units a sector of frontage. Instead, units are responsible for an operational area. And with the mobility of the helicopter, units like the 1st Cavalry and the 101st Airborne Divisions cover hundreds of square miles with their airmobile blankets.

The revolution I envision for the future comes not from the helicopter alone, but from systems that heretofore have been unknown.

For a moment, let us consider the basic combat role of the Army. As the Nation's land force, our mission is to defeat enemy forces in land combat and to gain control of the land and its people. In this role, we have traditionally recognized five functions. But we have emphasized only three: mobility, firepower, and command and control—in other words—move, shoot, and communicate. To me, the other two—intelligence and support—have not been sufficiently stressed. Placing the functions in proper perspective, I visualize the Army's job in land combat as:

First, we must find the enemy.

Second, we must destroy the enemy.

And third, we must support the forces that perform the other two functions.

By studying operations in Vietnam, one can better understand these functions.

Large parts of the infantry, ground and air cavalry, and aviation are used in what I will now call "STANO"—surveillance, target acquisition and night observation, or function number one—finding the enemy. In this function large areas can be covered continuously by aerial surveillance systems, unattended ground sensors, radars and other perfected means of finding the enemy. These systems can permit us to deploy our fires and forces more effectively in the most likely and most productive areas.

The second function—destroying the enemy—is the role of our combat forces—artillery, air, armor, and infantry, together with the helicopters needed to move the combat troops. Firepower can be concentrated without massing large numbers of troops. In Vietnam where artillery and tactical air forces inflict over two-thirds of the enemy casualties, firepower is responsive as never before. It can rain destruction anywhere on the battlefield within minutes . . . whether friendly troops are present or not.

Inherent in the function of destroying the enemy is fixing the enemy. In the past, we have devoted sizeable portions of our forces to this requirement. In the future, however, fixing the enemy will become a problem primarily in time rather than space. More specifically, if one knows continually the location of his enemy and has the capability to mass fires instantly, he need not necessarily fix the enemy in one location with forces on the ground. On the battlefield of the future, enemy forces will be located, tracked, and targeted almost instantaneously through the use of data links, computer assisted intelligence evaluation, and automated fire control. With first round kill probabilities approaching certainty, and with surveillance devices that can continually track the enemy, the need for large forces to fix the opposition physically will be less important.

Although the future portends a more automated battlefield, we do visualize a continuing need for highly mobile forces to surround, canalize, block or otherwise maneuver an enemy into the most lucrative target.

The third function includes an improved communication system. This system not only would permit commanders to be continually aware of the entire battlefield panorama down to squad and platoon level, but would permit logistics systems to rely more heavily on air lines of communications.

Today, machines and technology are permitting economy of manpower on the battlefield, as indeed they are in the factory. But the future offers even more possibilities for economy. I am confident the American people expect this country to take full advantage of its technology—to welcome and applaud the developments that will replace wherever possible the man with the machine.

Based on our total battlefield experience and our proven technological capability, I foresee a new battlefield array.

I see battlefields or combat areas that are under 24 hour real or near real time surveillance of all types.

I see battlefields on which we can destroy anything we locate through instant communications and the almost instantaneous application of highly lethal firepower.

I see a continuing need for highly mobile combat forces to assist in fixing and destroying the enemy.

The changed battlefield will dictate that the supporting logistics system also undergo change.

I see the forward end of the logistics system with mobility equal to the supported force.

I see the elimination of many intermediate support echelons and the use of inventory-in-motion techniques.

I see some Army forces supported by air—in some instances directly from bases here in the continental United States.

In both the combat and support forces of the future, I see a continuing need for our traditionally highly skilled, well-motivated individual soldier . . . the soldier who has always responded in time of crisis—and the soldier who will accept and meet the challenges of the future.

Currently, we have hundreds of surveillance, target acquisition, night observation and information processing systems either in being, in development or in engineering. These range from field computers to advanced airborne sensors and new night vision devices.

Our problem now is to further our knowledge—exploit our technology, and equally important—to incorporate all these devices into an integrated land combat system.

History has reinforced my conviction that major advances in the art of warfare have grown from the Fullers and Guderians—men who detected, in the slow, clumsy, underarmed, largely ineffective tanks of World War I, the seeds of the future. Between the two World Wars, they foresaw with clarity the blitzkrieg of armored and panzer forces that introduced a new dimension to ground warfare.

More recently, Generals Howze and Wheeler and the late Lieutenant General Bill Bunker conceived air mobility long before the machinery existed to fulfill the concept. Today we witness both the airmobile concept and the airmobile division proved in Vietnam.

We are confident that from our early solutions to the problem of finding the enemy, in Vietnam the evidence is present to visualize this battlefield of the future . . . a battlefield that will dictate organizations and techniques radically different from those we have now.

In summary, I see an Army built into and around an integrated area control system that exploits the advanced technology of communications, sensors, fire detection, and the required automatic data processing—a system that is sensitive to the dynamics of the ever-changing battlefield—a system that materially assists the tactical commander in making sound and timely decisions.

To achieve this concept of our future Army, we have established, at the Department of Army Staff level, a Systems Manager, Brigadier General Bill Fulton, to coordinate all Army activities in this field. We have done this because of problem complexity. We are dealing with systems that are fundamental to the Army—its doctrine, its organization, and its equipment. We are on the threshold for the first time in achieving maximum utilization of both our firepower and our mobility. In order to succeed in this effort, we need the scientific and engineering support of both the military and the industrial communities.

To complement the systems management, we are establishing at Fort Hood a test facility through which new equipment, new organizations, and new techniques can be subjected to experimentation, adaptation, evaluation, and integration. This facility will be headed by Major General Jack Norton who will report to the Project Director, Lieutenant General Bev Powell, III Corps Commander and Commanding General, Fort Hood.

Hundreds of years were required to achieve the mobility of the armored division. A little over two decades later we had the airmobile division. With cooperative effort, no more than 10 years should separate us from the automated battlefield.

Some will say that this is an unrealistic expectation. Some will say that the current experience in Vietnam, in which the infantry continues to bear the brunt of combat, does not support this visualization of the future. History tells another story. The experience and technology at the time of the British Mark IV tank at Cambrai in 1917 and the H–34 helicopter in the fifties provided the evidence to define the future of these systems.

I believe our future path has been clearly blazed.

We will pioneer this new dimension in ground warfare and develop an integrated battlefield system. The United States Army will again lead the way. Our young officers and NCO's will accept the challenge.

[From Business Week, Jan. 31, 1970]

THE PENTAGON PLAYS ELECTRONIC WAR GAMES

In the jungles of Vietnam, at Fort Hood, Tex., in military and industrial laboratories in the U.S. and West Germany, and at dozens of other locations here and abroad, the Pentagon has been secretly experimenting with a new concept of warfare.

General William C. Westmoreland, Army chief of staff, calls the concept the "automated battlefield." More commonly, it is known as the "electronic battlefield." By any name, it is nothing less than an effort to develop a totally new method of waging war at the footslogger's level. To date, the effort has been hidden within myriad programs of the three services. Thus far, $2 billion has been spent, and costs may soar to $20 billion in the next decade.

Out of the spending will come exotic new sensors—seismic, acoustic, infrared, radar, and others—to detect enemy movements over huge areas. Strikes will be made through use of data links, computer-assisted intelligence evaluation, and automated fire controls. And GIs will get costly electronic gear to help them find and fight the foe.

Soldiers on the front lines are already applying electronic battlefield techniques. General Westmoreland touched on this in a speech before the Assn. of the U.S. Army last Oct. 14: "The Army has undergone in Vietnam a quiet revolution in ground warfare—tactics, techniques, and technology. This revolution is not fully understood by many."

CONSOLIDATION

Now the diffuse concept is emerging more clearly as the Pentagon attempts to whip it into an understandable whole. Today, hundreds of systems for surveillance, target acquisition, night observation, and data processing are being used by or developed for all the services. And scores of contractors are working on them.

Covering a wide spectrum of projects are such companies as RCA, Westinghouse, Hughes Aircraft, Honeywell, General Electric, and ITT. Some, like Barnes Engineering, Sandia, and Texas Instruments, are working on such specialized devices as "intrusion alarms." Others, such as Varo, Inc., of Garland, Tex., and AeroJet-General, are developing night vision optical equipment.

Out of all the technological effort, two big problems have emerged:

Projects are becoming too many and too big to be buried within the three services' separate budgets as attempts to improve battlefield reconnaissance. Congressmen are probing for wasteful duplication and demanding that the program be brought into focus.

Technology, especially of systems to collect battlefield data, is now so advanced that further research is needed to make use of it. Almost certainly, entirely new tactics and troop organizations will have to be developed, and elaborate computerized command and control centers will direct them.

The Pentagon has set up the mechanism to coordinate projects and eliminate duplication under its electronic battlefield program. Lieutenant General John D. Lavelle of the Air Force is in over-all charge of the work. He heads a task force called the Defense Communications Planning Group. Secrecy cloaking most electronic battlefield projects, however, still makes it hard to follow their costs and judge how effectively they fit together.

GROWTH

Even the titles of many projects are classified. However, McGraw-Hill's DMS Industrial News Service has figures on how some of them have grown. In fiscal 1967, the Defense Dept's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) budgeted $3.5-million for sensor studies, and two years later the annual appropriations for electronic battlefield research topped $80-million. Then, as the armed forces placed orders for equipment developed and tested in the preceding two years, appropriations for procurement rose to $524-million.

For fiscal 1970, DMS estimates, $78.5-million has been approved in this area for R&D and $214.1-million for procurement. But either figure may increase through reshuffling of Pentagon funds before the fiscal year ends.

Says Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., the Pentagon's director of defense research and engineering: "We may well be on the verge of providing complete, realtime battlefield surveillance around the clock." But putting such information to full use will require command and control centers able to keep track of friendly, as well as enemy, forces. Companies such as Litton, Motorola, Otis Elevator, and HRB-Singer are deeply involved in developing the centers. But, in addition, special new troop formations may be needed just to handle complex electronic field equipment.

FIELD TESTS

The Army is tackling this problem on several fronts. This year, infantry and tank units will take part in full-scale battlefield experiments at Fort Hood, Tex., called Project Master. The aim is to develop an Integrated Battlefield Control System (IBCS), where computerized control systems could make use of data from the new sensors.

Going into IBCS will be Army experience in earlier and much more limited projects: Tacfire, a computerized tactical fire control system developed in the last three years, and TOS, a tactical operations system that was tested in Germany and demonstrated in December. Computerized equipment used in TOS will be shipped from Germany to Fort Hood this spring.

SENSORS THAT CAN SEE IN THE DARK ARE CHANGING THE WAY ARMIES FIGHT

The Army's Combat Developments Command also has run small-scale tests of the new tactics, weapons, and troop organization at the Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation in California. Now the Army is trying to decide who will get its expensive night-fighting devices—all fighting men or only certain units. To help get an answer, it is testing "limited action forces"—small units heavily equipped with sensors and special communications gear—in Hawaii and other training grounds.

A prototype picture of the electronic battlefield already exists in a limited way. In Vietnam, the Army is using more than a dozen new night vision devices as well as other types of sensors. These include infrared sensors, light-amplifying telescopes, and seismic detectors to monitor enemy movements for more than a mile around allied bases.

Some of this equipment, largely untested, was rushed into use two years ago during the siege of Khesanh, and hundreds of air strikes were directed against targets identified by sensing.

In the not too distant future, says the Army, airmen and infantry will work closely together, their tasks coordinated by control centers like those the Army and Air Force are trying to develop. For low-level strafing, the Air Force this year will try to build up to a total of 100 heavily armed, slow-flying "gunships" with amplified television, radar that penetrates jungles, and screens that display both radar and infrared images of what lies ahead of the plane. Bendix, Emerson, Itek, and Admiral are among companies working on these systems.

The Army also wants to put less weighty detection equipment aboard its Huey combat helicopters, built by Textron's Bell Helicopter Co. At least 16 companies are engaged in building or developing multisensored aircraft and helicopter systems, including Grumman, Fairchild Hiller, IBM, LTV, Martin Marietta, and Northrop.

To achieve surprise in reconnaissance, the Army and Marines, who fly at rooftop level, want more than a dozen Lockheed YO-3 "quiet" airplanes with several new sensing systems aboard. The YO-3s will whisper over the enemy and detect his presence before the planes are spotted. And the Air Force wants to quiet the turbojet Beech King executive aircraft, fit it with larger, more elaborate sensors and viewing equipment, and use it at about 17,000 ft. altitude.

In their efforts to get even quieter and more stable observation platforms for surveillance, military men are even looking into balloons. And Dr. Eberhardt Rechtin, director of ARPA believes that an unmanned, armored and sensor-equipped helicopter can be used to spot targets for the artillery. He expects to have such a helicopter operating within two years.

Ordnance. Many of the munitions that tie in with the concept of remote-controlled warfare will be in Vietnam by the end of the year. Among companies involved in their development are General Dynamics, Raytheon, and Sylvania. Already in use are shells, rockets, and bombs packed with hundreds of deadly, nail-like steel darts. And the Army is stocking up on a new type of tracer bullet that shows up only on night-vision equipment and thus avoids disclosure of a gunner's position.

Electro-Optical Systems is delivering to the Air Force kits that will convert conventional bombs to laser-guided weapons. Other companies at work on laser applications include Philco-Ford and Perkin-Elmer. This year the Air Force will begin to air-drop vast numbers of land and water mines that will detonate when anyone comes close to their sensors.

In a project related to air-dropped mines, the Air Force already has equipment to sow tiny, rugged "intrusion detectors" across vast stretches of land. Under a program called "College Eye," these high-flying U.S. aircraft are able to pick up concentrations of enemy activity. To aid in the subsequent attack, bombers carry TV cameras that can amplify light from the moon and the stars tens of thousands of times, thus allowing around-the-clock visual bombing.

The huge mass of information that such developments will make available may be the biggest problem in the electronic battlefield. As Lieutenant General George S. Boylan, Jr., deputy chief of staff for Air Force programs, says: "Our capacity to obtain information is continuing to increase more rapidly than our ability to reduce it to usable intelligence."

———

[From the Product Engineering, Feb. 16, 1970]

ELECTRONIC BATTLEFIELD DRAWS SCRUTINY ON HILL

(The Pentagon has never given Capitol Hill a full view of the total elements and costs of the electronic battlefield. This is the year Congress puts defense under surveillance.)

Congressmen this year will discover they have been trapped again into financing another multibillion-dollar military development program while learning almost nothing about its overall size, cost, or future defense implications.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Army Chief of Staff, calls it the "automated battlefield." Others call it the "electronic battlefield." Others call it the "electronic battlefield concept" because it requires vast amounts of electronic equipment, including:

Manned and unmanned airplanes, helicopters, and "drone" aircraft to locate, shoot, and bomb enemy forces by day and night.

Highly-amplified "image generators" to give daylight-clear television, infrared, and radar pictures of the enemy at night or in bad weather.

Whole families of acoustic, seismic, and magnetic devices to detect voices, footfalls, guns, and trucks of enemy troops.

Airborne and ground-based radars capable of detecting moving targets in thick jungle, rain, or fog.

High-powered lasers to illuminate targets with visible and invisible energy and to guide bombs, rockets, and anti-tank weapons.

Night telescopes, gunsights, binoculars, and goggles—for individual soldiers—that amplify starlight and moonlight up to 40,000 times.

Possibly millions of tiny "button bomblets" that give a sonic or radio signal to remote receivers, pinpointing the position of a soldier who steps on them.

Ground and air computers, communications links, and other devices to give enemy position data, TV images, and photos to central Army, Navy, and Air Force command centers.

Elaborate electronic command and control displays that pull together all data gathered by the electronic network and automatically show troop movements over vast areas of terrain.

Radar beacons worn by soldiers to help separate friend from foe.

"On the battlefield of the future," says Gen. Westmoreland, "enemy forces will be tracked and targeted almost instantaneously through the use of data links, computer-assisted intelligence evaluation, and automated fire control."

Congress in the dark. This whole new concept of warfare began as a modest R & D project to improve the night-moving, jungle-fighting enemy in Vietnam. Now Congress will discover the program has grown as expensive as the cost overrun on the C5-A jet transport, as advanced as the Main Battle Tank (MBT), and as complicated as the canceled F-111 electronics system. Army, Navy, and Air Force developers have spent nearly $2 billion in less than four years, according to McGraw-Hill's DMS industry news service.

Congressmen will also discover that potential campaign contributors from industry know more about the program now than does Congress, the taxpayers, and perhaps the President. Early in January, more than 800 defense contractors—nearly twice that number were turned away—jammed the National Bureau of Standards' auditorium for a classified briefing on the program's future. All the reports and predictions of the meeting were classified. For awhile, the Defense Dept. and the National Security Industrial Assn. considered releasing a speculative report on what might happen after 1980; but the paper, by retired Marine General F. P. Henderson, was pulled back into the "secret" category.

Only bits and pieces of the overall program emerged during last year's lengthy Congressional examination of defense budget and through a few industry-oriented pronouncements by defense officials. Those bits and pieces, however, give a fascinating picture of future warfare.

FLUSHING OUT THE ENEMY

One part of the picture is growth. In 1970, the Air Force will acquire the capability to sow land-mines and rugged, tiny seismographs across vast stretches of trails and mountain passes, through valleys, and around suspect Viet Cong assembly points. Under a program called "college eye," the Air Force apparently can monitor "blips" of activity in the neighborhood of these and other sensors while flying high above a suspect area. Television cameras capable of amplifying starlight and moonlight tens of thousands of times are being installed on B-52 bombers to make bombing possible around the clock.

Marine, Army, and Air Force troops are getting ground-based, light-amplifying telescopes, infrared sensors, and seismic detectors to monitor movement through jungles surrounding their bases.

This year the Air Force will try to have nearly 100 low, slow-flying "gunships" equipped with a variety of sensing equipment and armed to swoop down on trails and enemy camps with fast-firing guns and cannon. Amplified television, jungle-penetrating radar, forward-looking radar and forward-looking infrared images on TV-like screens in the cockpits will enable the pilots to follow their foe anywhere.

SILENT SURVEILLANCE

The Army, doing much of the same thing for its helicopters, received a severe setback last year when Lockheed's swift and powerful Cheyenne helicopter flunked its pre-production tests. Now the Army wants to put less weighty equipment aboad its Bell-built combat helicopters.

The Army and Marines, who fly at tree-top levels, have asked for dozens of Lockheed's YO-3 "quiet airplanes" with several sensing systems aboard. The Air Force, able to operate at 17,000 ft., wants to quiet the turbojet Beech King executive aircraft and fit it out with a larger, more elaborate suit of sensors and viewing equipment.

In their attempts to get even quieter and more stable observation platforms for battlefield surveillance, the military developers have been exploring balloons as observation vehicles. Dr. Eberhardt Rechtin, director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) for the Defense Dept., is spending nearly $30 million a year to advance sensor technology.

He has also demonstrated that an unmanned, Navy anti-sub helicopter armored and equipped with sensors can relay real-time combat reconnaissance information and help direct artillery fire on enemy targets. He expects to have an armed, operational version of the helicopter ready within a couple of years.

One more technique is being used in Vietnam to guide gunships, bombers, and helicopters to Viet Cong and North Vietnamese targets. "Hunter" aircraft, equipped with night-vision sensors, are zapping trucks, infiltrators, and boats with chemicals that glow in the dark. This glow remains visible for 10 to 15 minutes, plenty of time for heavily-armed "killer" airplanes and helicopters to swoop down for an attack.

Same game, new rules. This is the year the electronic battlefield concept will come under more intense scrutiny by Congress, because if it's going to be workable, it will require unification of battlefield communications, control, and command systems. All three services came under fire last year from the normally friendly House Appropriations Committee because of duplication and incompatibilities of computerized command systems already being developed in three services.

Even heavily-committed "hawks" will seek a fuller explanation of the Defense Dept.'s intentions, because the electronic battlefield concept, with its new weapons, requires fundamental changes in the way men fight.

For example, the Army faces a choice in how to equip its men. Should all soldiers receive the same equipment, making them equally capable of fighting by day or night? Another alternative being weighed: issuing all the special night combat equipment to only half the soldiers and dividing troops into daylight and night combat units.

A convert to the cause. By all accounts, the new sensors and night-fighting capabilities won their case with Gen. Westmoreland during the battle of Khe Sanh, besieged from January into April, 1968. Even though the Pentagon was not ready for field tests of much of the equipment, every type of sensor aid that could be fielded was brought into use, nearly six months ahead of the formal start of field tests. Hundreds of air strikes were directed against targets identified through ground and airborne sensing equipment.

"Khe Sanh made a believer in air power out of Westmoreland," said an officer who was on his Saigon staff during the battle.

Another application very useful in the Vietnam type of combat involves deploying a whole family of so-called "leave-behind" devices. This relieves some of the military's frustrations over engaging in heavy combat for territory that must be abandoned after the battle. Now when the enemy soldiers move back into an area, their movements are targeted through automatic equipment that relays data to nearby U.S. headquarters.

Problems vs. promises. Moving to electronic battlefield equipment poses problems despite its promises. For instance, it exposes highly sensitive technology to the roughest treatment. One hopeful infrared night-observation device for use over medium-range distances failed to develop properly and has been abandoned.

The multiplicity of sensors may also be giving the military too much data. Lt. Gen. George S. Boylan, Jr., Deputy Chief of Staff for Air Force programs and resources, says, "Our capacity to obtain information is continuing to increase more rapidly than our ability to reduce it to usable intelligence."

Both the Army and the Air Force are working on computerized control centers that can stand up in rugged field environments and help sort out significant events. The Army plans 26 division tactical operations systems (DIVTOS) for command and control functions, a development effort that will cost hundreds of millions of dollars over several years.

Keeping up with the Joneses. To complete development, the military must overcome objections to the proposed electronic battlefield as a menace to civilians. A few Congressional critics point out that most of the sensors can't discriminate between friend and foe, or animal and women and children. And in such primitive parts of the world as Vietnam, whole village may be wiped out or immobilized by seeding wide areas with air-dropped explosive devices designed to kill anyone who ventures into their neighborhood.

However well the military defends its electronic battlefield programs in Congress this year, the U.S. is well-launched into another escalatory R & D race with China, Russia, and their allies. Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., director of Defense Research & Engineering, believes Russia has a massive infrared sensory capability and should have wipespread use of image-intensified television by 1975. By the very nature of its air-dropped, unattended use, much of the latest U.S. sensing equipment moves back up the Ho Chi Minh Trail to military scientists in North Vietnam, Russia, China, and their allies. The U.S. defense industry must move fast to keep ahead of the Joneses. (1.28; 7.61) *Warren Burkett, McGraw-Hill World News, Washington.*

WHO'S GETTING ELECTRONIC-BATTLEFIELD CONTRACTS

Command control centers: Litton Industries, Computer Development Corp.

Image-intelligence control centers: Motorola, Raytheon, HRB-Singer, IBM, Otis Elevator, Philco-Ford, Cubic Corp.

Low-light-level television (LLTV), including laser illumination: RCA, Westinghouse, Textron, Philco-Ford.

Sound, heat, metal, and smell "intrusion alarms" for surveillance on land and water: General Electric, Sanders Association, Honeywell, Magnavox, Hazeltine Corp., Texas Instruments, Kaiser Industries, Dorsett Electronics, Sandia Corp., Westinghouse, Sperry Rand, Barnes Engineering, Hughes Aircraft, Sylvania.

Night-vision optical equipment: Varo Inc., Machlett, Electrospace Corp., Kollsman Instruments, RCA, Phillips, General Electronics, Itek Corp., Aerojet-General Corp., Polan Industries, Avien Inc., ITT-Aerospace, Canadian Commercial Corp.

Other hidden-surveillance lights and devices: Ling-Temco-Vought, Varo, Electrospace.

Laser illumination and attack systems: RCA, Perkins-Elmer Corp., Philco-Ford, Electro-Optical Systems, Hughes Aircraft.

Anti-mortar, target locator, and man-carried radar: General Dynamics, Texas Instruments, Admiral, RCA, Sperry Rand, Gray Mfg. Co., Cutler-Hammer, ITT-Gilfillan, Emerson, General Electric; also MIT-Lincoln Labs, Syracuse Univ., and Univ. of Michigan.

Airborne hunter-killer infrared and radar systems: Texas Instruments, HRB-Singer, Itek, Bendix, Admiral, Motorola, Hughes Aircraft, Emerson.

Multi-sensored aircraft-helicopter systems: Bell Aerospace, Radiation Inc., IBM, Grumman, Fairchild-Hiller, Lockheed, General Electric Northrop, Ryan, Aerojet-General, Gyrodyne, Martin-Marietta, Hughes Aircraft, Honeywell, Ling-Temco-Vought, Beech Aircraft.

Quiet aircraft: Curtiss-Wright Corp., Bolt Beranek & Newman.

Guns, bombs, mines, and shells for night-fighting systems: Honeywell, General Electric, Raytheon, Sylvania, General Dynamics.

[From the DMS Market Intelligence Report]

ELECTRONIC BATTLEFIELD

DESIGNATION

Electronic Battlefield; Army designation Surveillance, Target Acquisition and Night Observation (STANO); Formerly Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals, Practice Nine, Double Eagle, Igloo White and various other nicknames.

DOD PROGRAM

Research and Development, Procurement, Air Force, Army, Navy.

EXECUTIVE

Air Force Systems Command, Aeronautical Systems Div., Wright-Patterson AFB, Dayton, Ohio. Bomblets; mines, airborne equipment procurement.

Electronic Systems Div., L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass. SEAOR-62 procurement.

Rome Air Development Center, Griffiss AFB, Rome, N.Y. IR, radar, airborne & ground sensor equipment R & D.

Army Material Command, Washington, D.C. Overall Army program manager.

STANO Systems Manager (STANSM), Office of Army C-in-C, Washington, D.C. R & D, procurement for STANO.

Mobile Army Sensor Systems, Test, Evaluation, and Review, (MASSTER) Project Officer, Ft. Hood, Tex. STANO (Army) equipments T & E.

Defense Communications Planning Group, Washington, D.C. Overall program management.

Naval Air Systems Command, Washington, D.C. Sono and aquabuoys; DCPG support.

PRIME

(See Electronic Battlefield CONTRACTORS Report).

STATUS

Advanced Development, Engineering Development; Procurement.

MISSION

Provide a variety of sensors for surveillance, including electronic battlefield surveillance, perimeter defense, target acquisition.

TYPE

Acoustic, seismic, IR, magnetic, RF sensors, radar, LLTV, and laser detectors; aircraft; ordnance (including some laser-guided bombs); anti-personnel mines; bomblets to trigger sensors, bombs; night vision devices; target acquisition sensors.

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1970	1969	1968	1967
R.D.T. & E.:				
Air Force	15.0	[1] 20.0	15.0	9.0
Army	[2] 14.0	[2] 10.0	10.0	20.8
Navy	[2] 6.0	9.7	20.0	16.0
DCA	14.0	15.0	20.6	[2] 20.0
ARPA	[3] 29.5	14.4	17.2	[2] 10.0
Total	78.5	69.1	[4] 82.8	75.8
Procurement:				
Air Force	71.4	43.3	5.8	[2] 5.0
Army	129.5	468.7	300.0	162.9
Navy	13.2	12.0	2.4	24.7
Total	214.1	[5] 524.0	308.2	192.6

[1] Air Force reprogramed $19,100,000 of fiscal year 1969 request.

[2] Estimate; fiscal year 1970 Army funding for STANO.

[3] ARPA's fiscal year 1969 advanced sensors funded $13,500,000 for SEA relating to the dyemarker/muscle shoals and an estimate of $15,000,000 of the fiscal year 1970 request is for identical purpose to extend the barrier concept to the "electronic battlefield" concept.

TIMETABLE

Program study initiated: mid-1966.

Defense Communications Planning Group organized: late CY66.

Program initiated: Sept. 1966.

Initial funding: FY67.

Barrier partly operational: Dec. 1967.

Original "barrier" concept discarded: FY69.

Army STANO Systems office established: July 1969.

Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals concept re-oriented to "Electronic Battlefield": FY 70.

Sensors development & production to continue: thru 1970s.

GENERAL

Electronic Battlefield is the designation currently applied to reconfigured segments of the "McNamara Wall", or "electronic fence" in SEA, managed by the Defense Communications Planning Group (DCPG) created in late CY66 to direct the tri-service program. Designated in CY66 as the result of a study as Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals and until CY69 by various other nicknames (Practice Nine, Igloo White etc.) the program was to furnish a sophisticated barrier between North and South Viet Nam to stop North Vietnamese infiltration. Heavy procurement as well as construction effort was begun, but saw a drastic re-orientation during CY68, and the program under the new designation is now continued toward the objective of creating what DOD calls "the electronic battlefield." The original FY67 funding of the program was $3.5 million. After creation of the DCPG, the three services quickly upped funding to several hundred times that by reprogramming and use of emergency funds. The total RDT&E and procurement funding from FY67 through FY69 has been variously put at $1.6 billion and $2.0 billion. Of that figure used at Congressional hearings in FY70, DMS has identified $1,535.1 billion allocated for RDT&E and procurement by the three services, the

Defense Comunications Agency (DCA), and the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) from FY67 through FY70. The total refers to funds specifically allocated to the DCPG. But other funds are involved (ammunition buys, for example) and increase overall appropriations to the cited Congressional total of $1.6 billion through FY 69.

The electronic fence effort began in mid-1966 with a study, under the administrative sponsorship of the Institute of Defense Analysis (IDA), and led to the creation of the DCPG in Sept. 1966. The DCPG could be considered a DOD agency, although its role involves only modest in-house R&D, and allocation of funds appropriated by the services to specific R&D and procurement efforts. The DCPG does no contracting. This is done by appropriate agencies of the three services. The IDA study examined enhancement of ground and air functions in SEA to stop or reduce infiltration. The result was the concept of the "McNamara Wall", which has been abandoned except for some minor portions. Its follow-on relies on R&D done for the wall, but in concept it differs considerably. Touted by DOD as "the electronic battlefield", responsibility for R&D and procurement of equipments is assigned now to the services on a "segment" basis, corresponding to requirements of air and ground forces for battlefield surveillance, intrusion detection, base defense, correlation of intelligence, as well as the resulting requirement for command/control of reaction.

The shift from a "wall" of Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals concept to the Electronic Battlefield has led DOD to a reevaluation of the service's role in the concept managed by DCPG, although FY70 funding of services supports the overall effort directed by the special agency. The first to demand a role for itself involving its entire R&D and procurement structure is the Army. In July, 1969, the service created a Surveillance, Target Acquisition and Night Observation (STANO) program with a STANO Systems Manager (STANSM) directly in the Office of Chief of Staff, Army. In addition, it created Project MASSTER, an acronym for Mobile Army Sensor Systems Test, Evaluation and Review, with a PO at Ft. Hood, Tex. Creation of STANO has apparently taken away from the Combat Developments Command the short-range goal of development and production of Electronic Battlefield equipment, but the long range goal of validating requirements of equipment, doctrine and integration of developed equipments will remain with CDC. The long-range mission will continue to be performed by Task Force Riposte, whose creation preceded STANO.

The creation of STANO by the Army indicated that developments for the McNamara Wall in Viet Nam for the specific purpose of halting or reducing infiltration from the north, are now used in Viet Nam to create an Electronic Battlefield in that war theatre. More importantly, the current effort indicates that the wall concept has led to the Electronic Battlefield idea for application to other situations and conflicts.

The efforts of the three services overlap to some extent, but provision of R&D and procurement indicates some delineation: the Army is working in battlefield surveillance sensors, anti-personnel mines (along with the Air Force), and the entire range of ground-emplaced sensors; the Air Force effort is devoted to two areas, airborne emplacement of sensors, their monitoring, and base defense alert equipment; and the Navy and Marine Corps are almost exclusively working in the areas of land sonobuoys, as well as aquabuoys placed in Viet Nam waterways and coastal areas.

The service efforts include:

Air Force: The service is involved in two inter-related programs: support of the Electronic Battlefield through emplacement of sensors, anti-personnel mines, monitoring of sensors through communications/command/control, and in development of centrally-monitored airbase security systems.

The AF requested $189.0 million in FY70 for sensors RDT&E, with $15.0 million allocated. The breakdown of the $19.0 million request into six areas included: design changes and modifications to aerial emplaced intrusion detection devices, $0.7 million; development of radar, radio and visual devices for accurate emplacement and location of sensors, $1.0 million; data collection, $1.5 million; data processing changes to ground terminal equipment which receive sensor information from airborne relay vehicle (EC-121R), $8.0 million; testing at AF Flight Test Center, $6.5 million; and follow-on development of new equipments in ECM, delivery of sensors at high airspeed and improved accuracy, $1.3 million. Funds in the six areas are programmed through FY71, and none beyond. Efforts in the six areas are underway, with the exception of those designated "follow-on."

Developments completed by the AF since February 1968, excluding those to be completed during FY70—include for the DCPG:

Munitions: SUU-42/A dispenser, an externally mounted 8-tube unit for delivery of various types of sensors/flares from F-4 aircraft, completed RDT&E in March 1968 at a cost of $0.5 million (See DMS Ships/Vehicle/Ordnance binder for details); SUU-41 dispenser, a device dispensing the Gravel mine from high speed aircraft, completed development in April 1969, at a cost of $0.9 million; chemical weapon BLU-52, which is a BLU-1 napalm tank filled with riot control agent CS-2 used for area denial and harrassment, developed by April 1968 at a cost of $10,000; CBU-46 (consisting of SUU-7 and BLU-66), a jungle bomblet in 19-tube dispenser, completed RDT&E in February 1969 at a cost of $0.4 million; and CBU-42 (consisting of SUU-38 and BLU-54), which is the new 30-day Wide Area Anti-Personnel Mine (WAAPM), also known as Wampum, completing development in March 1969, at a cost of $6.4 million. Honeywell is prime on Gravel Mine, and received the WAAPM production contract (including the dispenser) of initial $24.9 million on a total contract of $49.8 million in November 1968. (Honeywell has recently asked for quotes from subs on a reported six million units). (See DMS Ships/Vehicles Ordnance binder O-Mines and O-Dispensers Bomb and Mine Reports for details).

Another new development is the Grasshopper pop-up RF triggered anti-personnel mine under development by GD/Pomona, with FY70 funding of $0.9 million, total RDT&E of estimated $2.2 million, and RDT&E completion in FY73. The program was initiated in FY70.

Communications/Command/Control: The AF completed development in Nov. 1968 at a cost of $2.0 million of the Deployable Automatic Relay Terminal (DART) for Commando Shackle, the surveillance system for the 3rd Corps Area in Viet Nam. DART is a transportable ground station with a single ADR antenna capable of receiving, processing and displaying data relayed through EC-121R, (SEAOR-62), or Pave Eagle drone sensor relay equipment, from sensor fields containing up to 150 units. DART is in operation with the Command Shackle relay, with the latter a single shelter containing EC-121R links. Three EC-121R aircraft are currently undergoing modification by LTV/Electro-systems to provide increased capability. Fiscal year 1970 AF procurement of $71.4 million (excluding $3.6 million for spares) is divided between the communications/command/control element with $20.0 million to provide DART relay and terminal stations, and $51.4 million to buy sensors.

Base Security: the AF is requesting $1.6 million, up from $1.0 million, for RDT&E of Base Security sensing devices, as well as for development of the Security Control Center which would co-ordinate and display information fed to it by Base Defense sensors, as well as those implanted by Army and Marine Corps units on the perimeter of an airbase. To procure tactical security support equipment for protection of 12 SEA bases, the AF in FY69 sought $12.3 million, and in FY 70, $13.0 million.

Equipment in six areas was under RDT&E in FY69; a composite seismic antenna loading detector (Seed); a wide area remote sensor system to detect intruders beyond the airbase perimeter; remote sensor data transmission network for channeling information to Central Security Station including communications under SEAOR-127; preliminary development of Central Security Station display; a discrimination analysis study to identify sensor stimuli; and continuation of work on Foliage Penetration Radar (FOPEN), of which two are under development. The interim sensor system for wide area surveillance; components of the remote sensor data transmission network; and a prototype of Seed will be procured during FY70.

Major Air Force hardware developed under previous budget funding include equipments in SEAOR-62, the College Eye EC-121R aircraft used by the AF to monitor sensor information; the family of foliage penetration battlefield surveillance radars (AN/PPS-5, AN/PPC-9, 10 and 11); acoustic sensors; the "people sniffer"; breakwire and laser detectors, and command/control centers monitoring sensor information. One of the few contracts identified as part of the SEA effort was an $5.8 million initial increment on a $11.7 million cost plus incentive fee letter contract to Radiation Inc. for development and production of airborne equipment reportedly for the EC-121 College Eye (SEAOR-62) aircraft. The equipment for relay of signals from ground senors to command/control centers is for Phase 3 of the program and involves the DART. IBM/Gathersburg is on Phase 3 computer programming and in Sept. 1969 received $2.1 million as definitization of a previously awarded letter contract. ESD issued both awards.

Army: The service in mid-1969 created a new program designated Surveillance, Target Acquisition and Night Observation (STANO), which appears to tie together experience gained in Viet Nam with the barrier to develop systems for the future evolving into the Electronic Battlefield.

All Army agencies from labs to commands, will contribute to STANO, with T & E performed at Ft. Hood by MASSTER. The range of Army effort to create an Electronic Battlefield in STANO will involve: night vision devices, surveillance aircraft (YO-3 included), personnel and equipment detectors, radars, ground sensors, photo equipment, optical equipment, and aural equipment electronic surveillance equipment, information transmission, identification and positioning devices and systems, and test, measurement and diagnostic equipment related to the systems and equipments.

MASSTER will provide the test bed for material evaluation of STANO development hardware and determinations on potential of commercial hardware. The test concept "as portrayed by the system assessment model will be developed," according to the Army, within the framework of what it has designated the Integral Battlefield Control System (IBCS), the closest anyone in DOD has come to giving a name to the "new" Electronic Battlefield as currently envisioned. (The IBCS is currently under study.) Two large systems under development, the TOS and Tactifire portions ADSAF, will be introduced into the MASSTER test system. The coordination of Electronic Battlefield activity by the Army in STANO, with its project manager in the Chief of Staff's office, is funded in FY70 at an estimated $14.0 million.

The Army's RDT&E funding in FY70 therefore supports STANO are not DCPG, although the other services in the current year identify their funds as supporting the agency supervising the Viet Nam Barrier. In addition, the Army in FY70 identified its Electronic Battlefield funding for procurement of $129.5 million, under the designation Duel Blade, which it said is a "barrier" equipment project, directly derived from Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals. Thus the Army is the first one to come full circle to begin development of the Electronic Battlefield, with its value apparently demonstrated by the McNamara Wall, despite the derision that concept received.

Navy: The service's RDT&E effort funding has declined since FY67 for DCPG. The Navy budget supports both its efforts, believed to be directed mostly at aquabuoys & sonobuoys, and those of the Marine Corps, which involve perimeter sensors. In succeeding years the service and the Marine Corps are expected to integrate DCPG sensor programs into regular roles and missions. Use of air-dropped sonobuoys, bought by the Navy and constituting the major share of its Naval Air Systems Command funding of $39.1 million for DCPG from FY67 through FY69, has been confirmed. The sono and aquabuoys used by all services on land and in water are produced by Sanders, Magnavox and others.

COMMENT

The Viet Nam program embodies in the Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals barrier authorized in Sept. 1966 has been terminated except for a minor segment, but the concept is alive, funded in FY70 and on its way to becoming what the Dept. of Defense Research and Engineering director now calls the Electronic Battlefield. The new description tells more than was apparent when the program was derided as the "McNamara Wall" and "Maginot Line East"—and that is that Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals was never a "wall", not even an invisible one of concealed sensors. More than half of its funding through FY69 procured ammunition—anti-personnel mines, the Gravel Mine, silent button bomblets to trigger sensors, the laser-guided bombs deployed in CY68, and other ordnance. Another large segment of funds bought specially equipped aircraft, vehicles and related equipment, with perhaps about 20 to 40 per cent of funds (varying with each service) buying what could be characterized as "electronic sensors." Additionally, total funds also paid for O&M and Military Construction. The Navy's expenditures from FY67 through FY69 provide a picture of the relationships: its total of $130.4 million directly supporting the effort of the Defense Communications Planning Group, elusive overseer of the Viet Nam program, show that the Navy spent $40.4 million for RDT&E; $28.1 million on procurement of aircraft and missiles (PAMN); $43.0 for other procurement (electronics); and $18.9 million for O&M.*

Procurement other than sensors—again, with the major support item ammunition—is reflected in Army contributions to DCPG. A major portion of the reduction in FY 69 funding for Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals from the requested $691 million (actual figure $680.2 million) to $524.0 million by SecDef Laird involved the buyout of the Gravel Mine with a reduction of $127.7 million in that fiscal year's Army budget for the Honeywell-produced item, as well as other ammunition items.

The shift to the Electronic Battlefield is more clearly reflected in the FY 70 budget requests. Of tri-service procurement budgeted in the request at $214.1 million, $146.9 million is for the range of sensors—acoustic, magnetic, RF, IR, seismic, as applicable to personnel, vehicles, and aircraft. This, however, does not mean that ammunition procurement has stopped. Beside specific DCPG funding, the services buy ammunition of various types under their ammunition budget item, for continued support of the "barrier."

Including FY 70 RDT&E and procurement funding, the Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals/Pratice Nine/Igloo White/Dual Blade/Electronic Battlefield program since its inception in FY 67 through reprogramming and other budget actions as well as specific funding for the DCPG, totals $1,535.1 million. This total, arrived at independently by DMS corresponds to the published estimates of $1.6 billion to $2.0 billion for the program. DMS believes, however, that its established total for RDT&E and procurement is low, since a number of ammunition items funded under their budget line items were procured for the "barrier," while they were not included in specific "barrier" funding. The O&M and MILCON funds are not included in the DMS total. Whether the specific—and still classified—program funding totals $1.5 billion or as much as $2.0 billion is of relative interest. There is no question that what began as the "barrier" concept has consumed huge sums (with all of RDT&E included in the SEA project designated PROVOST of which specific Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals RDT&E funding is part).

The question arises, "where did it all go?" A Senator offered the opinion during FY70 budget debate on the "barrier" funding that "I understand that much of the equipment sent over is rusting around Da Nang because the places where it was to be put are now occupied by the enemy." Bought on crash basis, mostly through unannounced contracts, equipment may indeed be "rusting around Da Nang", and as the result, DDR&E in FY70 is finally attempting to bring order into the battlefield detection and surveillance area. It therefore is pushing the Electronic Battlefield concept of rational sensor emplacement, and utilization of intelligence from them. Consequently, the high-dollar-yield fiscal years of indiscriminate Dyemarker/Muscle Shoals spending are over, foreclosing marginal equipments. The companies capable of foreseeing the possibilities of rational Electronic Battlefield development will benefit, and certainly the dollars to support the effort are included in FY70, and will be sought through the 1970s.

The development of the Electronic Battlefield is clearly the aim of the Army under STANO. The other two services apparently have not yet made an organizational shift to support of a STANO-like approach. Indeed, the Army's program includes so many items, that it too apparently will continue certain programs temporarily in FY70 as they were—especially in its night vision effort under SEA NITEOPS, identified as such in the FY70 budget (See Night Vision-Army Report.) But in FY71 SEA NITEOPS will be STANO. Although the Army has pulled together its Electronic Battlefield concept in STANO, the effort will be divided into a large number of items under various code names, already on its STANO list, with the latter classified. There are about 100 specific items listed.

[From Army magazine, August 1969]

NARROWING THE COMBAT INTELLIGENCE GAP

(By Lt. Gen. Harry W. O. Kinnard)

At the end of World War II, the Army made significant improvements in its firepower by developing several new weapons and munitions. In the early 1960s, it enhanced its mobility by adopting the helicopter and the airmobile concept. At the same time, great strides were made in command and control through improved communications equipment and automatic data processing. Support services, which include logistical services, have also been considerably modernized. However, in comparison to improvements in firepower, logistics, mobility and communications, the Army has lagged in developing the fifth element of land combat—intelligence.

The war in Vietnam has provided a stimulus for developing several devices used in detection and surveillance on the battlefield. Detection becomes a major problem in an unconventional war like the one in Vietnam. In conflicts of higher intensity it may well be the key to survival.

When I took the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) to the Republic of Vietnam in 1965, I knew that finding the enemy would be one of our toughest jobs. It occurred to me that perhaps we would be able to identify the guerrilla—a farmer by day and a fighter by night—by the dark circles under his eyes. As things turned out, one of our best means of intelligence was just about that unsophisticated, and terribly unnerving for our pilots. Pilots scouted the area in helicopters until the enemy revealed his presence by firing at them. Many major battles began in just that way.

Of course, the 1st Cavalry Division had other means of surveillance, ranging from foot patrols to electronic intercept and side-looking radars. We used them quite effectively but, in looking back, we see that our ability to find the enemy did not match our battlefield mobility and firepower. Since then, the gap has been narrowed somewhat by the development and use in Vietnam of devices such as the "people sniffer," the starlight scope and improved frontline surveillance radar.

But equipment alone does not necessarily improve the Army's capability. Devices used in surveillance and target acquisition must be matched with doctrine that prescribes their employment and a capability for processing information that will rapidly convert raw information into usable intelligence. The cycle is completed only when the resulting intelligence is transmitted and displayed to the troops who must engage the target or the enemy's forces. In short, our biggest job is to bring all the information gained through devices and human means into a system—including the front-line soldier—that gives the battlefield commander the intelligence he needs and in time for him to act or react.

The verbs *collect, process, transmit, display, act,* and *react* suggest the magnitude of the problem, which is not a new one. It is as old as the art of war. Nor are the recognition of the problem and our attempts to solve it new. Our army has come a long way since the days of the Indian scout, in both its ability to gather intelligence and its ability to react to it. Intelligence is a function in which the demand, and the development of the capacity to serve that demand, constantly stimulate each other and generate new and higher degrees of sophistication and capability. Today, we again face a great expansion in intelligence technology, an expansion that springs from a combination of new demands and technological developments.

During the past few years, several programs have been undertaken to meet the demands of our forces stationed throughout the world. These concern such diverse things as security of border barriers, the mobile army sensor system, and the orderly integration of the system of surveilance, target acquisition and night operations (STANO). Each of these has contributed to our capability.

At Combat Developments Command we recently set up Task Force Riposte to bring under a single effort within CDC the responsibility for planning and monitoring the integration in the Army of all devices used

*The total and individual Navy funding figures differ from those in the major funding table for this Report because the latter provides latest Navy figures.

in surveillance, night vision and target acquisition. Riposte's mission is to validate requirements for equipment, write doctrine for its use and place it within the Army's tables of organization and equipment (TOE). Riposte will also evaluate field and troop tests of devices and concepts.

Our approach to the task is through two major objectives. The short-range objective is to speed developments to meet the urgent needs of our forces in Southeast Asia. The longer-range objective is to provide improvements in the combat intelligence system for world-wide use that employs the most effective mixture of equipment for collection, data linkage, processing and display.

The principal aim in the short-range objective is to fill voids and gaps in the ability at any echelon to meet a combat commander's information needs, at the same time avoiding costly overlaps. First generation equipment, now rapidly entering the Army's inventory, is backed up with doctrine for its employment. This equipment includes improved radar, night vision devices and sensors which reveal the presence of the enemy through physical agents such as heat, light, pressure, sound motion and chemical or electro-magnetic variations.

Properly programmed, the short-range effort will enhance the longer-range plan to develop the needs for a second generation of equipment targeted for the Army up through 1985. Improvements in the first generation of materiel are clearly predictable in such features as weight range, reliability compatibility and automation. For the first time, these improvements offer the possibility that our forces will be able to carry out continuous operations, employing a full 24-hour combat capability, by extending the fighting into conditions of poor visibility and darkness at near-daylight effectiveness.

So far, much of the drive for development has come from our objectives to improve our defensive capability. The greatest potential value of STANO lies in exploiting its offensive capabilities as the means to gain decisive results in combat. Offensive operations allow the combat commander to retain the initiative; they give him the flexibility he needs to strike the enemy at his most vulnerable point in time and space. Further, by coordinating his collecting capabilities with his means of fire support, the commander can control areas that are not occupied by his troops—an application of the principle of economy of force.

Battlefield reconnaissance, essential as it is, can reveal only what is in an area up to the time a reconnaissance takes place. On the other hand, sensors placed in the same area by reconnaissance troops, or by other means, can give the commander permanent surveillance at a very low risk.

We realize that during our studies many human factors must be constantly weighed. Very real matters such as combat fatigue and psychological processes bear heavily, so we don't profess to have all the answers. Scientists can build many capabilities into equipment; only people can make use of those capabilities. That is why we feel that doctrinal considerations and developments must guide advances in materiel, not the opposite.

The situation of the Army is necessarily one of constant change. That is why we must constantly bring our doctrine up to date. At Combat Development Command we consider a doctrinal study to be one that translates and operational concept into a clearly defined tactically sound arrangement of material manpower and operational capability. A doctrinal study must have a valid objective and provide a solution to a problem. Desirability, it also provides guidance for budgeting in the programming of resources. Not only must we establish needs for materiel and manpower, including MOS training, methods of employment must be published in field manuals or other doctrinal literature, and the TOE must be worked out.

Many considerations enter into the organization for continuous operations. For example, is it advisable to organize and equip one unit for night operations, and another for daytime fighting, somewhat like the two-platoon system in football? We must remember, of course, that, unlike the gridiron, the battlefield has no sidelines that are safe from attack. Or might we enhance the soldier's powers of endurance through stimulants? I am not suggesting that either of these is a practical solution; I mention them only to suggest that there is considerable ground to be explored in human research.

Human actions in the intelligence function also offer a fruitful area for exploration. Our equipment can alert us to the presence of people, but it cannot tell us which side they are on. Blips on a screen can indicate presence and even numbers, but only humans can reveal intentions. Our ability to extract information from the enemy is still somewhat crude. Our combat elements are often confronted with opportunities to gather intelligence from prisoners or local inhabitants which are not fully exploited because of lack of interrogators whose knowledge of the language is good enough to unlock the needed information. This effort is also limited—and properly so—by international agreements. Human actions in intelligence can be modernized through the use of technology and better understanding and application of the behavioral sciences.

Drawing on our experiences of the past, we realize that advancements in firepower and mobility have come through newly developed materiel; however, a higher combat capability was realized only when the materiel was integrated with new concepts of operation, organization, training and logistical support. Thus we can conclude that the recent proliferation of equipment for surveillance, target acquisition, and night observation (STANO) offers an opportunity for significant gains in continuous operations and in the intelligence function of land combat.

The introduction of first generation STANO equipment into the conflict in Vietnam has been encouraging and has done a lot to narrow the intelligence gap. Likewise some of this equipment is proving useful in Korea, where infiltration from the north is a constant threat. These considerations were instrumental in the decision to create within CDC an agency to plan and monitor the integrated introduction of STANO capabilities into the Army. The principal means for developing these capabilities is a series of operational evaluations in the combat zones.

Concurrently, the U.S. Army Combat Developments Command's Experimentation Command is running a series of field experiments in the highly instrumented, controlled environment of Hunter Liggett Military Reservation, where soldiers and scientists are coming to grips with the problems.

Other agencies, such as Army Materiel Command's Test and Evaluation Command (TECOM), the Night Vision Laboratory, the Human Engineering Laboratory and the Behavioral Science Research Laboratory, are attacking various facets of the matter. The objective of this intensive and extensive testing of STANO is to produce or collect data on doctrine, organization, tactics, training and materiel.

These laboratory and field experiments will determine human performance, fatigue, operator selection and techniques, and technical support factors relating to STANO capabilities and developments. Continental Army Command will incorporate the results into a training program.

Under its charter, CDC is charged with integrating STANO capabilities into the present and future Army. Obviously, AMC and CONARC have a continuing part in this undertaking. Interactions among these three commands, as well as the overseas commands that are affected, are close and constant.

In viewing any new system, it is first necessary to determine the variables in the tasks to be performed. If the system is to be applied Army-wide, then it must be viewed in differing environments, at all intensities of conflict. In viewing the functions of combat, it appears that while STANO is oriented principally to the intelligence function, it also affects mobility, firepower, command and control and, to a lesser degree, the support services. Thus, we use a "program matrix," or mold, as a management tool. This places all elements of the system against the demands of task, function and intensity of conflict. Besides, no system can be viewed in isolation: its relation with other systems must be considered. For example, target acquisition subsystems linked through automation to the tactical fire direction system (TACFIRE) may significantly improve the accuracy and effectiveness of firepower. Surveillance and night operations subsystems logically would have an effect on the tactical operations system (TOS) to improve our means of disseminating operational information and intelligence. Ideally, a battlefield commander would have an accurate and contemporaneous display of the situation of the friendly unit and that of the enemy, including target intelligence and counterintelligence.

Even a partial listing of tasks would be lengthy, but within each level of conflict intensity, some tasks stand out. In conflicts of low intensity, characterized by much of the action in Vietnam, detection of enemy movements and positions in jungle terrain during darkness and poor weather is a formidable task. Also, identifying the enemy who mingles with and uses local people as a cover is very difficult. Current STANO equipment is improving our ability to do these tasks, and new materiel offers us the capability to overcome one of the greatest difficulties in that conflict.

In conflicts of medium intensity, like World War II and Korea, accurate intelligence of enemy means of delivering fire is desired in enough detail to permit their neutralization. Also, the positions and movements of enemy reserves from deep in the rear must be detected early, to permit interdiction and counter-maneuver.

In conflicts of high intensity, priority must go to locating and destroying enemy nuclear stockpiles and means of delivery. Besides, intelligence that will give some warning of a nuclear strike can permit our forces to take protective measures that will enhance their chances of survival.

The continued equipment of the Army with aircraft is greaty expanding the size of the area over which a commander must maintain surveillance. In past wars, battalions fought along relatively narrow frontages, and even our fastest mounted forces measured movements in terms of kilometers and hours. Today, with the mobility provided by the helicopter, our ground forces range over dozens of kilometers in minutes.

In our studies for the Army of 1970–75, it became apparent that intelligence capability had lagged behind the other elements of combat. Many of the materiel systems discussed in this and other issues of ARMY have resulted from attempts to close this gap. During the past two years, a concept of organization for combat intelligence has been studied, a modification of which was combat-tested by a combat intelligence battalion in the 1st Infantry Division in Vietnam.

This study, labeled Target Acquisition and Combat Surveillance in Vietnam (TACSIV III), served to validate or disprove many theoretical claims. One conclusion of the study is that perhaps a company-sized unit is needed in divisions to handle intelligence.

In brigades and battalions, smaller battlefield information centers are needed to help the S2 process, and to produce and disseminate intelligence. Future TOE will reflect these additions. This unit would furnish assistance needed by the division G2 and the brigade and battalion S2 by providing battlefield information control centers to coordinate the collection of information, to process and disseminate intelligence, and to furnish dedicated communication circuits.

Finally, the problems of surveillance, target acquisition and night operations have been recognized and many are well on the way to solution. These solutions will not come free, so we must carefully weigh the trade-offs. Far-reaching decisions must be made on how much of our resources of materiel and manpower should be expended to gain better and more timely information about the enemy. Solutions to many of the problems call for highly sophisticated and costly equipment, with the associated high cost in training troops. During our study we must weigh these factors and the relative merits and faults of trying to gain an improved intelligence capability at the expense of other needs. Our objective is a proper balance within the limits of our resources. I am convinced that a combination of technology and ingenuity will bring us to that objective.

[From Defense Industry Bulletin]

AUTOMATION—FORCE EFFECTIVENESS MULTIPLIER

(By Brig. Gen. Wilson R. Reed, USA)

Data systems are like weapon systems, only more so.

A system is far more than a mere complex of intricate equipment: It is a combination of machines, methods and men, organized to accomplish a mission.

The Army, which incubated the Electronic Numerical Integrator and Calculator (ENIAC) during World War II and, thus, introduced electronic digital computer technology to the world, came to an early understanding of this dictum, and is applying its understanding vigorously.

In March 1969, the Chief of Staff of the Army established the U.S. Army Computer Systems Command (CSC) and assigned to the command a scope of responsibility and a range of automatic data processing (ADP) action areas, that are broader than any ever before assigned to a single line command in the defense establishment. The Computer Systems Command is responsible for centralized data systems development, integration, and support of all multi-command automatic data processing systems. Its charter establishes the CSC commanding general as project manager over ADP systems for combat, combat support, and combat service support in a tactical environment, as well as over the entire spectrum of administrative systems which are required both within the continental United States and overseas, but which can operate within a conventional fixed-station installation. The command is, therefore, the central systems design and management agency for systems calling for development of new vehicle-mounted, militarized data processing equipment, and for systems using the same commercial computer equipment used by industry, universities and Government for the full range of scientific, management and process control systems.

The command is located within the Army and is internally structured to play a central role in the development of all four system components (mission, men, machines, methods). The command is dedicated to the principle that men and mission are by far the most important system components.

MISSION

System missions are defined by the top functional managers of the Army, by each of the Deputy and Assistant Chiefs of Staff, and by other agency heads of Headquarters, Department of the Army. To assure the proper interplay and collaboration between management need and technical response, the Computer Systems Command reports directly to the Army's Vice Chief of Staff, who maintains an Army Management Information Systems Master Plan. This plan establishes priorities within which all of the Department of the Army functional staff works to develop its management systems requirements. The Computer Systems Command works closely with these agencies to assure that thee management requirements evolve into a system mission statement, which takes full advantage of the advancing technology and which is fully understood by the system designers.

The Computer Systems Command is a worldwide organization, but its headquarters is located at Fort Belvoir, Va. Fort Belvoir is not only close to the offices of the Army's top managers in the Pentagon, but is also the location of Headquarters, Army Combat Developments Command. Thus, for all tactical systems and, especially, for combat and combat support systems, mission definition is greatly enhanced by the intimate collaborations between the personnel of these two commands.

MACHINES

System design is based solidly on system mission definition, and the design phase is characterized by continuous dialog between designers, managers, and combat doctrine specialists. Hardware-software tradeoff analysis is performed when system design has progressed to the point that machine requirement and computer programming requirements can be specified separately. Acquisition of machines is accomplished with the participation of two other Army agencies.

Materiel development is the responsibility of the Army Materiel Command, whose headquarters is also within a short drive of Fort Belvoir. Whenever new ADP equipment development is necessary, either to meet militarization requirements or to advance the state of the art beyond the off-the-shelf stage, the Army Materiel Command performs the equipment acquisition. When commercial equipment is required, the Army Computer Systems Support and Evaluation Command at nearby Fort Myer, Va., makes the equipment selection. Both of these commands work in response to equipment specifications set by the Computer Systems Command, and all procurement is executed through Army Materiel Command procurement offices.

METHODS

The methods component of each data system combines the manual methods for system operators and users, and the automated methods which are programmed into the computers. Once again, constant teamwork is performed to maintain full synchronization between user and management procedures, developed by the management agencies; and computer programs, data control, and operations procedures, developed by the Computer Systems Command. Often, the assistance of software contractors is engaged through the Army Materiel Command procurement offices.

MEN

As the systems design progresses, incorporating equipment development, computer programming, and standard operating procedures preparation, project personnel of the Computer Systems Command work closely with the Army Materiel Command, the Combat Developments Command, and the Continental Army Command to perform the necessary methods and skills analysis, and to determine the numbers and qualifications of personnel required to operate and use the systems.

Training of both user and operator personnel is performed by the Continental Army Command. To assist in the training process, the Computer Systems Command, working with the Combat Developments Command, provides:

Essential inputs to the establishment of tables of organization and equipment.

Systems documentation to serve as basis for training manuals and user and operator reference material.

Instructor training.

Assurance that plans of instructions are up to date with current versions of system design.

TYING THE SYSTEM TOGETHER

System integration is performed by the Computer Systems Command. Trained men and delivered equipment are brought together with the computer programs and all appropriate documentation by the command's field operations specialists. Command personnel supervise the knitting together of these elements into an operational system, and deliver the system to the ultimate customer, the field commander. Command personnel help the field commander to conver from his earlier procedures to the new system. A worldwide network of support groups and field assistance teams continue to provide field engineering support for the entire useful life of the system, calling upon CSC headquarters design personnel who hold their toothbrushes at the ready-to-go-anywhere-in-the-world posture if a sufficiently serious design problem calls for it.

Operation of the delivered system is turned over entirely to the field commander. It is his system, and its men and machines belong to him. Methods are updated by the Computer Systems Command when design improvements are required, or when top Army management modifies the mission statement for the system.

CSC ORGANIZATION

Though the Computer Systems Command derives much benefit from its relationships with the many other agencies, both within and outside the Army, the projected growth of the command will provide self-sufficiency in all aspects of data systems technology.

Special emphasis is placed upon the CSC Scientific and Management Advisory Committee, a specialized version of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel, devoted to all aspects of research and development in computer technology and information science. Convened and coordinated by the CSC Chief Scientist, within the Office of the Commanding General, the committee has a membership of data systems authorities of national reputation. The committee includes scientists from industry, Government and academic institutions whose specialties range from systems architecture to equipment production and the management of data and information systems.

The CSC mission is divided between two major organizational units, headed by a Deputy for Systems Management and a Deputy for Technical Management.

DEPUTY FOR SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

Operating under a project manager's charter, issued by the Secretary of the Army, the Computer Systems Command implements the principles of project management with an organizational structure which designates a system director or system manager for each data system assigned to the command. Each systems management office serves as the coordinating agency for the execution of all actions in the life-cycle management of a system and, as such, works as a central clearing house on all systems developed and released by the command for field use.

System management offices are located within the Project Control and Integration Directorate, and are organized into divisions according to echelon levels serviced. The Organization Systems Division contains systems management offices for all data systems designed primarily to serve lowest echelon organizational units. Similarly, the Base Systems Division and the Army Support Command Systems Division contains systems management offices for all data systems to be implemented at respectively higher echelons.

The various system management offices represent the primary authority within the command for assigned systems. For other than emergency programming support, they are the offices at CSC headquarters through which field units, support groups, and higher headquarters staff agencies interface with the command. They obtain the necessary resources from Headquarters, Department of the Army; surface problems and speed up the decisions necessary for their solution; and, above all, expedite the delivery of support to the user in the field.

Data systems development directorates perform actual system development, maintenance support, and emergency programming support. Each directorate is keyed to one technical specialty of the Army and contains a staff of system designers, system analysts, and computer programmers.

The Logistics Data Systems Directorate specializes in logistic systems, including supply systems, transportation systems, and materiel readiness system. It also represents a concentrated source of advice and assistance in these areas.

The Personnel and Force Accounting Data Systems Directorate is devoted to all matters dealing with manpower. Examples include personnel record keeping, force accounting, and medical regulating.

The Financial Data Systems Directorate concentrates on systems which serve the comptroller function throughout the Army.

These directorates actually design and develop the data systems released to field and to fixed-station installations. They are responsible for producing a fully tested and documented operational package, and for its support once it goes into operation. Rigid adherence to test standards and procedures minimize the need for on-site emergency fixes. Each directorate maintains a full-time standby service for furnishing emergency fixes and advice to the user.

From the very start of the system life cycle, each of these directorates is the primary contact with its counterpart Department of the Army staff element responsible for defining system requirements. The directorates provide "hands-on" experience in functionally specialized ADP design. Thus, their personnel are functional specialists, as well as ADP specialists.

At CSC headquarters, the Field Operations Directorate is engaged in certifying the operability of all systems and modifications developed by the command, and in delivering them to the field. Field operations personnel coordinate and perform site surveys, advise on-site preparation, arrange for equipment delivery, and monitor acceptance tests of ADP equipment. They assist in the installation of the equipment, and assure that the hardware is ready to accept the systems workload.

Because field operations personnel also perform system testing and certification, they are expert in systems capability and operations requirements. They are experienced in data conversion planning and cutover of operations from old system to new. Field operations personnel have a working knowledge of data processing operations management—scheduling, machine room procedures, data control and utilization reporting. They serve as a central clearing house for manufacturers' support to commercial ADP equipment. They interface with the Continental Army Command to assure proper training support. Field operations personnel are proficient and ready to assist on all problems related to ADP preparation and installation, and the establishment of smooth operation, whether or not the system is one the Computer Systems Command has delivered.

On the current Tactical Operations System (TOS) and the Tactical Fire Direction System (TACFIRE), systems, management and field operations are supported as on other projects, but from totally project-oriented directorates devoted to TOS and TACFIRE, and similar systems as assigned. Thus the command maintains in-depth capability, even when the problem involves Army-developed hardware and in-house Army executive software support capability.

DEPUTY FOR TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT

Through the staff of its Quality Assurance Directorate, the command imposes rigorous standards of quality assurance on its in-process activity. This group of ADP generalists also serves as a staff of in-house consultants to evaluate data systems design and progress, to identify incipient problems, and to make timely recommendations for their solution.

Development and modification of general purpose executive software is a growing function associated with ADP systems. General purpose software is at times inefficient and unnecessarily time consuming, when applied to a limited range of applications. Tailoring can result in significant improvements in efficiency. Particular skill is required, however, to adapt machine-oriented programs. Therefore, the Computer Systems Command has established a Design Support Directorate of software specialists who are devoted to software research and development activity, developing new techniques, and modifying manufacturers' software.

An Engineering Support Directorate, with a staff of data system-oriented electronic engineers and communications specialists, assures proper communications planning in support of multi-command ADP systems. Electronic engineers, specializing in computer equipment design, are included in this staff. This planning resource is available to all Army users of ADP systems.

CURRENT PROJECTS

Several major systems assigned to the Army Computer Systems Command are intended for battlefield deployment.

The Tactical Fire Direction System (TACFIRE) is an integrated truck-mounted, online tactical computer system being developed for the Army's field artillery units. TACFIRE is being built to increase the effectiveness of field artillery support through increased accuracy, better and more rapid use of target information, reduced reaction time, and greater efficiency in the determination of fire capabilities and the allocation of fire units to target. Specifically, TACFIRE applies automatic data processing to perform technical fire control, tactical fire control, fire planning, artillery target intelligence, artillery survey, meteorological data, and ammunition and fire unit status. One of the goals of the present program is to provide the materiel base for a family of militarized general purpose ADP equipment suitable for use by other Army tactical ADP systems.

The Tactical Operations System (TOS) is a truck-mounted combat system, an online automated information system incorporating remote inquiry and time sharing features. TOS is being developed to use high-speed computer facilities located at communications centers near division, corps and Army main headquarters to serve the commander, planning staff, and tactical operations centers. The objective of TOS is to increase significantly the effectiveness of tactical operations within the Army in the field in three areas: operations (including personnel and logistics summary information pertinent to the operations estimate); intelligence, and fire support coordination. The introduction of a first-generation ADP system is projected for the mid-1970 time frame, and most TOS equipment will be identical to TACFIRE materiel.

Combat Service Support System (CS3), a van-mounted automated administrative support system for use at several echelons of the Army in the field, provides through integrated automation a computer-supported logistics, personnel and administrative system to increase the responsiveness of combat service support required by the Army in the field.

Quick Reaction Inventory Control Center (QRICC) is a special combat service support which uses equipment and logistics programs of the CS3 System. The QRICC is a deployable inventory control center, using CS3 logic, which can be used in expediting the provisioning of any special task force.

Theater Army Support Command System (TASCOM) requirements are now being defined for combat service support. These requirements will be implemented by the Computer Systems Command.

Division Logistics System (DLOGS) is a van-mounted combat service support system which automates repair parts provisioning, property book reporting, and equipment status reporting. Now operational, the DLOGS system will be phased out as the more powerful CS3 system becomes ready to replace it.

The Direct Support Unit/General Support Unit Computer System (DSU/GSU) is also fully operational. It is a magnetic ledger card system used for automation of stock record accounting of repair parts (previously accomplished annually by the use of visible record files) in direct and general support units. A small-scale, low-cost computer system, using commercial off-the-shelf ADP equipment mounted in two M373 semi-trailer vans, the system is self-sufficient and operates from a 30KW trailer-mounted generator shipped with each system. Over 105 DSU/GSU systems have already been delivered to the Army in the field in Vietnam, Thailand, Okinawa, Germany and the continental United States; and 43 additional systems will be delivered by June 1970. Even after deployment of CS3, the DSU/GSU system will continue to operate as the organization level ADP system for the Army in the field, exchanging data with CS3 to assure optimum support from rear echelons.

The Personnel Management and Accounting-Card Processor System (PERMACAPS) automates various military personnel applications for the Army in the field. PERMACAPS uses card processor and peripheral equipment mounted in four transportable expansible vans. PERMACAPS combines Army division and personnel services company personnel data processing systems and the Army-wide personnel reporting system, to enhance data processing capabilities and improve internal division personnel management support. There are 37 PERMACAPS installations worldwide, with 17 additional installations planned by the end of 1970. Like DLOGS, PERMACAPS will be phased out as CS3 is deployed worldwide.

To back up battlefield automation, several other data systems, operating fixed-station installations, complete the roster of systems assigned to the Computer Systems Command:

CONARC Class One Automated System (COCOAS) is a base-level management information system designed to meet many management and reporting requirements at installation level, and to serve commanding officers of Class 1 posts, camps and stations throughout the continental United States. The prototype equipment configuration, operational at Fort Sill, Okla., uses third-generation commercial computer equipment. The fundamental objective of COCOAS is to improve the readiness of Army units by being responsive to the informational requirements of all unit commanders, and by providing timely and accurate administrative and supply support to obtain maximum effectiveness from available resources.

Centralization of Supply Management and

Operations System (COSMOS) is an automated retail supply system which performs supply management and stock fund management for each continental U.S. Army. The primary equipment configuration consists of a third-generation, disk-oriented central processor with a satellite computer for communications switching.

The Standard Supply System (3S) became the responsibility of Computer Systems Command in the Pacific Theater. It is a theater-wide depot/inventory control center supply and stock fund data processing system, designed by the U.S. Army, Pacific, and responsive to the various missions of the major subordinate commands in the Pacific Theater. The 3S system processes supply and related financial transactions for subordinate command supply depots and finance and accounting offices, to satisfy depot customer's materiel demands quickly and economically through maximum use of electornic computer capabilities.

The Continental Army and Major Overseas Command System (CARMOCS) is used among other functions to maintain personnel master files of all military personnel assigned to the geographical areas of eight data processing centers, one serving each of the five continental U.S. Armies; U.S. Army, Pacific; U.S. Army, Vietnam; and U.S. Army, Europe. An equipment upgrading program is now underway. CARMOCS assures accuracy in the maintenance of active Army personnel data banks and timely processing and transmission of data. Among the benefits are management control based on, planning, standard system and strict reassignment controls, reduction of workloads, and system-wide compatibility.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Projects earmarked for assignment to the Computer Systems Command in 1970 and following years include:

The USAREUR Supply and Maintenance System was developed by the Materiel Command of Theater Army Support Command, U.S. Army, Europe (USAEUR), to provide centralized theater control of supply management, stock control, field depot maintenance, and supporting finance and transportation functions. The system is operational at the single USAEUR Inventory Control Center. Maintenance of the system will be assumed by the Computer Systems Command early in calendar year 1970.

The Army Authorization Document System (TAADS) is a guidance and reporting system in the definition stage. CSC personnel are participating members of the TAADS team of Headquarters, Department of the Army, to initiate the cycle. A General Functional System Requirement is currently being developed. The Computer Systems Command is anticipating the assignment of TAADS as an additional operating information system within several of the established projects.

Integrated Facilities System (IFS) is a guidance and reporting system in the development stage within Headquarters, Department of the Army. CSC liaison with the proponent, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is being accomplished in the development of Functional Systems Requirements.

Military Police Operating Information System (MPOIS) is a system for the support of military police functions in the definition stage. CSC liaison has been established.

Communications-Electronics Management Information System (CEMIS) is a system to support the Assistant Chief of Staff for Communications-Electronics. The initial application is "Automated Frequency and Call Sign Assignment Procedure for the Army in the Field." CSC personnel are working closely with Headquarters, Department of the Army, in planning for the installation of the contractor-developed system.

GREATER FORCE EFFECTIVENESS

The Army Computer Systems Command is a single agency whose functions cover lifecycle project management, systems development, and systems support for all Army's multi-command data systems. Substantial manpower growth of the command is projected for the next five years, but centralizing control over system development and support will lead to better application of resources, and far more data processing capability with, if anything, a net reduction in requirements for scarce design and support talent.

Automation does not add to the nation's defense arsenal; it multiplies its effectiveness. The systems being developed and delivered by the Computer Systems Command to the Army in the field and at home do not do the soldier's thinking for him. They incorporate data shaping machine tools, relieving the soldier of the drudgery of rethinking tactical and administrative processes which have already been thoroughly defined by experienced doctrine developers and top managers. As such, they multiply the effectiveness of the weapons available to the Army today.

The Computer Systems Command is dedicated to this force effectiveness multiplication in an era when additives are not likely to be sufficient.

EXHIBIT 2

THE ELECTRONIC BATTLEFIELD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to point out a classic example of the Pentagon's "foot-in-the-door technique," one of the main reasons why the military budget is out of control. I am informed that the Pentagon has already spent some $2 billion on a secret weapons system called the electronic battlefield. Some estimate its ultimate cost at $20 billion or more. To my knowledge this weapons system, as a weapons system, has never been directly authorized in the annual procurement bill in which major weapons systems are examined, judged, and passed on by the House and the Senate.

There are other ramifications as well. Among these are the fact that the system involves vast amounts of complicated electronic equipment—sensors, lasers, computers—which have been the major cause of cost overruns, late deliveries, and failures to meet specifications on a large number of other major weapons systems.

In addition to all of this, the electronic battlefield includes items which are difficult to control and which may well result in indiscriminate killing. Thus, there are reasons going beyond the huge potential cost of the system why public hearings and detailed reviews of the system should be held.

Mr. President, under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, "The Congress shall have power to raise and support armies," and "to provide and maintain a Navy." The Constitution also provides that no appropriation of money for these uses shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

It is, therefore, widely assumed that Congress authorizes in the military authorization bill all of our major weapons systems—tanks, planes, ships, missiles, and the research which precedes them. Before the Pentagon builds a tank or a new airplane, Congress approves the project and authorizes the funds for its development. This system, of course, is not perfect. Even with congressional approval, as with the C-5A, the procurement of weapons systems leaves a great deal to be desired.

With regard to the electronic battlefield, I think it is safe to say that most Congressmen have never heard if it. Like Topsy, it just grew. It exemplifies, as few other examples can, why the military budget is out of control.

Yet, speaking of this new system, Gen. William Westmoreland has said: "It will revolutionize ground warfare."

An industry source has called it "as advanced as the main battle tank and as complicated as the canceled F-111 electronics system." Designed to kill anything that moves it cannot discriminate between enemy soldiers and women and children. Despite the fact that as a weapons system it has never been specifically authorized, it has already cost the American taxpayer almost $2 billion. Some experts predict it will ultimately cost $20 billion, almost twice as much as we are spending on the ABM and four times as much as we have spent on the C-5A. What is this new system? Although known by various code names, it has been called the automated battlefield by General Westmoreland. Among industry officials, it is more commonly known as the electronic battlefield. By any name, it is nothing less than an effort to develop a totally new method of waging ground warfare. Essentially, it is a system of applicated sensors designed to assist in the detection of enemy movements over wide areas. The system involves the use of data links, computer-assisted intelligence evaluation and automated fire controls. In a word, it is extremely complex. It requires vast amounts of complicated electronic equipment including:

First, whole families of acoustic, seismic, and magnetic devices to detect voices, footfalls, guns, and enemy troop carriers;

Second, high-powered lasers to illuminate targets with visible and invisible energy designed to guide bombs, rockets, and antitank weapons:

Third, millions of tiny "button bomblets" that give a sonic or radio signal to remote receivers, pinpointing the position of anything that steps on them; and

Fourth, elaborate electronic command and control displays that pull together all data gathered by the electronic network, and automatically show troop movements over vast areas of terrain.

In short, the electronic battlefield involves an entirely new concept in ground warfare, and if widely adopted, will require fundamental changes in the way our men fight.

Yet, this revolutionary weapons system on which as much as $2 billion has already been spent, and upon which as much as $20 billion may well be spent, has gone ahead beyond the research and development stage without any specific authorization of Congress. We have never been asked, Do you wish to authorize billions of dollars for the automated battlefield?

The program was developed as an outgrowth of the ill-fated McNamara wall in Vietnam. That was a sophisticated electronic barrier between North and South Vitnam which was designed to stop North Vietnamese infiltration. When the original barrier concept was discarded as unworkable, the program was reoriented and renamed the electronic battlefield. No longer designed to provide an electronic barrier, it is now intended to provide complete surveillance of enemy movements through the use of sophisticated sensoring devices backed by highly complex computer systems. First tested in Vietnam, the new devices are now undergoing intensive development for a variety of combat uses.

Perhaps the outstanding feature of the program is the sharp rise in costs which have been incurred. Although the official figures are secret, some published figures show how explosively the program costs have grown.

Research: In fiscal 1967 the Defense Department's Advanced Research Products Agency budgeted $3.5 million for sensor studies. One year later the amount spent on research for the electronic battlefield had grown to $82.8 million or over 25 times the amount spent the previous year.

Procurement: Two years after the start of the program, procurement costs for the new surveillance devices had risen from $192.6 million in fiscal 1967 to $524 million in fiscal 1969.

Although just over 2½ years old, the cost of the entire program, research, procurement, ammunition for testing, and funds from other sources—totals close to $2 billion.

The most frightening fact about all of this is that this may be just the beginning of a cost spiral. Should the Armed Forces decide to deploy these devices in large numbers, costs could rise astronomically. This is so because much of the program consists of very expensive electronic devices supported by computer systems. If the experience the Pentagon has had with other complicated electronic systems such as that used in the F-111 is any kind of indicator, costs could increase spectacularly while performance is continually compromised.

But, in view of the size and nature of the program, the most shocking fact about the electronic battlefield is that it has never been directly authorized by Congress. The program has never been subjected to public hearings or a detailed review.

But what is more, the military contractors know more about the program than most Congressmen and Senators. Early in January of this year more than 800 defense contractors jammed the National Bureau of Standards auditorium for a classified briefing on the program's future. All the reports and predictions made at the meeting were classified, as is practically all of the information relating to the program.

Major problems and questions: The program raises several fundamental questions regarding not only congressional control over military spending, but also control over the secret development of new weapons.

Perhaps most important, how is Congress to control expenditures if it does not even have knowledge, much less control, over major programs such as the electronic battlefield? The fact that the Pentagon could initiate such a large program without specific inclusion under the military authorization bill suggests that military spending may rise by several billion dollars more than we have been led to believe. How many more programs like the electronic battlefield costing millions of dollars and unknown to Congress has the Pentagon failed to include in the military authorization request? If Congress does not know about them, how can Congress approve them?

The second important set of questions which the program raises centers around the development of secret weapons and their future implications for military policy. General Westmoreland has said that the electronic battlefield will revolutionize ground combat. In a speech given last October before the Association of the U.S. Army, he declared:

"The Army has undergone in Vietnam a quiet revolution in ground warfare—tactics, techniques, and technology. The revolution is not fully understood by many."

The financial implications alone of this so-called revolution are frightening. Will the Congress suddenly be told that it is essential that all ground forces be equipped with the new electronic sensors before the full implications of such a decision are known? Will we be told that the expenditure of almost $20 billion is necessary if we are to match the Russians in ground capability? In short, will Congress be confronted with a "decision" on the electronic battlefield over which it has little control? These are just a few of the questions which are raised by the secret nature of the program.

The electronic battlefield also presents several other problems related to its use in combat. One of the biggest problems is that it may be an indiscriminate weapon. The sensors cannot tell the difference between soldiers and women and children. It has been pointed out that in such underdeveloped parts of the world as Vietnam, whole villages may be wiped out by seeding wide areas with air dropped explosive devices designed to kill anyone who ventures into their neighborhood. Once seeded, we would lose control over these devices and they could represent a permanent menace to the civilian population, much like old land mines.

A second major problem is presented by the extreme vulnerability of much of the electronic equipment to malfunction due to rough treatment. One infrared night observation device for use over medium range distances has already been abandoned because it could not withstand handling under combat conditions. In addition, the replacement costs alone for equipment damaged by rough handling could be enormous.

Finally, the most important, is the program really worth the money? Is combat capability increased to such an extent that the probable investment of billions of dollars is warranted? Once the Vietnam war is over, will we really need such a complicated system of sensors for combat operations?

These are all questions which should be carefully examined before the Congress approves any more money for the electronic battlefield. They should be answered before we become committed to it as a weapons system. The program may not necessarily be a bad investment. My remarks today should not be interpreted as meaning necessarily opposition to the program. I am saying that it needs to be very carefully studied before additional money is committed for its development. I am asking for information. In an effort to obtain more information on the program, I have written a letter to Secretary of Defense Laird requesting answers to several questions related to the purpose and application of the electronic battlefield. I also intend to raise questions about it when the military authorization bill is before us. I believe it should be subjected to a full review before it goes any further.

Mr. President, the fact that a program of this size and importance has never been specifically authorized and that the Pentagon has spent almost $2 billion on it, is outrageous. If Congress is to have any hope at all of controlling military spending it must have control over all major weapons systems. The electronic battlefield is no exception. It deserves the same detailed scrutiny to which all major weapons are subjected. I shall continue to work to see that it receives that review.

Mr. President, along that line, I think this is a perfect example of why we needed to have line items in the bills that come before Congress, even though it takes a 300- or 400-page bill. We should have a line item on each subject so that the Congress will know what it is voting on and will have a chance to find out where our money is going.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter I sent to Secretary Laird on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"JUNE 28, 1970.

"Hon. MELVIN LAIRD,
"*Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.*

"DEAR SECRETARY LAIRD: Recently I learned of a new weapons system known as the electronic or automated battlefield. As I understand it, this is an integrated system of sensors which, according to General Westmoreland, 'will revolutionize ground combat.'

"In view of the critical nature of the program, I would appreciate answers to the following questions. Although I am aware that much of the information related to the program is classified, I would like the responses to be unclassified.

"1. When was this program started? What is the purpose of the program and which services are involved in its development?

"2. When was the program authorized by Congress?

"3. What costs have been incurred for research and procurement? What has been the total cost of the program to date?

"4. What applications are planned for the program? Will the program be restricted to purely military intelligence?

"5. What future developments are expected and what will be the probable cost of the program in the years ahead?

"6. How effective have the sensors proven in actual combat? Where have they been used?

"7. Are there any plans to equip all ground forces eventually with sensor devices and support systems? What would be the cost of such a decision?

"Your answers to these questions will greatly improve understanding of the nature and purposes of the electronic battlefield program. Thank you for your cooperation and I shall look forward to hearing from you shortly.

"Sincerely,

"WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
"*U.S. Senator.*"

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able senior Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Once again I would hope the people of America realize the great service being done for the taxpayers of this country by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin.

This particular subject has long been a sore point with me, because, although I was a ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, back in 1966 or 1967, I first learned of this particular operation, a defense line south of the DMZ, and all the electronic fixture contained in it, when I read about it in a weekly magazine. I thereupon went to the chairman of the committee and asked whether he knew about it, before that, I went to the staff and asked whether it had ever come before the Armed Services Committee. I was told by both, no, that it had never come before the committee, despite the hundreds of millions of dollars involved, which later turned into billions.

So I asked if we could have a briefing on the matter, which was already an accomplished fact, and on which the Department of Defense at that time was spending hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

As a result of that request, a briefing was given by a high-ranking general, in the Department of Defense. There were two of us there. When it was over the other Senator present remarked, "All I can say, General, is that it is too bad Rube Goldberg is no longer around, because he could have drawn all this better than you have explained it."

Later, at a meeting of the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, with two Senators present, of which I was one, we asked the witness if he would tell us about the weapons system.

The witness did not feel he was in a position to do so, then turned to an officer, I believe a major general, and asked him to give details of what was going on in this case. That officer stated he was sorry, but the matter was too highly classified to be discussed even in executive session.

I present this story to illustrate just how far away is real control by Congress of money expended in certain fields. Inasmuch as years ago I tried, with little success at first, to find out why we needed this system, especially in that some friends in the Pentagon itself told me that the whole idea was absurd, that the billions of dollars to be ultimately spent was nothing more than a sheer waste of the taxpayers' money, I was interested; but for a long time could not find out the details despite my being on the committee.

Again, I congratulate the able Senator from Wisconsin, who is working as no one else in the Congress to show how we can save money in our budget, especially our Defense budget. It is as clear as light to me there are many investments we should not make that we are making and I have never seen a better illustration than what the Senator from Wisconsin presented this morning.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri, because there is no Senator who can speak with more authority. He is the only Senator who serves on both the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he is also an ex officio member of the Appropriations Committee with respect to Defense expenditures. So he is in a position to know what he is talking about.

Did I correctly understand the Senator to tell the Senate that when he first read of this in a news weekly magazine, he talked with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who said he had not heard of it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the chairman of the Armed Services Committee did not know about it, the Senator from Missouri, one of the top-ranking members of that committee, knew nothing about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And when later a top-rank briefing was held, and a major general was one of those asked to inform the members of the committee who were present about the electronic battlefield, he stated, when asked to go into detail, that this was too secret a matter to go into detail about, even in a private, executive session?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In executive session. Right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Although it had already involved \$2 billion in expenditures, and could involve a \$20 billion expenditure, and very likely, in the light of our experience with electronic weapons in the past, will involve more than \$20 billion?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Perhaps the able Senator is a little high on that figure.

This at the time became quite famous as the so-called "McNamara Line." The words were used in that way in effort to compare it with the tragedy of the French Maginot Line.

I was so worried about it, Mr. President, I went out to South Vietnam, around the DMZ, and talked with officers about it there. There was some difference of opinion, but my impression was most considered it a waste of money at that time; and in any case, when we went into the field we got the facts.

In all fairness to the present administration, my experience in this particular matter was during the past administration. But I think it about time that Congress, following the great work of the Senator from Wisconsin, notify everyone that we intend to know more about what is being done with the taxpayers' dollar before we appropriate these billions that through taxes are just about breaking the backs of our people.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Missouri may well be correct, that the \$20 billion estimate may be too much. The reason I use that figure is that I am quoting an article in Business Week—this weekly magazine which seems to have more information than Senators do, even though they serve on the Armed Services Committee—entitled "The Pentagon Plays Electronic War Games," published in the January 31, 1970, issue of that magazine. They say:

> Thus far \$2-billion has been spent, and costs may soar to \$20-billion in the next decade.

The reason I think that may not be an extravagant estimate is that almost every forecast we have had of electronic weapons—the Senator will recall the Stubbings report, for example—is that they cost on the average more than twice as much as originally estimated. I am not just talking about the so-called "McNamara Line," in Vietnam. The \$2 billion is a starter, because the notion was that this would be used very widely, and would be something we would use in every theater.

So I think the Senator can see that this could conceivably eventually cost \$20 billion. As I say, this comes from a responsible and a very respectable publication, Business Week, and for that reason as well as the other reasons I have stated, I do think \$20 billion is not an exaggeration.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is my understanding that it costs hundreds of millions of dollars a year to operate this so-called line, as well as billions of dollars to produce it, and under those circumstances, the Senator's figure may well be correct.

Later on, when this became a "celebrated cause," you might say, we did have briefings on it, plus detailed explanations of it. My opinion was even less as far as to its efficiency on the basis of its cost-benefit ratio.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. The point I was making is that, as I understand it, the Defense Department seems to be going ahead to universalize this system. At any rate, this demonstrates very clearly to me—I think the Senator from Missouri has made the point far better than I have—that we simply must insist that we have a thorough investigation of any weapons system that has already cost \$2 billion, and may cost a great deal more, before we go further ahead with it.

It is my understanding that there is a substantial amount in proposed expenditures of this type in bills that will be before the Senate in the coming weeks and months, and when they come before the Senate we should certainly be in a position to challenge the amounts in those bills, to determine how much is for such purposes, and to insist upon justification. Maybe the Senate doors will have to be closed at that time. But certainly everything I have disclosed so far this morning, and everything the Senator from Missouri has said, is unclassified public information.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri very much for his most enlightening help in this discussion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin again for what he is doing in an effort to meet the increasingly serious financial problem characteristic of our overall situation today. I would hope that more would follow his leadership, just as we would do in private business, where, before you put up this kind of money, you justify the reasons in detail why you are spending it. You have to do it for your stockholders in any private business. Our taxpayers are stockholders of a great country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to withdraw the request for the quorum call.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin with interest. I am glad that he has made the record clear and has pointed out that what he has stated on the floor of the Senate some time ago has been a matter of public record for a number of months. I am delighted that the sources have been cited.

I know of no man in this body who is more careful of his facts and figures nor more qualified to speak on the subjects which he has.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. I deeply appreciate what he has said. I mean it when I say that there is no man in the country from whom I would rather have that kind of support.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would make one more comment about this matter.

The whole question of unnecessary and ill-advised secrecy in Government, and what that secrecy could do to the future of our country, is involved in this discussion. Many people believe a lot more information could be released, not only to the Congress but also to the public. I agree, and have so stated for some time. The best illustration of the importance of lifting unnecessary secrecy seen in some time was that presented by the able Senator from Wisconsin this morning.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

I should like to point out to the Senate that I understand that in a few days we will have the military procurement bill before us. I think that what we have discussed this morning is another good reason to consider seriously a sharp reduction in the military procurement bill. It not only would mean a great saving to the taxpayers of this country and the best and most effective way to fight inflation, but also, in my view, it could mean a stronger, leaner, and tougher military establishment.

I yield the floor.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1016, S. 3959.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3959) to provide certain retirement benefits under title 5, United States Code, for air traffic controllers.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out:

S. 3959

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 8339 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n)(1) For the purpose of this subsection, 'air traffic controller' means an employee who performs duties as—

"(A) an air traffic control specialist in the Department of Transportation and is engaged in the separation and controlling of aircraft; or

"(B) a first line supervisor in that Department directly and is engaged in supervising such air traffic control specialists at an air traffic control tower, center, or approach control facility.

"(2) The annuity of an employee who is an air traffic controller, or was an air traffic controller, retiring under this subchapter is computed under subsection (a) of this section, except that the years of creditable service as an air traffic controller to be considered as part of the employee's total service shall be determined by multiplying the number of full years and twelfth parts of years of service as an air traffic controller (excluding the fractional parts of a month, if any) by 1.4. An employee who has at least thirty years of service, as determined under the preceding sentence, is entitled to an annuity."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

That (a) section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (18);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (19) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

On page 4, line 2, after the word "section", strike out "8339(n)" and insert "8331"; and in line 6, after the word "certified", insert "to"; so as to make the bill read:

"(20) 'air traffic controller' means an employee who performs duties as—

"(A) an air traffic control specialist in the Department of Transportation or its predecessor organizations engaged in the separation and controlling of aircraft; or

"(B) a supervisor directly engaged in supervising air traffic control specialists at an air traffic control tower, center, or approach-control facility."

(b) Section 8332 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Service as an air traffic controller is the product obtained by multiplying the full years and twelfth parts thereof by 1.4 excluding from the aggregate fractional parts of a month, if any.

(c) Section 8336 of such title is amended by redesignating subsection "(g)" as subsection "(h)"; and adding immediately after subsection "(f)" the following new subsection:

"(g) An employee who is separated from the service after completing thirty years of service, and who has at least ten years of service as an air traffic controller, is entitled to an annuity."

S. 3959

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 8339 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n)(1) For the purpose of this subsection, 'air traffic controller' means an employee who performs duties as—

"(A) an air traffic control specialist in the Department of Transportation and is engaged in the separation and controlling of aircraft; or

"(B) a first line supervisor in that Department directly and is engaged in supervising such air traffic control specialists at an air traffic control tower, center, or approach control facility.

"(2) The annuity of an employee who is an air traffic controller, or was an air traffic controller, retiring under this subchapter is computed under subsection (a) of this section, except that the years of creditable service as an air traffic controller to be considered as part of the employee's total service shall be determined by multiplying the number of full years and twelfth parts of years of service as an air traffic controller (excluding the fractional parts of a month, if any) by 1.4. An employee who has at least thirty years of service, as determined under the preceding sentence, is entitled to an annuity." That (a) section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (18);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (19) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(20) 'air traffic controller' means an employee who performs duties as—

"(A) an air traffic control specialist in the Department of Transportation or its predecessor organizations engaged in the separation and controlling of aircraft; or

"(B) a supervisor directly engaged in supervising air traffic control specialists at an air traffic control tower, center, or approach-control facility."

(b) Section 8332 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Service as an air traffic controller is the product obtained by multiplying the full years and twelfth parts thereof by 1.4, excluding from the aggregate fractional parts of a month, if any.

(c) Section 8336 of such title is amended by redesignating subsection "(g)" as subsection "(h)"; and adding immediately after subsection "(f)" the following new subsection:

"(g) An employee who is separated from the service after completing thirty years of service, and who has at least ten years of service as an air traffic controller, is entitled to an annuity."

SEC. 2. Section 6307 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(d) An employee who is an air traffic controller, as defined in section 8331 of this title, is entitled to sick leave in addition to any other sick leave authorized by this section for such reasonable periods as determined by the Secretary of Transportation upon a finding by the Secretary, based on sufficient medical evidence certified to by a flight surgeon and at least two medical doctors, that the employee is temporarily unable to perform his duties."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1012), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

This legislation would change the computation factor for determining civil service retirement benefits from 1.0 to 1.4 for each year of air traffic controller service. The special provision would apply only to air traffic controllers and "first-line" supervisors directly supervising air traffic controllers. A controller or a supervisor would be eligible to retire after completing 30 such years of service regardless of age if he has at least 10 years of service as an air traffic controller or supervisor.

JUSTIFICATION

For several years, the committee has studied legislation to resolve the unique problems pertaining to early retirement for air traffic controllers. Because of the stress involved in working as a controller in high-density airports, air traffic controllers are subject to mental and physical strains and disabilities not found in other employment in the Federal service or as air traffic controllers at less impacted airports.

The most effective solution to the problem of air traffic controllers is the appropriation and effective expenditure of money to maintain an adequate supply of controllers in the Federal Aviation Administration and to purchase and use the kind of electronic equipment to improve air traffic control methods and improve air safety. The record of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Bureau of the Budget in planning and executing policies in compliance with this objective is poor. The recent "sick-out" of air traffic controllers at key airports over the Nation was, in the committee's judgment, directly attributable to the lack of foresight on the part of those responsible for the development of an efficient and effective air traffic control system.

Nonetheless, the failure to resolve by other means these difficult problems does not argue against the enactment of legislation designed to improve the nature of employment of air traffic controllers. Benefits for these employees should be adequate to insure the recruitment and retention of high-quality personnel. The legislation proposed in S. 3959 is part of that solution. It will offer the air traffic controller, who has reached the age of no longer being able to operate with 100 percent efficiency at an extremely exacting and exhausting kind of employment, the alternative of retiring from the Federal service on an annuity that will not drastically reduce his standard of living.

Under existing law, an employee under civil service retirement may retire voluntarily after 30 years' service at age 55, or 20 years' service at age 60. An employee who is involuntarily separated may retire after 20 years' service at age 50 or with 25 years' service regardless of age.

Air traffic controllers do not readily fit this employment pattern because many of them are recruited when they are in their early twenties, frequently after having been trained for air traffic controller duties in the Armed Forces, and do not become eligible for voluntary retirement until they are well past 50 years of age. The nature of air traffic controller service is simply too great a strain on the mental and physical capabilities of a human being to stay on the job until attaining age 55 or 60. Unfortunately, other occupations in the Federal Aviation Administration are not available in sufficient numbers to maintain a systematic line of transfer from controller duties to administrative duties. No program for retraining controllers for other kinds of duties has yet been satisfactorily developed in the Federal Aviation Administration to insure other employment opportunities.

This legislation will provide one alternative for controllers who believe that the time is at hand to leave the stresses and strains of the radar scope and tower observation. By so multiplying service as a controller or as a supervisor directly engaged in supervising controllers on the job, a controller with 22 years' service as a controller will be eligible to retire on an unreduced annuity as if he had 30 years service. His retirement annuity based on 30 such years of service is equal to 56.25 percent of the employee's average salary during the high 3 years of his career. Thus, a controller who entered the service at the age of 23 or 24 would be eligible to retire at the age of 45 or 46, but for annuity purposes would be treated as if he had remained in service an additional 8 years, and his annuity will not be reduced because he is less than 55.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committeee also recommends that the Federal Aviation Administration, in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission, consider changes in the nature of air traffic control employment to insure that controllers and air safety traffic does not suffer because of the nature of air traffic control employment.

A controller ordinarily works at least 8 hours a day, at least 5 days a week. In busy towers, this service in recent years has more frequently been 10 or 12 hours a day, 6 days a week. Because of scheduling difficulties and the shortage of personnel, employees usually work a rotating shift, frequently being assigned to the swing shift for a few weeks, the day shift for a few weeks, and the graveyard shift for a few weeks. The effect of these changes on the mental and physical strength of an individual is adverse.

It is ironic, in the committee's judgment, that a blackjack card dealer at a gambling casino in Las Vegas is generally relieved from his duty after 40 minutes of dealing because of the monotony and mental strain of keeping up with a deck of cards, while an air traffic controller responsible for moving airplanes in and out of a busy airport will frequently remain on a radarscope for 4 hours without relief, and when relief comes after 4 hours or more, it will be so that he can go to the tower for visual control of takeoffs and landings.

The Federal Aviation Administration and the Civil Service Commission must develop programs for relief from these working conditions for air traffic controllers. The recruitment of additional controllers is part of the problem, but the mental and physical strain of staying on the radar scope or in the tower for long periods of time should not be continued under any circumstances. Periods of rest and the assurance that short breaks and adequate lunch breaks will be taken must be made. Today, controllers eat a sandwich while staying at the radar scope instead of being able to leave the tower for a real break from the monotony and the stress and strain of this duty to eat a meal and relax for a few minutes.

The committee expects the Federal Aviation Administration and the Civil Service Commission to report to this committee by the beginning of the first session of the 92d Congress on what steps have been taken to change these employment practices.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional civil service retirement and sick leave benefits for air traffic controllers."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished acting minority leader is in the Chamber, I would like to discuss with him, for the benefit of the Senate, just what the schedule will be.

The pending business, when we get through with the morning business, will be the legislative appropriations bill, which should be completed this afternoon.

Hopefully, later this afternoon, we will take up Calendar No. 1006, S. 3586, amendment of the Public Health Service Act; and then, due to a change in plans, instead of proceeding to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 924 and 925, S. 26 and S. 27, the recreation bills, which tentatively had been slated for tomorrow, we will, hopefully, proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1010, S. 2455, authorizing appropriation for the Civil Rights Commission and make that the pending business for tomorrow, to be followed by Calendar No. 926, S. 1830, a bill to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes.

Upon the disposition of that bill, it is anticipated we will proceed to the consideration of S. 26 and S. 27, on Wednesday or thereabouts.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now transact routine morning business.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suppose the most tragic part of North Vietnam's prisoner of war policy is that it has, in fact, no policy at all.

The word "policy" means some sort of rational, measured approach to a problem. In this case, an international policy had been set forth in the Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War. The Government of North Vietnam was a signatory thereto.

The convention is deliberately worded to include all types of conflict, whether or not there is an actual declaration of war. It provides for some very basic actions on the part of those nations adhering to it. The simplest of these is preparation of a list of prisoners held, and communication between them and their families.

Instead, we have a wall of silence imposed between American prisoners held by North Vietnam and their families here in our country. This might be expected from some primitive tribe or society, but hardly from a government seeking recognition as one of the family of nations.

Mr. President, I call once more for every effort to be made at the public and private level to open communications on the fate of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam.

TESTIMONY OF CYRUS EATON BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this morning, Mr. Cyrus Eaton appeared as a witness before the Joint Economic Committee. Mr. Eaton is 86-plus years old, has had some 70 years of experience in American business at all levels, and has had a great interest in bringing about a better understanding between the Communist countries and our country. He has gone to a great deal of trouble to inform himself about the attitudes and the policies of people in various Communist countries, all the way from Cuba to Russia and North Vietnam.

His testimony this morning was extremely interesting. I ask unanimous consent that his opening prepared statement be printed in the RECORD, in order that it be made available to the Members of this body.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I regret that Mr. Eaton's answers to the questions and the discussions which took place following his opening statement cannot be made a part of this RECORD, although I expect that in due time the hearings will be published.

I certainly commend to the Senate and to the public a perusal of Mr. Eaton's remarks. In a way, he is a unique figure, with his long experience, going back to the days of the first Rockefeller in business and on up to the present. He is a lifelong Republican, and his uncle was a Republican Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Eaton is one of the leading businessmen of this country; and, together with his interest in international political affairs, I do not know of anyone quite comparable to him in the world. He is personally acquainted with many of the leading political figures of the world and has gone to great trouble to talk with them. I do think that his judgment is entitled to great respect, and I hope that the Members of this body and the people of the country will at least go to the trouble of reading and informing themselves about his views, which were very well expressed, especially in the question-and-answer period and in the discussion that followed his opening statement before the Joint Economic Committee this morning.

I compliment the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, for arranging to make available in public session a man of Mr. Eaton's stature.

EXHIBIT 1

OPENING STATEMENT OF CYRUS EATON BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JULY 13, 1970

My name is Cyrus Eaton. I am Chairman of the Board of The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company. I welcome the opportunity afforded by your invitation to express my views on the state of the economy.

In my opinion, we are already in the midst of a full-scale recession. Moreover, no amount of explanatory telecasts by the President or other members of the Administration will save us from a devastating depression unless the war in Southeast Asia is brought to a quick and complete conclusion.

My business career, starting almost at the beginning of this century, has included active participation in industry, public utilities, banking, railroads and farming, both in the United States and abroad. I have known the giants of industry—Rockefeller, Ford, Firestone, Edison and many others. I have been a reader of "The Economist," of London, for 70 years and of "The Wall Street Journal" for 65 years.

I have considered it an urgent duty, consistent with my stake in America and capitalism, to know and maintain close contact with the heads of state in the communist and socialist nations, as well as in the capitalistic countries.

As a businessman, I have experienced first-hand all of the economic depressions and panics of this century, including those of 1907, 1914, 1921, and the prolonged worldwide collapse that started in 1929. The panic in 1921 all but toppled Ford Motor Company and Goodyear Tire & Rubber. The 1929 crash wiped out many banks. In my hometown of Cleveland, alone, two of the largest closed forever, and the double liability that shareholders were forced to pay on their stock crippled for years to come.

Whatever is to follow in the current economic crisis, we have already witnessed the bankruptcy of the Penn Central, the nation's largest railroad system. The full repercussions of that disaster remain to be felt. One immediately measurable effect is the stock market loss to a widespread family of shareholders. The value of their holdings has shrunk 92 per cent, from the post-merger high of slightly more than $2 billion to approximately $157 million. The similar declines which have occurred in many other corporations have caused painful losses to millions of American investors.

The abrupt resignation of seven Penn Central directors because of conflicts of interest arising from their affiliation with financial institutions holding Penn Central loans, points to the necessity for legislative reform. Officers of banks and insurance companies should not be permitted to be directors of corporations to which they lend money. Not involved in the Penn Central case, but relating to the conflict of interest problem, is the reprehensible practice of bank officers perpetuating themselves in office by voting the stock of their own bank held in a fiduciary capacity. This abuse should be prohibited by law.

Because the undeclared war in Vietnam is so inextricably involved in our business and financial crises, affecting the money markets and credits, I must refer to it in this discussion. Congress supplies the money for war and has an equally grave responsibility for the nation's economic health.

The Nixon Administration was elected on the strength of a purported but still undisclosed plan to terminate the war in Vietnam. Three of the key figures in the Administration, the President, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, are Wall Street lawyers who have been closely associated with the problems of corporate and municipal finance. Their failure to recognize the portents of impending economic doom and to conclude the rash military adventure responsible for those portents, even after eighteen months in office, is incredible. Instead we have been treated to the spectacle of escalation in desperation, accompanied by economic chaos, if not collapse.

As a concerned capitalist, I have communicated my misgivings to the Administration. Last November, when Bell Telephone bonds were sold at the, up to then, highest interest rates in American corporate history, I called this to President Nixon's attention by telegram.

My message to the President stated:

"Our government's massive expenditures on world-wide military commitments threaten the greatest crisis in our financial markets and the very soundness of the dollar. Unless there are immediate and drastic changes in our foreign policies, I feel we are headed for a panic that could destroy the Nixon Administration even as the financial debacle of 1929 destroyed the political career of Herbert Hoover."

That was probably an understatement since there was no war in 1929.

The chaos in the bond market still exists, but has more recently been overshadowed by the stock market collapse. At the beginning of June, I felt impelled to wire the President as follows:

"Businessmen are watching your Administration with increasing anxiety for signs that you will come to grips with the nation's grave economic problems. Unemployment increases. The squeeze on credit and money supply tightens. Operating profits are disappearing. Several large corporations are in serious trouble. Wall Street is in a panic. The international payments deficit threatens the dollar. Mammoth military expenditures make it impossible to restrain inflation. Those of us who witnessed inflation in World War I can testify to its causes and hazards. The business community beseeches you to act before the financial storm breaks into full fury."

If the President will not act, then the Congress must. Under the Constitution, the Congress is charged with controlling the public purse and determining how much of the estimates submitted by the Executive will be funded. This nation simply cannot afford to continue spending $80 billion a year for military purposes. The $25 billion included in that budget for the Vietnam adventure is money completely down the drain, while much of the remainder goes for the development and production of weapons that would extinguish the human race if ever used.

It is sobering to consider that we have Vietnam-style commitments to forty-three foreign countries. If we should be obliged to live up to all of them, we could find ourselves in forty-three wars at one time, even though we are going broke on just the one in Vietnam.

One half the world is Communist. Many of the Communist nations are anxious to purchase the products of our factories and our farms. We should trade with them and extend credit to them as do all the nations that are our allies and friends.

The astronomical sums we are spending annually to kill people could better be spent to improve their standard of living.

Less than a week ago I received a letter from Viscount Montgomery written at his home in England. The great general, a student of warfare throughout the ages, makes this judgment on President Nixon's conduct of the war in Vietnam—

"He (Nixon) should realize that a political end to the war in Vietnam is the only possible way to end that war."

Holders of American securities abroad were disturbed by the extension of the war into Cambodia. It is harmful to the nation and its credit in world financial markets for the President to commit the nation and its armed forces to warfare in a situation where the President's authority to do so is doubtful. Steps ought to be taken to clarify the matter of jurisdiction and power, and they ought to be taken not only with respect to Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, but with respect to anything that may arise in the future.

In other words, whether by legislation or by constitutional amendment or by judicial decision, there ought to be a firm definition of when, if ever, the President of the United States can involve our armed forces in warfare outside the boundaries of the United States without getting prior Congressional approval.

In conclusion, let me offer a few specific steps that I believe should be taken without delay to stave off complete economic calamity.

1. First, and foremost, the war in Southeast Asia must be terminated with a negotiated settlement.

2. Astronomical federal expenditures for such abhorrent military projects as ABM, for military aid to other nations, for the so-called intelligence activities of the Pentagon and the State Department and such unproductive agencies as the CIA and the FBI should be pared to the bone.

3. Money rates should be substantially reduced, and funds should be made available for housing and other essential American needs.

4. Margin requirements on stock purchases should be lowered to 33 per cent.

5. A strong federal corporation on the pattern of the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be created immediately to make funds available for business concerns, industrial corporations, railroads, banks and insurance and loan companies.

I repeat that the war in Southeast Asia must be terminated immediately. I have recently visited Hanoi, Cambodia and Laos and have conferred with their statesmen. I have also talked to spokesmen for Great Britain, Soviet Union, Japan, Canada, Poland and France.

The example of France's ending the war in Algeria is the one we should follow. After years of killing and endless negotiations, DeGaulle decided to end the war. He stopped the fighting and withdrew 500,000 soldiers and a million French civilians, and France is none the worse for it. Not one more American life is worth spending on a war we cannot win; a war in which the only thing we seem to be salvaging is foolish pride.

The allegation that North Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam will not negotiate is not in accord with the facts. I suggest for the Congress' consideration that a small committee of the Senate and House meet informally in Canada or in France with a similar group from North Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government. By so doing they would learn at first hand, as I did, the terms on which this expensive and economically disruptive war may be ended.

PERU'S DISASTER STIRS DRAMATIC U.S. AID EFFORT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the whole world has been stunned by the suffering visited on the people of Peru as a result of the May 31 earthquake.

This disaster has been described as "unprecedented in scope in the history of South America." Informed estimates as to the number of people killed have risen to over 60,000.

The extent of aid from foreign governments and international relief agencies has been impressive. Our Government has already committed over $10 million in aid. Certainly, Mrs. Nixon's flight to Peru with a planeload of needed medicine, clothing, and so forth, has helped to demonstrate the concern of the United States and its citizens for the victims of the disaster.

A long and very interesting article appeared in the National Observer for June 29, concerning the efforts of U.S. private citizens and groups to help, as well as the efforts of governments here and elsewhere.

The article is also a reminder that among the things "right with America," is the deep reservoir of good will and charity, always available to help the less fortunate.

The article quotes Mrs. Alicia Esteves, first secretary at the Peruvian Embassy in Washington about the American response to her country's ordeal:

These people are so great and doing this in such a nice way. People are sensitive about other people's sorrow. There are not many countries like that.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

PERU'S DISASTER STIRS DRAMATIC U.S. AID EFFORT: GOVERNMENT, COMPANIES, VOLUNTEER GROUPS RUSH TO HELP EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

(By Lawrence Mosher)

"For Christ's sake, I want to help my brothers in distress. God be with you." The note from a man in Maplewood, Mo., was sent to the Peruvian Embassy in Washington, D.C., in early June. It contained $5.

The violent earth shudder that rattled northern Peru and sent tons of mud and rock cascading down a valley high in the Andes called Callejon de Huaylas was measured on the Richter Scale at 7.7. But on the human scale Peru's nightmarish disaster has plumbed an immeasurable depth of human concern. And last week, almost a month after the May 31 tragedy, that response had catapulted to astonishing heights, particularly in the United States.

Private donations from all over the country have already exceeded $3,000,000, coming separately and through a score of U.S. voluntary organizations like the Red Cross, Catholic Relief Services, Church World Service, and CARE, Inc. U.S. companies both with and without interests in Peru provided help: road equipment to cut through the landslides from Cerro de Pasco Corp., and food and clothing from Sears, Roebuck and Co., and International Petroleum Co., an American-owned corporation expropriated in late 1968 by the Peruvian government. The U.S. Government pledged $10,500,000 in aid, along with help from dozens of other countries, including Cuba but curiously excluding the Soviet Union.

And this week Mrs. Richard Nixon flies to Lima for a three-day visit and tour of the stricken areas. In what is the First Lady's first official trip abroad, Mrs. Nixon is to personally hand over to the wife of the Peruvian president, Mrs. Juan Velasco Alvarado, some blankets and children's clothing, tokens of the avalanche of emergency supplies that are now descending on Peru.

During the first day after the earthquake there was little indication in Washington of what an American Red Cross official would later describe from the scene as a disaster "unprecedented in scope in the history of South America." The U.S. ambassador to Peru, Taylor G. Belcher, cabled his first report June 1, which reached the State Department at 8 p.m.

It wasn't until June 3 and Ambassador Belcher's first detailed report that official Washington began to appreciate the full gravity of the situation in northern Peru. After flying over the crumpled coastal towns and the mud-choked inland valley, Mr. Belcher cabled this account:

"Canon del Pato and Callejon de Huaylas worse than press reports. Entire valley remains isolated except for helicopter and parachute drops. . . . Town of Carez severely damaged but Yungay and Raurahirca wiped off map by wall of water and mud brought by waters of dislocated glacial Lake Llanganuco. This is major calamity. . . ."

Ambassador Belcher's cable brought an immediate decision from Assistant Secretary of State Charles A. Meyer for "maximum effort" by the U.S. Government. Estimates of Peruvian dead were climbing daily, to reach 60,000 by last week. Among the known casualties were five Americans—two Peace Corps workers, a Catholic priest in Huaraz, and two nuns in Chimbote.

Even before Mr. Belcher's June 3 cable, however, the Defense Department had dispatched a 24-member disaster relief team (later increased to 135) from Howard Air Force Base in Panama. The initial group, made up of two doctors, sanitary and construction engineers, and communications specialists, took with them two small "Huey" helicopters and emergency medical supplies. The team left Panama shortly after 6 a.m. June 2, and by the end of the next day were in full operation at Chimbote.

Peruvian and American relief workers first had to overcome monumental transportation and communications hurdles. "The tremendous mountains turned back all efforts to reach the Callejon de Huaylas," said Stephen R. Tripp, co-ordinator for the Disaster Relief Center. "After the earthquake had moved an entire mountain impenetrable dust, mixed with mist and clouds, prevented helicopters and airplanes from landing in the valley. To get to the Callejon de Huaylas they had to go up over 14,000 feet to clear the mountains and carry enough fuel for a 200-mile round trip."

The little one-rotor Hueys were clearly unsuitable, so the Defense Department again went into action. By late June 3 the Army's New Cumberland materiel depot in Pennsylvania was preparing two big CH-47C "Chinook" helicopters for shipment in two Air Force C-133 Cargomasters.

The Chinooks have long cigarlike bodies that are lifted by two rotors, and are designed to carry 40 fully equipped soldiers, or a total of 23,450 pounds. Like the Hueys they can fly as high as 15,000 feet. By 4 a.m. June 5 the disassembled Chinooks were loaded aboard the Cargomasters with nine service personnel for the 7½-hour flight to Lima.

CARRIER HEADS FOR PERU

Far to the south in the Caribbean Sea, the helicopter carrier Guam received orders June 5 to make for Peru. On board were 11 large Chinook-type HGO helicopters, 4 Hueys, a transportable 60-bed receiving hospital, and a mountain of needed medical and other supplies. The Guam arrived off Chimbote June 11 and immediately began flying medical and communications teams into the valley. In two days the Guam mercy flights had placed relief teams with 26 clusters of stranded earthquake victims, and had flown out the injured either to the ship's 1,000-bed "sick bay" or Peruvian hospitals.

The Chinooks from Pennsylvania began operating in the stricken area June 9. During its last flight the next evening one of the helicopters spotted a group of 80 children stranded near a devastated village 8,500 feet up in the mountains north of Yungay. The children were strapped two-to-a-seat aboard the 40-passenger helicopter and lifted over a 14,000 foot mountain to safety.

At the Disaster Relief Center in Washington one of the most impressive public responses for help came from nurses. Part of the over-all $10,500,000 U.S. aid committed to Peru was two Public Service "package" hospitals, which were flown down in crates. On June 2 the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) was asked to staff the hospitals.

AID's Virginia Worsely, a Public Health Service (PHS) nurse and disaster relief medical co-ordinator, called another PHS nurse in Washington, who in turn called the director of nurses at California's Highland Hospital in Oakland. This nurse, Miss Dorothy Merrill, approached the California Nurses Association. And then, as nurse Worsely tells it, "all hell broke loose."

Radio spot announcements placed every 15 minutes in California brought in 5,000 telephone responses at the PHS office in San Francisco. And in Washington, the Disaster Control Center's four telephone lines all became jammed with calls from nurses eager to go to Peru.

By June 5 AID had 200 nurses inoculated, provided with passports, and ready to fly to Lima. Pan American World Airways, which along with Braniff International Airlines and others were providing free airlifts on a space-available basis, offered to round up the nurses in the United States and whisk them south. But as of last week, they were still in the United States.

The reason? The world's overwhelming response to the earthquake tragedy had already met the medical needs in Peru. France sent a transportable hospital unit with 60 nurses, and by the end of last week the French medical team was already heading home again. Chile staffed a hospital, and Norway flew in a complete medical unit.

The Norwegian plane broke down in Brasilia, the capital of Brazil, so the U.S. Air Force assisted the Norwegians in the last leg of their trip. But after the Norwegians set up, they received only one patient, an old lady who fell down and fractured her shoulder.

"It's true of earthquakes," Nurse Worsely later explained. "Few are injured. People are either killed outright or they survive unhurt. As it turned out they had empty hospital beds all over Peru."

U.S. voluntary organizations also rallied impressively. The American Red Cross assembled 50,000 "comfort kits," containing dozens of needed items like soap, sewing needles and thread, safety pins, and buttons. The first batch will arrive this week with Mrs. Nixon. The sewing kits will be especially useful because the earthquake victims, mostly Peruvian Indians, are smaller than their North American donors and will need to alter their "new" clothes.

World Medical Relief, Inc., a Detroit group, supplied chewable antibiotics in the first U.S. air shipments. The easily administered drugs were effectively used by the Army disaster relief team. Project Hope, which uses a borrowed Navy hospital ship to teach effective medicine around the world, sent a disease control team.

The Salvation Army flew down two jeeps that had been driven from New Orleans to the Miami International Airport, and a bundle of picks, shovels, hammers, and nails from St. Louis. Catholic Relief Services had 600 tons of food, clothing, and medicines on hand in Peru for immediate relief. Later an unnamed sponsor paid for full-page ads appealing for aid in both the New York Times and the New York Daily News. The list could go on and on.

Church World Service, a Protestant relief organization, dispatched more than 100 tons of various supplies, mostly from a combined 2,000-ton stock maintained in four warehouses around the country. Then the organization found itself in the middle of a logistics "fiasco" in Los Angeles.

A Presbyterian minister in Whittier, Calif., one of Los Angeles' many satellite communities, initiated a public appeal that eventually used the national organization's name without gaining specific clearance from Church World Service's New York City headquarters. The public, through radio and television news programs and a paid Los Angeles Times advertisement, was asked to take clothes, blankets, and other items to some 45 collection points around the city, mostly churches. The main problem, as explained by Wilson Radway, an officer of the national group, is that the newspaper advertisement failed to include Church World Service's usual provision that says it can also use the donations to replace goods already shipped to the needy area.

What happens so often in disaster-appeal drives among the voluntary groups is that many of the donated items are processed, sorted, and stored for the next emergency. Goods given in previous appeals are used to provide fast relief for the current emergency. But in Los Angeles, because of the advertisement, the city's Department of Social Service is insisting that all the goods collected in the local Protestant drive be shipped directly to Peru, whether Peru now needs the goods or not.

DONATED GOODS PILE UP

Los Angeles International Airport is currently glutted with more than 125 tons of donated but unsorted goods that are now awaiting transfer by sea following Peru's request to stop further air shipments, at least until Lima's airport can clear out its own pile-up of supplies. The 5,000-foot runway there is now completely lined with goods that could be ruined with the approach of Lima's damp season.

"It's a bit of a mess," admits Mr. Radway. "The Lord knows what it will cost to get out of this. We want to make the best use of the goods without turning off the people."

Despite such foul-ups, which may be unavoidable in the rush to help, Americans demonstrated innumerable ways that when there is need they are seemingly incapable of turning away.

In Perth Amboy, N.J., one of the first Americans to pass the word about the enormity of the Peruvian tragedy was Joseph Kozna, a factory supervisor and ham radio operator. The day after the earthquake Mr. Kozna turned on his set in a mixed mood of dread and expectancy. He was the regular radio contact between a Paterson, N.J., priest who was running a mission in Peru, and the priest's friends and relatives at home.

At 5 p.m. on June 1 the voice of the Rev. James Jannucci came in on schedule to report that Chimbote, where the mission had a branch, was 90 per cent destroyed. Soon a reporter at the Paterson Evening News was talking with Father Jannucci over a radio-telephone "patch," and the word went out for help. By June 3, even before Ambassador Belcher in Peru had cabled his first detailed report, the newspaper's publisher donated $500 to start a disaster-relief drive. By last week more than $5,300 had been collected just in Paterson.

At the Peruvian Embassy in Washington, Mrs. Alicia Esteves, the embassy's first secretary, said this about the American response to her country's ordeal:

"These people are so great and are doing this in such a nice way. People are sensitive about other people's sorrow. There are not many countries like that."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the entrolled bill (S. 3430) to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize additional appropriations, and for other puropses, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

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

JOINT REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Acting Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a joint report of the Federal supervisory agencies (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1969–April 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Snohomish Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 125, the Upper Skagit Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 92, and the Snoqualmie and Skykomish Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 93, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 277

("A concurrent resolution relative to the continued value to the United States of Fort Polk as a permanent military installation)

"Whereas, Fort Polk, located in Vernon Parish in the state of Louisiana, serves an invaluable role in the military preparation of the fighting men of the United States since World War II; and

"Whereas, during its proud history Fort Polk has been the site for the training of nearly eight million soldiers during World War II, of some forty thousand men during the Korean Conflict, and the place where, between 1962 and 1970, some eight hundred thousand more of our nation's fighting men have been trained; and

"Whereas, the variety of terrain of the some two hundred thousand acre reservation comprising Fort Polk is such that it is there possible to train soldiers in topography which duplicates areas of North Africa, Western Europe, Southeast Asia and Latin America; and

"Whereas, due to the topographical similarity of portions of Fort Polk to the jungles and highlands of Southeast Asia, Fort Polk was selected to conduct Vietnam-oriented advanced infantry training, and now provides more infantry replacements to Vietnam than any other training center; and

"Whereas, the moderate climate of the area in which Fort Polk is located reduces military training costs by reason of the fact that special winter clothing is not required; food costs are reduced due to lower caloric intake requirements in warmer climate; construction costs are lessoned by reduced insulation and other building requirements; the short winter season and its relative mildness minimizes fuel costs, and there is a significantly low loss of training days due to upper respiratory infections and other ailments in comparison to posts located in many other areas of the Nation; and

"Whereas, the relatively rural location of Fort Polk insures unrestricted use of air space, freedom from smog and from air and water pollution, and an ample supply of fresh water is readily available; and

"Whereas, significant investments of public monies have been made to provide training facilities at Fort Polk, as evidenced by the fact that the present value of the properties of this magnificent military installation for the training of men for combat approximates three hundred thirty-five million dollars; and

"Whereas, the nearly four million citizens of the state of Louisiana take great pride in the fact that this outstanding military base is located within this state, and over the nearly three decades of its existence a highly desirable spirit of camaraderie has developed and been maintained between the citizens of the area surrounding Fort Polk and the military commanders and their personnel and are honored to have them as friends, neighbors and associates.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana, the Senate thereof concurring, that the Legislature of Louisiana, for all of the citizens of this state, hereby expresses to President of the United States and the Congress of the United States its considered view that the development and maintenance of Fort Polk in Vernon Parish, State of Louisiana, as a major permanent military installation for the training and preparation of military personnel for combat duty long has served a vitally essential function in the overall effort for preservation of this great democracy, and its further view and sincere belief that the continued operation and maintenance of said installation, with its tremendous advantages and vast investment of public funds, as a permanent military training center, is in the best interest of the entire nation.

"Be it further resolved that a copy of this Concurrent Resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress.

"JOHN S. GARRET,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. C. AYCOCK,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

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

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 134

("A concurrent resolution to memoralize the President of the United States, the members of Congress and the Governors of each of the states of the Union to give vigorous support to the adoption of legislation to prohibit the advertisement of movies which are not recommended by the motion picture industry rating code for viewing by general audiences, including children, in theatres where the main feature being shown is recommended for general audience viewing)

"Whereas, the great majority of motion pictures produced today are ascribed a rating by a board of the motion picture industry, based primarily on the amount of sex and violence attendant to each movie and which, in some instances, restricts the age of persons allowed to attend certain movies; and

"Whereas, the movie rating code is a great public benefit to all communities and is a valuable instrument to guide the concerned parents of our young people in determining the fitness of a particular movie for their individual child, especially in times such as these, when sex and violence are so prevalent on the movie screens; and

"Whereas, it has become the practice in some theatres to advertise excerpts from movies which have been ascribed a restricted rating at times when the main feature being shown is recommended for viewing by general audiences, including children, thereby defeating and undermining one of the primary purposes of the rating code; and

"Whereas, this problem is one of grave concern to all parents throughout the country and uniformity in legislation at the federal level and in all of the several states is highly desirable, due to the increased interstate travel and mobility of families in these times; and

"Whereas, the health and welfare of the youth of this country should be of paramount importance to the political leaders of the United States and of each of the several states.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana, the House of Representatives thereof concurring that the President of the United States, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, and the Congress of the United States and the Governors of the several states are hereby memorialized to give vigorous support to the adoption of appropriate legislation to prohibit the advertising by owners or operators of motion picture theatres of movies which are not recommended under the motion picture rating code for viewing by general audiences, including children, at times when the main feature being shown at the theatre is recommended under said code for viewing by general audiences, including children.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, and to each member of the Congress of the United States and to the Governors of the several states.

"C. C. Aycock,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.
"John S. Garret,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

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

"House Concurrent Resolution No. 93

("A concurrent resolution to urge and request the Congress of the United States to adopt and the members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress to support legislation providing for the sharing of a portion of the revenues from the federal income tax with state and local governments)

"Whereas, the concept that the federal government should share a portion of the revenues produced from the levy and imposition of the federal income tax with state and local governments has been endorsed by the National Governors' Conference and the National Legislative Conference and such proposal has the support and endorsement of many other public officials, educators and businessmen;

"Whereas, state and local expenditures have increased at a far greater rate than federal expenditures in the last decade, and state and local governments rely primarily on property and sales taxes and forms of taxation other than an income tax as a source of revenue since the field of income taxation is the source of the bulk of federal revenues; and

"Whereas, the trend of expenditures by state and local government will continue upward due to the efforts of states and cities to meet the crisis in our cities and in providing necessary services to citizens; and

"Whereas, statistics indicate that the public throughout the nation disapproves of additional tax increases thus limiting the sources of additional revenues to state and local government; and

"Whereas, while the financial condition of state and local governments has been weakened despite tax increases, federal revenues are increasing on an annual average of approximately six billion dollars; and

"Whereas, federal revenue sharing would provide state and local governments with a continuing, dependable source of revenue which will in some measure relieve these governments of the constant shortage of funds thereby enabling the states to be in a better financial position to provide additional educational, hospital, health and welfare services for their growing populations.

"Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the legislature of Louisiana, the State thereof concurring, that the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged and requested to adopt legislation providing for the sharing of a portion of the revenues from the Federal income tax with State and local governments, and that the members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress are hereby respectfully urged and requested to support such legislation.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution shall be transmitted to the presiding officers of each of the two Houses in Congress and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

"John S. Garret,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. Aycock,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the Florida Jaycees, Lakeland, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to review the status of cancer research appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Tallahassee, Fla., Women's Republican Club, commending the President for his efforts in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

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

H.R. 7517. An act to amend the Canal Zone to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1015).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ALLEN:

S. 4077. A bill to repeal Public Law 91-285; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) (by request):

S. 4078. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Snohomish Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 125, the Upper Skagit Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 92, and the Snoqualmie and Skykomish Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 93, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 4079. A bill to increase the authorization for annual contributions in aid of low-rent public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

S. 4077—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REPEAL PUBLIC LAW 91-285

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I introduce a brief and simple bill to repeal Public Law 91-285. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record and I send it to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gravel). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed at this point in the Record as requested.

The bill (S. 4077) to repeal Public Law 91-285, introduced by Mr. Allen, 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. 4077

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 91-285 is repealed.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, Public Law 91-285 is the statute recently debated as H.R. 4249 and the misleading title "to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to discriminatory use of tests and devices."

H.R. 4249 with various amendments became the present ludicrous hodgepodge of new propositions of constitutional law and is now officially designated Public Law 91-285.

In the first place, Public Law 91-285 does not extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Act would not have expired. So, rather than extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which would not have expired in the first instance, the law as enacted expands the old law so as to suspend the qualification of literacy as a condition for registration and voting in all States of the Union. I must say that such an expansion of coverage is indeed an extension—not of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but rather of an alleged power in Congress to proscribe and prescribe qualifications for voting in all States of the Union.

From time immemorial, students of government have believed that the ideal government would be one in which the power to govern is exercised by the intelligent and virtuous. There are some who continue to believe in that ideal. It is true that Public Law 91-285 does not deal with the subject of virtue as a qualification for voting. Certain felons may continue to be deprived of the right to vote. Yet when Congress denies the people the right to establish literacy as a qualification for voting, it has asserted the power to deal with the subject of virtue also, as well as other qualifications for the exercise of the franchise.

For example, one of the amendments attached to the hodgepodge bill which became law, is predicated on the proposition that the Constitution delegated to Congress the power to prescribe residency requirements for voting. Another provision added by the amendment is predicated on the proposition that the Constitution delegated to Congress the power to fix age qualifications for voting at 18, or any other age which Congress may arbitrarily decide upon.

Mr. President, it seems likely that some will try to advance the idea that this law is really aimed at the South and that a little bit of unconstitutional law and a little bit of cynicism and double standards and demagoguery when aimed against the people of the South are justified on political grounds if not by morality and law.

Mr. President, I am no prophet, but I dare say that the majority of the people of the United States are sickened by laws enacted in cynical disregard of the law of the Constitution of the United States. No Senator—no Member of Congress—will seriously contend that the Federal Constitution does not recognize the inherent right and power in the States to determine the qualifications for voting. I am not talking about discriminatory State laws—I am talking about a power supposedly delegated by the Constitution to Congress to fix qualifications for voting. Congress has no such power. The people know that Congress has no such power. Laws enacted without or beyond powers delegated to Congress are nullities. Public Law 91-285 improperly assumes this power in Congress, and it should be repealed.

Mr. President, Public Law 91-285 should be repealed for other and perhaps more compelling reasons that I have already mentioned. This enactment breaks new ground in the area of constitutional theory in that it adopts a new and dangerous method of amending the Constitution. This statute says in effect that regardless of what the Constitution may otherwise say, Congress can propose an amendment to the Constitution in the form of legislation and that such amendment may be ratified and approved by judicial decree. This idea is revolutionary. It does violence to the Constitution.

Mr. President, every Member of this Senate knows full well that the Constitution prescribes only two methods of amendment. Amendment of the Constitution by judicial decree is not one of them. Let it be remembered that debate on the 18-year-old voting age amendment on the floor in the Senate invoked this new method of amendment. It was earnestly urged and strongly advocated that the Constitution could in effect be amended by the enactment of a statute and ratification and approval by the Supreme Court of the United States. This is a dangerous innovation. It should be rejected in principle and denounced by repeal of Public Law 91-285.

Mr. President, at the beginning of these remarks, I mentioned that the bill used as the vehicle for enacting Public Law 91-285 was deceptive. It invokes the idea that masses of voters in the South are disfranchised. Let me elaborate for a moment on this particular point.

Mr. President, according to official returns released last Friday from the Office of the Secretary of State of New York State, only 944,998 persons in the entire State of New York voted last month in the Democratic primary election for Governor. In a similar primary election in Alabama last month, a total of 1,085,783 persons voted for candidates for Governor. Yet, New York State, according to latest available estimates, has a population of 18,321,000—while the population of Alabama is only 3,372,463.

Thus, 140,785 more persons voted in the Alabama Democratic primary election than New York State Democrats did in their statewide primary election.

Also, less than 30 percent of the registered Democratic voters in New York State participated in nominating their candidates for Governor. In contrast, approximately 67 percent of all Alabama registered voters—Democrats and Republicans alike—participated in choosing the Democratic candidate for Governor.

To illustrate further the disparity in voter interest and participation in elections, let me cite a random comparison of recent examples of congressional races in Alabama and in New York. In the congressional district presently represented by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, a total of 23, 915 votes were cast for five candidates in the Democratic primary election to choose a candidate to represent that district in Congress.

In contrast, in the Seventh Congressional District in Alabama, a total of 115,108 votes were cast for a single candidate—Congressman TOM BEVILL of that district.

In this connection, I believe that it is worth noting that, according to figures furnished by the Library of Congress, roughly 65 percent of the total voting age population in New York State is registered to vote. In contrast, 85.4 percent of the total voting age population of Alabama is registered to vote. These figures speak volumes about the distorted concept of federalism which seeks to justify denying citizens of the sovereign State of Alabama the fundamental constitutional right to register qualified voters and to conduct its own free and open elections by laws and procedures and principles in force and effect in other States of the Union. The citizens of Alabama and the citizens of six other States of the South are denied this fundamental right because in 1964 they had literacy tests and less than 50 percent of the voting age population of such States were registered to vote or else for good and sufficient reasons failed to vote in the presidential election of 1964.

The cynicism behind this absurd standard for depriving States of their constitutionally protected powers is exposed to public view and to increasing condemnation with each election, such as those I have cited.

Yet, this absurd standard for purposeful discrimination against Alabama and the South has been solemnly perpetuated by this Congress with the blessings of this administration in the enactment of Public Law 91-285.

Mr. President, there is much talk about the danger of polarization. I know of nothing more certain to polarize this Nation than continued application of double standards by which one region of this great Nation is subjected to absurd and unjust discrimination.

Mr. President, Public Law 91-285 is a monstrosity. It establishes a judicial despotism. It pleads the Constitution as the source of its authority to do so. The time has come for a change. The wave of the future is constitutional government. Those who resist that change are in opposition to the vast majority of the people of this Nation. Let us begin that change with the repeal of the monstrous and infamous Public Law 91-285.

S. 4078—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF CERTAIN INDIANS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, for myself and the senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), by request, a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Snohomish Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 125, the Upper Skagit Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 2, and the Snoqualmie and Skyomish Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 3, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the Executive communication requesting the introduction of this legislation be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 4078) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Snohomish Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 125, the Upper Skagit Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 92, and the Snoqualmie and Skykomish Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 93, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), by request, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The communication, presented by Mr. JACKSON, is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1970.

Hon. SPIRO T. AGNEW,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Snohomish Tribe in Indian Claims docket numbered 125, the Upper Skagit Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 92, and the Snoqualmie and Skykomish Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 93, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted.

The three awards represent additional payments for lands ceded by the respective tribes under the Point Elliott Treaty of January 22, 1855 (12 Stat. 927), ratified March 8, 1859, which had been concluded with some 22-named tribes or groups "and other allied and subordinate tribes and bands of Indians," located in the Puget Sound area of the then Territory of Washington.

Funds to cover the Snohomish judgment, in the amount of $136,165.79, were appropriated by the Act of May 29, 1967 (81 Stat. 30, 42), and the funds to cover the Upper Skagit and the Snoqualmie and Skykomish judgments, in the sums of $385,471.42 and $257,698.29, respectively, were appropriated by the Act of October 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 1190, 1198). Financial statements on the judgment funds are enclosed. The beneficiaries in each of the three awards have been determined to be the scattered living lineal descendants of members of the respective tribes as they existed in 1855. For the purpose of expediting the disposition of these funds, the three awards have been combined in one legislative proposal, as the nature of the claims and the situation of the tribal groups are similar. The general information presented in this transmittal letter is applicable to all four tribes involved in these awards. Detailed information specifically relating to the respective tribes is provided in the background data report which accompanies this letter.

Under the Point Elliott Treaty, four separate reservations were established for all the treaty participants—Port Madison or Suquamish, Perry's or Swinomish, Island of Chah-choo-sen or Lummi, and Tulalip or Snohomish. Many of the Snohomish Indians and a number of the Indians of the other three tribes settled on Tulalip Reservation along with other groups of Indians who participated in the 1855 treaty, and it is where their descendants still live.

The Indians were given an opportunity to obtain land allotments on Tulalip, and 165 Indians were allotted, which included 76 Snohomish, 33 Snoqualmie, 2 Skykomish, and 16 Skagit. There was no indication whether the persons of Skagit blood were Upper Skagit or Lower Skagit. Lower Skagit, a separate tribe, has a claim pending before the Indian Claims Commission.

A number of the Indians who moved to Lummi, Swinomish, and Port Madison received lands on those reservations and have continued to live as members of the respective groups. Through intermarriage and affiliation with other tribal groups, many of them have lost their original tribal identity. An indeterminate number of the treaty Indians have never affiliated with any recognized reservation group and are now widely scattered. It is believed that the majority of them live throughout the Pacific Northwest. Their ancestors chose not to move to the reservations and continued to live in the area where homes had been developed prior to the 1855 treaty. Later, they were given homesteads in fee simple or trust status on the public domain portion of the area occupied by the aboriginal groups. A considerable number of the Western Washington tribes and bands have managed to maintain their identity in some form, either as an organized or unorganized group, banded together for social purposes or to promote business enterprises.

None of the tribes represented in these awards has a reservation which is exclusively its own. There is a group of Snohomish Indians which identifies itself as the Snohomish Tribe of Indians, a group of Upper Skagit Indians which identifies itself as the Upper Skagit Tribe, and a group of Snoqualmie Indians which identifies itself as the Snoqualmaie Tribal Organization. These organizations have not been recognized by the Federal Government as tribal entities. They have, however, been recognized for the purposes of prosecuting their land claims against the United States. There is no presently existing organization known as the Skykomish Tribe but among the present-day Snoqualmie tribal membership there are persons who have Skykomish ancestors.

The individual members of these organizations are considered descendants of members of former tribes, rather than present-day members of successor tribes. These organizations do not represent all of the descendants of the respective tribes. The majority of the members of these organizations are persons who have never affiliated with any reservation group. The organizations have membership requirements, but such matters as degree of blood and proof of ancestry, etc., have not been verified. Persons have been able to register if they paid a fee.

The Upper Skagit organization does not include in its membership individuals whom the group considers belong to the Suiattle group. The Upper Skagits feel that because the Suiattle-Sauk separated from the Upper Skagits at the time claims were filed before the Indian Claims Commission, they have no right to participate in the Upper Skagit award in docket 92. The Commission has found that the aboriginal Suiattle-Sauk can be properly classified as Upper Skagit Indians. Information on the Suiattle-Sauk Band is included in the background data report on the Upper Skagit Tribe.

Some 35 tribal groups of the Western Washington area, including 12 tribes of the Point Elliott Treaty group, are represented in 31 separate dockets which were filed before the Indian Claims Commission on behalf of aboriginal tribes and groups, including 6 dockets by non-treaty groups and 25 dockets by participants in 5 separate treaties. A list of the tribes and groups who filed claims with the Indian Claims Commission is enclosed.

The Indian Claims Commission has completed 16 dockets and the remaining 15 dockets are pending in various stages of litigation. Seven of the pending dockets involve Point Elliott Treaty groups, and 3 dockets are of unorganized tribes. We have no estimate as to when they will be finally settled.

So far, there have been favorable judgments in 11 dockets and 5 dockets have been dismissed. Congress has enacted legislation providing for the disposition of judgment funds from 7 awards. Five tribal organizations, which have been recognized as successors in interest of aboriginal tribes, have participated in judgment funds from 4 awards, while funds from 3 awards are to be distributed per capita to living descendants of members of aboriginal tribes as they existed at treaty times.

The Snohomish and Upper Skagit organizations favor distribution of the judgment funds only to persons not affiliated with any other tribal group, and believe persons of mixed-blood should not be entitled to share in more than one award. The specific recommendations of these organizations are discussed in the socio-economic report which accompanies this letter. The documents presented by these organizations in support of their positions are attached to the socio-economic report. The Snoqualmie organization has not expressed itself to the matter of distribution of the judgment funds. Bureau of Indian Affairs field personnel have met with these groups and have consistently informed them that the awards probably would go to all descendants without regard to membership.

Many of the Indians of the Northwest area have blood connections with quite a few other Northwest coast tribes. Such multiple blood ties are common within the membership of many Northwest coast tribes. In all probability mixed-bloods of the 4 tribes involved in the 3 awards can trace their ancestry to one or more of the tribes or bands of the Point Elliott Treaty groups, and possibly to other Western Washington tribes whose claims have been settled or are pending before the Commission. They therefore could claim the right to share solely on the basis of descent in more than one award unless limited by legislation.

Previous judgment disposition acts distributing funds on a descendancy basis to Western Washington tribes contained no restrictions limiting persons of mixed-blood to participate in only one award. Entitlement was solely on the basis of descent and included both reservation-affiliated and non-reservation-affiliated Indians, provided they met the eligibility requirements of the authorization act. We do not propose a change in the class of persons who will be entitled to participate in the distribution of the three awards covered by the draft bill.

We recommend that the scattered lineal descendants be named the beneficiaries of the awards in Snohomish docket 125, Upper Skagit in docket 92, and Snoqualmie-Skykomish Tribes in docket 93. For this purpose, the proposed bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to prepare separate rolls of all lineal descendants of members of the respective tribes as they existed in 1855 who meet the eligibility requirements set forth in the proposed bill.

Neither the Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation nor the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community of the Swinomish Reservation, as now organized in connection with its reservation, will be the beneficiaries of any claims awards. No tribe or band named Tulalip was a party to the 1855 treaty, and no such band or tribe ever existed. Individual members of these organizations who are able to trace their ancestry to the respective tribes as they existed in 1855 will be entitled to share in the judgment funds.

We have considered the possibility of programing the funds, but find it impracticable since, in each instance, we are not dealing with a tribal group but with scattered descendants. Therefore, the proposed bill provides that the Secretary shall distribute per capita shares of living enrollees directly to such enrollees and gives authority to the Secretary to develop procedures for the disposition of the shares of minors and persons under legal disability.

Information is not readily available on the number of persons who will participate in the distribution of each of the funds. However, the Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates the following number of persons will be on the rolls of the respective tribes: Snohomish Tribe, 2,450; Upper Skagit Tribe, including the Suiattle-Sauk Band, 1,000–1,500; Snoqualmie and Skykomish Tribes 1,000–1,500.

The Indians of the Tulalip Reservation are organized under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and incorporated under the corporate name of "The Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation." Their current membership roll, now under preparation, includes the names of 997 persons, 778 of whom are of Snohomish descent. Of the persons shown to be of Snohomish descent, 185 are also shown as possessing the blood of other tribes, including Snoqualmie, Skykomish, and Skagits.

In 1919, Special Allotting Agent Charles Roblin prepared a "Schedule of Unenrolled Indians," listing tribal groups separately. Roblin's lists included the following number of unenrolled Indians of the tribes involved in these awards: Snohomish, 355; Snoqualmie 251; Skagit 471 (appears to include Lower Skagits). Roblin also prepared a list of Suiattle Indians in 1916, which contains 129 names.

There is no single roll or record of the respective tribes which might be used to trace ancestry. For those Indians who are affiliated with the four treaty reservations, there are census rolls and allotment records which contain the names of persons of the blood of these tribes who may be enrolled with other tribes, many of whom may have lost their separate tribal identity.

The Office of Management and Budget advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

FRED J. RUSSELL,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

S. 4079—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCREASE THE AUTHORIZATION FOR ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS IN LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to increase the authorization for annual contributions in low-rent public housing for the fiscal year 1970–71 by $150,000,000. This action is of urgent necessity because the authorizations available to this program are rapidly being exhausted. Unless such an action is taken now, new commitments for the remainder of this fiscal year just begun will come to a virtual end. The new authorization made available on July 1, 1970, has been fully committed, and new contract agreements will have to be frozen for the remainder of this current fiscal year.

The new authorization for public housing which became available on July 1, 1970, will enable the Federal Government to assist approximately 90,000 dwelling units. At the present time, there are pending program reservations for local communities covering some 180,000 to 190,000 units. In addition to these reservations, there are applications pending from local communities for another 250,000 units that have not been processed because of lack of authorization funds. Furthermore, it is anticipated that local communities will apply for an additional 200,000 units during fiscal year 1971.

Mr. President, many local communities throughout the Nation, including many in my home State of Minnesota, have proceeded in good faith to develop plans for badly needed low-income housing. They are being informed that there is not a sufficient authorization for their reservations to be honored, or their applications to be processed. We cannot permit this situation at a time when the housing needs of low-income families are so great.

I would also point out that, over the past few years, the public housing program has demonstrated a greatly expanded capacity to produce housing. Beginning in 1968, public housing production began to increase at an accelerated rate—in fact, in this 1 year, it doubled its production from 37,000 units to 75,000 units. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, over 82,500 public housing units were placed in occupancy. In the fiscal year just concluded on June 30, 1970, the final count of units completed is expected to reach 93,000. The pipeline of demand from local communities has now reached the point where the public housing program can achieve the goal for fiscal 1971 established in the 10-year housing goals adopted by the Congress in 1968 of 190,000 units. But, the pipeline must be kept moving. It requires an additional authorization for this fiscal year.

The additional authorization which I am proposing of $150,000,000 would permit the Federal Government to assist an additional 100,000 dwelling units in fiscal 1971. These units, combined with the 90,000 units estimated to be possible under the existing authorization, would permit the 1971 fiscal year's effort to reach 190,000 units— the target for this year under the 10-year housing goals established in 1968.

Mr. President, failure to provide this authorization would have a debilitating effect on public housing—the only program that is providing housing for truly low-income families. A stagnating period of nearly a year without authorization to proceed could set back all of the hard-won momentum achieved in this program since 1968. The pipeline would be halted, and the enthusiasm of local communities would be cooled.

It is also important to note that this new authority would not destabilize this year's already precarious budget. The new authorizations which I am seeking would simply allow HUD to enter into new contract agreements totaling this amount. The actual expenditure would come in the future and surely not in this fiscal year.

For all of these reasons, I introduce this bill, and ask for its support. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 4079) to increase the authorization for annual contributions in aid of low-rent public housing, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4079

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 10(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "$170,000,000 on July 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "$320,000,000 on July 1, 1970".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 3418

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the name of the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3418, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine.

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

S. 3724

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) be added as cosponsors of S. 3724 with respect to ammunition recordkeeping. This measure is known as the McGee amendment.

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 13, 1970, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3430) to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING TO UNEMPLOYED AND UNDERPRIVILEGED PERSONS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 771 AND 772

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am submitting for myself, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) two amendments intended to be proposed to S. 3867, a bill to assure opportunities for employment and training to unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes.

These two amendments are designed to provide a clear role for community action agencies in the conduct of manpower services programs. The second amendment also would provide recourse to the Secretary of Labor for a small governmental unit which felt that the manpower program being conducted in the area under its jurisdiction was not adequate. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The amendments (Nos. 771 and 772) were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

AMENDMENT 771

On page 25, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new paragraph:

"(4) appropriate arrangements with community action agencies, and, to the extent appropriate, with other community-based organizations serving the poverty community, for their participation in the conduct of programs for which financial assistance is provided under this title;"

On page 25, line 21, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

AMENDMENT 772

On page 27, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) An application submitted under section 205 shall not be approved unless an opportunity has been provided upon the request of any unit of general local government or any community action agency for a hearing, upon which basis an appeal may be taken to the Secretary as of right, on the ground that the services provided for in such application for the area served by such unit or by such community action agency are inadequate. If the Secretary, after conferring with the applicant, determines that the applicant will not provide adequate services, then he shall enter into direct arrangements with the appropriate unit of general local government or the appropriate community action agency or any other public or private agency, and funds which would otherwise be available to the applicant for providing such services shall be made available through such direct arrangements."

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN LAND CLAIMS OF ALASKA NATIVES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 773

Mr. JACKSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1830) to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CREATION OF AN OFFICE OF DISASTER ASSISTANCE—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 774—SUBMISSION OF AN AMENDMENT TO AMEND S. 3619 SO AS TO PROVIDE SPECIAL LOANS TO DISASTER VICTIMS TO PREVENT THEM FROM LOSING THEIR HOMES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit, for approriate reference, an amendment which would amend S. 3619, the Omnibus Disaster Assistance Act, so as to provide the Small Business Administration with authority to make loans to disaster victims for the purpose of preventing such individuals from losing their homes as the result of the foreclosure or cancellation of any mortgage, lien, contract of sale or lease. This special loan program would be available to those disaster victims who have become unemployed or otherwise so financially burdened as a result of a major disaster that they cannot meet the payments on their homes.

Mr. President, I originally included this provision in my bill, S. 3848, to provide emergency assistance to the victims of the Plainview and Lubbock tornadoes. My experience in working with the problems caused by such major disasters as these tornadoes and Hurricane Beulah has taught me that one of the most tragic aspects of any major disaster is the multitude of financial problems it imposes upon people in the lower income groups. Not only are their homes damaged or destroyed and their possessions ruined, but in many cases their income is either seriously reduced by unusual expenses attributable to the disaster or eliminated altogether. For example, many of the businesses that employed the Mexican American people in Lubbock were either destroyed completely or seriously damaged in the tornado. Consequently, these people were laid off from their jobs and lost what little income they had. Once these people lose their source of income or become overburdened with medical expenses and repair bills, a dreadful spiral begins which often results in eviction from their homes, repossession of their personal property and the ruination of their credit. Having lost everything, disaster victims, such as the Mexican Americans of Lubbock, are forced to leave the communities which have been their homes for many years and become wandering migrants.

The amendments that I am offering today will fill a gap that has existed for many years in our disaster assistance laws and provide the type of relief that will enable many disaster victims to retain their place in the community. As a cosponsor and strong supporter of S. 3619, I feel this amendment will strengthen the bill and broaden its coverage so that it deals with some of the other problems that are generated by a major disaster. A reconstruction or repair loan is of little value to a person who cannot make the payments on his home. I urge the Senate Public Works Committee to incorporate this special loan program as part of S. 3619.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I am offering today be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 774) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 774

On page 20, after line 24, insert the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) In the administration of the disaster loan program under section 7 (b) of the Small Business Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 636 (b)), the Small Business Administration, if necessary to prevent the dispossession or eviction of any person from his residence as a result of the foreclosure of any mortgage or lien, cancellation of any contract of sale, or termination of any lease, oral or written, of the property which is such person's residence, and if such foreclosure, cancellation, or termination is related to circumstances arising out of the effects of a major disaster, shall make such loans for the refinancing of such mortgages or liens and for the payment of installments on such contracts and leases, under the terms and conditions set forth in such section of the Small Business Act as modified by subsection (a) of this section.

"(2) No application for a loan under this subsection which states that such loan is made necessary by circumstances arising out of the effects of a major disaster shall be denied for insufficiency of proof of such statement unless the Small Business Administration finds, and sets forth its findings in writing, that such loan is made necessary by circumstances not related to the effects of a major disaster."

On page 21, line 1, strike out "(b)" the first time it appears and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES—AMENDMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment to amend H.R. 9183 which would provide that upon the exportation of jet aircraft engines that have been overhauled or rebuilt in the United States with the use of imported merchandise, there shall be refunded the duties which have been paid on that merchandise.

According to title 19, United States Code, section 1313, the provision which forms the statutory basis for granting drawback of duties, exported articles manufactured or produced in the United States with the use of imported merchandise deserve a full drawback of the duties paid upon the merchandise.

Mr. President, I believe that the Bureau of Customs has wrongly interpreted this provision by excluding rebuilt aircraft engines from the classification of manufacture or production.

Among other cases, Hackendorf against United States holds that engine rebuilding constitutes manufacture or production under the Internal Revenue Code. So, I believe, should it hold under the tariff provisions.

Moreover, the addition of the subsection for which this amendment calls would place the U.S. aircraft engine overhaul industry at a competitive advantage with foreign companies, to the benefit of the U.S. balance of trade.

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

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

The amendment (No. 775) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 775

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1313) is amended by redesignating subsections (h), (i), and (j) as (i), (j), and (k), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

"(h) Upon the exportation of jet aircraft engines that have been overhauled, repaired, rebuilt, or reconditioned in the United States with the use of imported merchandise, including parts, there shall be refunded, upon satisfactory proof that such imported merchandise has been so used, the duties which have been paid thereon, in amounts not less than $100."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles exported on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 711

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) be added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 711 to Senate Joint Resolution 1, to provide for the Direct Popular Election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

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

NOTICE OF MIGRATORY LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, announce that public hearings will be resumed on July 20 and 21, 1970, in Washington, D.C.

These hearings will be the eighth in a long series of investigations into migrant and seasonal farmworker powerlessness. In past hearings we heard migrants themselves tell of their own lives, as well as psychiatrists and sociologists analyze the effects of many years of desperation and hopelessness that characterize the farmworker existence.

In other hearings we have investigated the successes and failures of community and union organization efforts, the legal problems of migrants, the border commuter labor problem, the effects of pesticides on farmworkers, and in April 1970, the economic and manpower problems of migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

On July 20 and 21, the subcommittee will again consider the plight of the powerless migrant.

Our first witness will be a team of noted doctors who, under the auspices of the New York Field Foundation, traveled to Texas and Florida to study the health problems and living and working conditions of migrants.

I am shocked and outraged beyond belief by the preliminary reports of these doctors. We find the lives of hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens manipulated and managed in such a way as to reduce them to sub-human status. We find isolation, anger, frustration and fear among people for whom lives lived on the land could be as rich and as fulfilling as the land itself.

The destitution and exploitation of men, women, and children, horrifying beyond imagination, will be documented in our hearings.

I have asked some of these doctors, among them members of the original team of doctors who in 1967 and 1968 made an inquiry into the extent of hunger and malnutrition in this country, to share their observations with the subcommittee. It is a public scandal to read from their preliminary reports that—

The conditions they observed in Texas and Florida are worse than those that existed in Mississippi in 1967;

That migrant camps could only be described as "slave quarters";

That the conditions viewed by one doctor were worse than in South America;

That an examination of over 1,000 migrants in Texas revealed that rickets, scurvey, pellagra, and diarrhea were rampant. Polio, for which we have a vaccine, is epidemic; and,

That health services are almost non-existent—a boy going blind was given a urine test and sent home.

I believe that America has its own version of the "tiger cages" of South Vietnam in the migrant labor camps of Texas and Florida and in the stream States where migrants travel to harvest our abundance of food. No other conclusion can be drawn from these reports.

I further believe that it is time for this subcommittee to go further into the causes of this harvest of shame. And we intend to do so.

We will not only look at the deplorable state of health and welfare of the migrant farmworker and his family, but we will investigate who is consciously determined to maintain this condition.

If there are the powerless there are also the powerful. We will find out who is responsible for these conditions. We plan to call upon the doctors, upon Federal and local officials and others to find out which institutions and persons, public and private, Government and agribusiness, are responsible for these conditions. It is time for an explanation. It is time to find out who are the exploiters. Nothing will change until this rotten system is exposed and held accountable.

HUNTLEY CONFESSES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the real Chet Huntley has finally revealed himself to the Nation, and he is nothing more and nothing less than many of us suspected—a part propagandist who has an antipathy for Republicans.

Mr. Huntley made one other thing clear—he is easily frightened by Republicans.

He was not frightened by President Johnson's decision to turn South Vietnam into a major American battleground, but he is frightened that President Nixon is getting us out of that battleground.

He was not frightened by the Johnson policies that led to the worst inflation in this century, but he is frightened because President Nixon is ending that inflation.

Mr. President, those who have held Republican or conservative views have felt over the years that the Huntley-Brinkley report was biased, prejudiced, and not objective.

I believe the confessions of Mr. Huntley indicates his dislike for President Nixon, Vice President AGNEW, and perhaps anyone else who might be associated with the Republican Party. His confessions unquestionably indicate the feelings held by many who report the news, and the fact that they do have anti-Nixon, anti-Republican, anti-conservative views.

In the name of objectivity, and fairness it is perhaps time, after 14 years, that Mr. Huntley has revealed his true colors to the American people. Perhaps his colleague, Mr. Brinkley, will follow his lead.

IS A COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT BENEFICIAL FOR SOUTH VIETNAM?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) was quoted as saying that President Nixon is determined to keep the Thieu-Ky government in power in South Vietnam because he believes any kind of government, no matter how tyrannical, would be better than a Communist government.

Is the Senator suggesting that a Communist government in South Vietnam would be better than the Thieu-Ky government?

If this is or is not the case, I wish he would say so, that we know where he stands instead of merely knowing where he thinks the President stands.

I would ask the junior Senator from South Dakota a few questions:

Does he think that the Thieu-Ky government is more tyrannical than that of North Vietnam, or North Korea, or Red China, or Albania, or Russia?

Does he prefer a totally anti-American, anti-Western government in South Vietnam to a pro-American pro-Western government?

Does he believe a North Vietnamese victory and a North Vietnamese Government imposed on South Vietnam would mean freedom and justice for the South Vietnamese?

Mr. President, have not we learned anything by watching the Communists over the years? We hear talk of repression in the United States today as riots and rioters go virtually unchecked and unpunished; as pornography invades our movies, our mails, and our homes, as use of dope is rampant, when in fact, repression is almost nonexistent.

The real repression, as always, is in the Communist countries, where to say or write what one thinks means prison or death. Where obedience to the state is mandatory.

Is this the kind of government we should inflict on South Vietnam just because they do not like Thieu?

Mr. President, the North Vietnamese murder and torture as part of their policies, if we can believe Douglas Pike and Stephen Hosmer, two experts in Communist repression.

Mr. President, the North Vietnamese daily torture the wives and families of Americans they hold captive by refusing to give any information about them and by refusing to let them communicate with their loved ones.

Mr. President, in North Korea a similar government tortured the men of the *Pueblo* and before that the men they captured in the Korean war.

In Czechoslovakia, the cruel hand of Red repression lays heavily on a people that had just begun to see the light of freedom. In Russia they are again deifying the cruelest butcher of them all—Stalin. One could go on and on, Mr. President.

For myself, I support the President of the United States. If the South Vietnamese voluntarily choose a Communist government, they are welcome to it. However, we must not be a part of any effort to inflict such a government on them.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

ADMINISTRATION EASES IMPACT OF HIGHWAY CUTBACK—LEGISLATION CONSIDERED TO PROHIBIT SHORT-TERM REDUCTIONS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Federal highway funds for the 1971 fiscal year will be released to the States today in the amount of $4.6 billion. This amount is less than the $4.9 billion in the 1970 budget recommendation.

The decision to authorize spending at this level was reached after considerable discussion with the White House and the Bureau of the Budget. I am informed that the Bureau of the Budget recommended that only $3.6 billion be apportioned, apparently as a device to help reduce overall Federal spending.

Last Wednesday I sent a telegram to President Nixon urgently recommending that there be no reduction in the apportionment below the level authorized by the Congress.

The development of the national transportation system is at a stage that we cannot tolerate any substantial reduction in the obligation of Federal highway funds. Each such reduction aggravates an already serious cost problem and only contributes to the eventual higher cost of completing highway projects previously authorized.

The investment in basic transportation facilities to underpin the economic and social growth of the United States is so important that we must have a continuous spending pattern insuring that minimum levels in the development of these facilities be met each year in an orderly fashion.

I will, therefore, recommend that Congress consider legislation exempting funds apportioned to the States under Federal highway legislation from short-term reductions for budgetary considerations.

VAL DECKER PACKING PLANT, PIQUA, OHIO, IS IN BUSINESS TO STAY

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, on June 18 I made some remarks before this body relative to the plight facing the small meatpackers in many of our Midwestern States. I noted that several firms were faced with closing their doors because of what I regarded as unnecessarily harsh Federal restrictions, primarily with regard to physical size and layout.

One of the businesses I said may shut down was the Val Decker Packing Plant, in Piqua, Ohio. Mr. President, I have learned that the information I received with regard to Val Decker was erroneous. The firm has easily been in compliance with all sanitary and architectural requirements and, I am delighted to say, has no intention of closing its doors. So while I continue to maintain that many small packers face unnecessary hardships and may be forced out of business, I am pleased to add that Val Decker appears to be in business to stay. I am sorry that my original information was incorrect, and I am happy to set the record straight.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCTIVITY—A DEBATING SOCIETY?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some commissions are useful, some are not. They are too often set up to avoid an issue or to postpone action. They are set up to give the appearance of action when there is no action at all.

When it was announced, the new Commission on Productivity seemed to have some reason for its existence. It seemed to be a partial answer to the need for an incomes policy and for wage and price guidelines.

But now even that small hope is not to happen.

At best the Commission will merely publish after the fact what has happened to wages or prices in some of the key areas of the economy. And apparently this is to be done with little or no comment. The fact is that we would be better served to give its statistical functions to some group such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, whose reliability for factual information and the absence of "cooked" figures is noteworthy.

The New York Times editorializes about this matter in its lead editorial today. It states that in naming the members of the Commission, the President appears to have employed the commission device for one of its ancient and least worthy purposes; namely, to stimulate action while in fact delaying or preventing it.

That hits the nail on the head. That is exactly what has been done. Those of us who have been pressing for some small action on an incomes policy, and who initially welcomed this tepid and minor move, are almost entirely disenchanted.

It would be much better if the administrative costs of the National Commission on Productivity were donated to charity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMISSION OF PRODUCTIVITY

In naming the members of his new National Commission on Productivity, President Nixon appears to have employed the commission device for one of its most ancient and least worthy purposes: to simulate action while in fact delaying or preventing it.

With 23 members representing the Nixon Administration, business, labor, and the public, the body seems designed to function as nothing more than a high-level debating society. Presumably there will be someone to manage its activities, but the President did not even name a chairman for the commission; its chairmanship will rotate among the five Administration officials. However, any commission that hopes to produce significant results in this controversial field needs a strong, active, and dedicated chairman, such as the British found in Aubrey Jones as chairman of their National Board for Prices and Incomes.

The over-all cast of the commission is conservative and opposed to Government intervention in any particular wage or price decision. Mr. Nixon nevertheless hopes that it can help the nation achieve "a balance between costs and productivity that will lead to more stable prices." This may be mildly interesting to two of its most important members, James Roche, chairman of General Motors, and Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers, but it is unrealistic to suppose that these two men would be willing to see general principles or platitudes related to the collective bargaining in which they soon will be locked and which will be so crucial to the future course of the United States economy.

Now that the Productivity Commission has been named, it is clearer than ever that the basic inflation problem in this country still demands a genuine national incomes policy not more truisms about the significance of rising productivity for price stability.

Even without getting involved in specific cases, however, the commission could do one useful job if it helped to scotch the idea that all the Government needs to do to keep prices stable is to slow the economy down and increase unemployment. The stagnation of productivity in the past year has been a consequence of the governmentally induced recession, not an unfortunate coincidence.

This lag in producticity, combined with a strong push by labor on the wage front, boosted unit costs of production steeply and fed inflation. Powerful corporations put through big price increases in the face of weak markets in order to protect their profit margins.

If the Nixon Administration can be helped by commission studies to see that a sluggish economy may aggravate, not solve, the inflation problem, it might make one important contribution to education on productivity. At this point, however, it appears more likely that the President is looking to the commission to give him some political protection rather than criticism of his Administration's fundamental economic policies.

ADDRESS BY STEVE BURKE, EUSTIS, NEBR., HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there are those among us who deplore and abhor the lack of understanding which some young people are showing toward our Nation, its accomplishments, its challenges, and goals for the future.

I speak today for the opposite reason—to praise a young man and express my confidence that he speaks for the great mass of Americans in whose hands the future of the Nation rests.

I commend to you, Mr. President, and to all the Members of the Senate the perceptive, constructive views expressed by Steve Burke, 16, a senior at Eustis, Nebr., High School, who is one of two Nebraska winners in the National 4-H Oratorical Contest.

It is with deep respect for his oratorical and his writing ability as well as his perception that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Steve's speech as reprinted by the Cozad, Nebr., Tri-City Tribune.

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

EUSTIS BOY'S WINNING 4-H SPEECH

(By Steve Berke)

Young people today want to change the world. This revolutionary desire is expressed in their discussions, writings, and music. A recent song by the Beatles says it this way:

"You say you want a revolution.

Well, you know, we all want to change the world.

You ask me for a contribution.

Well, you know, we all want to change the world."

The contribution which each of us makes will determine whether change is constructive or destructive. We have to decide what kind of revolution we want to be a part of.

One plan for revolution which confronts us today was devised over one hundred years ago—by a man named Karl Marx. He believed that employers in the capitalistic system of free enterprise oppressed the common laborers. Therefore he urged workers to unite and revolt. Today, the revolution that he envisioned has become a reality in parts of the world. Based on the economic principles and philosophies of Marx, the Communistic system which has evolved restricts and controls the personal freedom of the people it governs. Over one-third of the world's population, more than one billion human beings are ruled by Communism. And the revolutionary conquest is being conducted actively today in Southeast Asia, Korea, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe. Communists definitely have control of the world as their goal, a fact which they do not even try to hide.

But how would Communist revolutionaries try to overthrow a powerful democratic government like that of the United States, our own nation? The infiltration and guerrilla warfare methods used on small countries would probably not work. Nor would an all-out nuclear war, which would be disastrous to the Communists themselves. Nikolai Lenin, the founder of the Soviet Union, once stated the Communist plan. "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands." The main Communist objective right now is to cause deterioration within our country, to make America an overripe fruit. This objective is to be accomplished through the implementation of a step-by-step plan, the Communist Rules for Revolution.

The Rules for Revolution were obtained from a known member of the Communist party in the United States, who acknowledged them as being the Communist program for overthrowing our government.

The very first rule on the list, indicating that its enactment is of prime importance to the Communist plan, deals with the youth. "Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness."

Is this the standard of change we want for young people? Not if we care about our nation and the world of the future. And if we do care, we should show our concern through action. Each of us can make his contribution to world change by beginning a counterrevolution, to make a positive change for the better. 4-H Club work can be a key part of the counterrevolution for youth. Because, while the keynote of the Communist rule is corruption, the 4-H motto is "to make the best better," to build what is good rather than to tear it down. For example, Communists want superficial youth but 4-H teaches boys and girls to be independent workers, who can feel a sense of accomplishment upon the completion of a project. Communism also encourages immorality and an unhealthy attitude toward sex, but members of a 4-H Club learn to establish wholesome relationships with members of the opposite sex as they work and play together. The things which all 4-H'ers pledge—clear thinking, loyalty to country, service for others, and better living—are real constructive contributions to world change. As 4-H'ers, parents, and leaders, we can do our part by encouraging young people to join 4-H Clubs, and then to actively participate and make 4-H the building youth organization it can be.

There is another Communist Rule for Revolution which concerns us as individuals. "By specious argument cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues: honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged word, ruggedness."

In other words, the goal of this rule is to replace personal ethics with perversion. Lenin, the late Soviet leader, tells us how to counteract this Communist guideline. He once said, "Marxism cannot be conceived without atheism." A strong faith in God is ruinous to Communist hopes of revolution, because faith gives each individual the power to resist the deteriorating changes which Communism wants. Faith enables us to preserve honesty and ruggedness, even in the face of pressure. If each person would reevaluate and practice his belief in God, downgrading Communist revolution could be defeated.

The challenge to rebel and revolt is clearly all around us today. Do we want change dictated by the Rules for Revolution, to make youth corrupt and destroy our personal morals? Or are we going to build a counterrevolution, in which each of us makes an effort to work with and guide young people through such worthwhile organizations as 4-H Clubs, and in which we let the strength of God guide us in whatever we do? These two things will help other people and make us better individuals. Let's start this counterrevolution. Then we can look to the future with assurance, knowing that our contribution to change will make our nation and the world a better place to live.

TURNAROUND IN THE ECONOMY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in the "business roundup" of the July issue of Fortune magazine, the staff economists observe that the Nation is successfully turning from an economy based on defense and business investment to one directed more toward consumption, housing, and social welfare. In its forecast for the next 18 months, the article projects a trend toward an accelerating recovery and the retardation of inflation by increased productivity. This is further indication that under the Nixon administration we are working our way out of the problems of deficit spending during 8 years of Democratic administration.

Mr. President, 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:

THE GREAT TURNAROUND

The U.S. economy has turned the corner on its 1970 readjustment. National output began to expand again last quarter, after erosion of nearly - percent in real G.N.P. between last summer and last winter. Roundup forecasts that real economic growth will accelerate over the next eighteen months, to an annual rate of nearly 3 percent in the next half year and a little better than 4 percent during 1971. Expansion will continue to speed up in 1972, and indeed the 1971 rate may be pushed higher by a turn early next year to a more expansionary fiscal-1972 budget.

For 1970, G.N.P. still promises to total about $980 billion, as Roundup forecast in January, but with two or three billion less than forecast in real output and about as much more in extra inflation. G.N.P. in current prices promises to pass the trillion-dollar rate before year-end and to total $1,050 billion in 1971. While the 1970 rise in G.N.P. will be almost all attributable to inflation, half of next year's larger rise will represent an advance in real output.

It seems clear that—without either stumbling into a deep recession or renewing the inflationary boom—the nation is successfully negotiating a massive redeployment of priorities and resources, from an economy based on defense and business investment to one directed more toward consumption, housing, and social welfare. This grand reshuffle, netting out to a new balance rests on a series of major economic turns that have sometimes been obscured in recent weeks by more dramatic headlines. Despite Cambodia, defense production has declined at an accelerating pact, and so it will begin to level out next year. Despite outsized reports of spending plans, business has already begun trimming its investment purchases to fit its shrunken needs (and funds), and will continue to do so next year. Despite the stock market, consumers have increased their purchases of goods as millions of people benefited from fatter federal checks or thiner tax withholdings, and this too, will continue. And despite the congestion in financial markets, new housing funds have flowed into a sharp rise in building permits, which presages an immediate start on a long recovery in home building.

In reflection of these shifts, final sales of goods have leveled out, so inventory buying has for the present settled to a replacement basis, following a $10-billion cutback in the accumulation rate between last summer and last winter. This inventory cutback pared over-all G.N.P. then; and the ending of the cutback is what allowed the uptrend in services to lift G.N.P. last quarter. As sales strengthen, business will gradually increase its inventory buying.

The inventory swing, as usual, has been felt less heavily in G.N.P. than in the FRB index of industrial production, which went from a high of 174.6 last July to 169 in May. But the decline may well have stopped there. The index should move back up to 171 or so by the year-end, go on to a new high next spring; and be pushing 180 before the end of 1971.

PRODUCTIVITY COMES ALIVE

The signal economic fact of the spring, however, had to do not with the new strength in demand, but rather with the new strength in supply—which Roundup last January tagged as "fundamentally a larger concern for 1970." Productivity, or output per man-hour, rose sharply, for even as over-all output advanced, employment declined. On the basis of the preliminary May data, Roundup estimates that productivity in the private economy rose a full 1 percent last quarter alone. This follows nearly two whole years in which productivity failed to show any net advance at all, the longest such period of the postwar era. If events now follow the patterns of the past, productivity should resume its average annual advance of 3 percent.

Good news about productivity is of course good news for prices—though temporarily bad news for unemployment. Through last winter, with hourly wage compensation rising at a rate of some 7 percent a year but hourly productivity stagnant, labor costs inevitably went up 7 per cent a year and inflation accelerated to a rate of over 5 percent. But inflation has been slowing since then, most obviously in wholesale prices—down to a 1 percent rate between February and May. In cutting payrolls, business has been intent on getting costs down in order to get profit margins up, but the paring will also be reflected in a slower rate of increase in prices. If a productivity gain of 3 percent does occur, partly offsetting the rise in wages, the rise in labor costs will slow to a 4 percent rate. Roundup expects the inflation rate to drop below 4 percent before the end of the year and to abate further during 1971.

On the heels of the payroll cutting, unemployment has reached the 5 percent level months ahead of time. It would ordinarily tend to rise fractionally over the rest of this year and into 1971, so long as economic growth remains below a 4 percent annual pace, and only begin to subside as the economy approaches 1972. True, unemployment is being held down to the extent that marginal workers are leaving the labor force as work gets hard to find. On the other hand, unemployment is being pushed up by extra productivity gains. Both factors may continue to operate for some time, working in opposite directions, and changes in the official unemployment figures will largely depend upon which of these two factors is stronger.

If unemployment does rise above 5.5 percent, say, it may well take over from price inflation as the bellwether index for the economy and economic policy. What President Nixon likes to call his "activist Administration" will have opportunity next winter to take advantage of any such extra slackening in the labor market and, presumably, in the inflation rate. He could give a more expansionary tone to the federal budget for fiscal 1972 than is in prospect right now on the basis of what he has so far announced.

The Federal Reserve, needless to say, will also be reappraising policy, in the light of trends not only in prices and unemployment but also in the budget and the U.S. official balance of payments, now in continuing deficit. Over the past six months the Fed has effected a transition in policy, which proved, as Roundup put the matter in January, "difficult to effect smoothly, for technical as well as psychological reasons." On several occasions this spring the Fed has been pressed to supply liquidity to thirsty and sometimes panicky markets (which indeed still have major Treasury financings to face in the weeks ahead). At times the money supply has run up—though not bank credit, to a proportionate extent—and then come part way back.

But when it can, the Fed seems likely to settle down to growth rates on the order of 5 percent for money and 8 percent for credit—rates that the January Roundup suggested might be normal under present circumstances. Short-term interest rates, already down a percentage point from peaks of six months ago, should head down again in 1971. Long-term rates, which have gone on up once more to new historic highs, should start a gentle decline before very long.

The malaise that hit financial markets in the spring, while not altogether unexpected, nonetheless proved unsettling to say the least, and had some effects in shaving business prospects. During a liquidity squeeze, there is always a risk of a chain reaction that could undercut business spending even further from the reduced levels projected here. But the worst seems to have passed, particularly as the Fed is supplying some liquidity.

There is no guarantee, of course, against a nasty surprise from some quarter—e.g., the Penn Central bankruptcy last month. But on balance, even if the pace won't be exciting for a while, the economy appears to have come through a spring of turbulent transition surprisingly well.

DEFENSE

The real volume of purchases of goods and services for national defense will decline about as much in the coming eighteen months as in the past eighteen—$20 billion in all over the three years, to the lowest levels since 1965. The sharpest part of the drop is under way now, indeed with virtually all the cutbacks in procurement to be completed this year. In current-dollar terms, owing to two pay increases and other inflation of costs, the spending rate has eased by only $2 billion over the past eighteen months; it could go off by $6 billion in the next eighteen, unless military pay is raised substantially in a move toward a volunteer army.

BUDGET

The federal budget moved into deficit over the past eighteen months, but it will move back toward surplus over the next eighteen. The past economic effect has tended to be stimulative, and the coming one will be somewhat restrictive.

Leaving aside the temporary outflow last quarter for retroactive pay and pension rises, spending went up some $19 billion in the past year and a half and will go up at least $17 billion in the next year and a half. Declining defense outlays would account for any difference. Nondefense spending, up by a rate of over $20 billion (or 20 percent) in the past period, will go up a bit more in the next—assuming passage of the new $5-billion welfare program.

On the revenue side, losses from the surtax termination and tax reform will be largely offset by increases in the social-security tax, in employment tax rates, and the payroll base on which these rates are assessed. With little or no net tax cutting and a modest economic recovery, the rate of revenues should rise $22 billion, twice as fast as in the past year and a half.

Recently the federal deficit was running over $10 billion a year, on the national-income basis (including the $5 billion in retroactive checks). The budget should be in rough balance for fiscal 1972, even though the economy (and so revenues) will probably be well below full-employment levels. This is not a likely context for new taxes next year unless the Administration or Congress comes up with spending increases far beyond anything so far indicated.

Capital goods

Spending for new plant and equipment, now running over $100 billion a year, turned down in real terms last winter, and the decline continued last quarter, with investment in machinery and commercial structures particularly weak. Roundup projects that the volume of investment will continue to recede over the next eighteen months, at an average annual rate of about 5 percent.

Recent spending has been running some $5 billion below the rates indicated by autumn surveys of business plans. A new survey last month turned up another set of goals that will prove to be too high by a similar amount. In current dollars—i.e., including the inflation of costs—spending this year will be up 4 percent from 1969. Next year spending will be off by 2 percent from 1970. With profits down and borrowing costs very high, many companies cannot finance new plant. Even more important is the burden imposed by rising excess capacity amid economic slowdown.

The picture is most dramatic in manufacturing, which accounts for more than a fourth of investment and will account for most of the retrenchment. Use of factory capacity last quarter was less than 79 percent, down 13 percent from the extraordinary peak of 1966, and the lowest since the 1961 recession, yet manufacturers were still adding 5 percent annually to their capacity. They will cut back to perhaps half that much by late next year, when utilization may still be no higher than now.

Electric and communication utilities, however, will be increasing outlays (now $20 billion). When they begin to level out spending, in a year or so, investment by stores and other commercial enterprises (now $17 billion) should be recovering.

By late 1971, on balance, growth in total capacity will be running at a rate of about 3.5 percent, down from 4.5 percent at present. A rate of 3.5 would be below the economy's potential long-term growth rate, and so an upturn in capital goods can be visualized for some time thereafter.

Inventories

After a $10-billion cutback between last summer and last winter, inventory buying appears to have stabilized at next-to-nothing levels. The liquidity squeeze *might* cause liquidation, but a shifting about of buying rates among a number of industries helps assure against a sudden turn toward general liquidation on any sizable scale. Car-dealer stocks fell in the first quarter but rose in the second, and will be up this summer. They may go down again in the autumn if there is an auto strike, but hedge buying of steel will start then in preparation for a possible steel strike in 1971. In the meantime the arms and capital-goods industries have already begun liquidation.

While inventories and sales are both stable now, the over-all stock-sales ratio is on the high side, about 3 percent above year-ago levels, and this will operate against any resurgence of heavy buying. Roundup projects that, as final sales gradually quicken during the next eighteen months, business will work off about half of this extra stock, even while gradually increasing inventory buying. Some industries such as construction will be needing more while others—e.g., aerospace—will still be working down surpluses. The over-all buying rate may be $5 billion better than now at the end of 1971, and still going up into 1972.

Credit

Credit conditions have begun to ease in recent months, and they will continue to ease over the next year and a half. Corporations will maintain on balance about the same rate of investment in plant and inventory together, while internal funds from profits and depreciation will increase substantially. These trends will reduce needs for external funds. Meanwhile, however, more funds will be going to finance Treasury borrowing, local government flotations, and a rising tempo of housing activity.

Funds are still in heavy demand to improve liquidity—e.g. to enable some corporations to shift from commercial paper to bank loans. The Fed has already been supplying more credit, of course. The various credit statistics have been rather mixed in their message over recent months and may well stay confused for a while until the trends sort themselves out. No serious questions of monetary policy are on the horizon, but the matter of pace may become more of an issue again by next winter.

Short-term interest rates will tend to stay firm through coming weeks of Treasury borrowing, and seasonally they tend to firm up at year-end, but there should be another decline by next spring. Long-term markets have obviously been under great pressure from demand, but this will gradually moderate, and so will inflationary expectations. And as they do, long-term rates will tend to come down again, not abruptly but perhaps soon.

Housing

Residential construction has already begun a long boom that will add well over $5 billion to the volume of building activity by the end of 1971, and more thereafter. After falling by some 600,000 from the peak in January, 1969, to below 1,100,000 this past January, the annual rate of private new housing starts recovered to 1,200,000 in May. Roundup projects a powerful surge, carrying before next year-end to new highs of over 1,800,000.

A giant springtime increase in the flow of savings to thrift institutions solved one industry problem, availability of money, and April–May housing permits already indicate that a 1,400,000 rate will be reached by autumn at the latest. In reporting to Fortune's semi-annual survey last spring, builders said that they expected to make a fast comeback—and Roundup thinks they should do nearly as well as in the 1966–68 recovery. A remaining question is whether they can expand their organizations in time for a record effort in 1971.

As for the market, demand for space is today more urgent than at any time since the end of World War II. Vacancy rates are low and household formations are at a record level. This demand is being undercut to some degree by housing costs—resulting from the pyramiding of high money rates atop soaring building costs. But Roundup expects that mortgage rates will gradually come down through 1971. And federal housing agencies are now rapidly expanding various programs to help subsidize interest costs, which will underwrite a major building upsurge well into 1971.

Prices and wages

Inflation ran to more than 5 percent in the over-all G.N.P. deflator during 1969, and the pace rose above 6 percent in the first quarter, pushed up by the retroactive federal pay raise. But that was the peak. Roundup estimates the rate of rise during the spring at 4.5 percent or less, and there are other signs of improvement. The rise in retail food has slowed a lot, and the Department of Agriculture looks for little change the rest of the year. And the lift in productivity last quarter should help slow inflation too. In manufacturing, the improvement in productivity since last December has actually kept unit labor costs steady in the face of rising wages.

Two opposing forces are tending to keep the 1970 rise in hourly labor compensation at or below the 7 percent annual rate of the past two years. More union workers this year are winning larger settlements than before, and deferred increases under contracts signed earlier are larger to. But the softening labor market is holding down other labor costs—overtime pay, nonunion wages etc. And the longer unemployment stays high, the larger this constraint tends to become, even in union settlements. Now that productivity seems to have resumed its winning ways, pressures on costs and prices will subside even if hourly wage rises do not. Last year there was no gain in productivity to provide an offset to wages, and prices soared even as profit margins shrank. As productivity resumes a 3 percent yearly rise, margins can widen and still price rises can moderate. For 1971, Roundup's guess now is that inflation will slow to less than 4 percent for the year, and possibly to a 3 percent rate before year-end.

Income and savings

With higher prices and taxes making inroads, real disposable income grew at a moderate rate during 1969—2.5 percent a year. But income has just risen by 2.5 percent or so in the first two quarters of 1970 alone, thanks to lower taxes and higher federal pay and pensions. Over the next eighteen months as a whole, the economic growth Roundup projects would by itself push up real income at an average annual rate of 3 percent. And there will be further federal largess, including the surtax cut now and the welfare program in late 1971.

Consumers at first put some of their income windfalls into savings, of course. The savings rate temporarily rose last quarter to 7.2 percent of disposable income, up from the 6.5 percent average of the three prior quarters—and, indeed, several prior years. In the coming period, savings will fluctuate, but the trend will be down—the rate will go below 6.5 percent—because of higher unemployment and an easing of credit availability.

Consumer spending

Purchases of consumers goods, a $225-billion item, held steady in real terms for three quarters ending last winter. This volume rebounded by 1.6 percent in just the spring quarter. Roundup projects a further rise of 1 percent a quarter for the rest of 1970, and an increase in the quarterly growth rate to 1.5 percent by late next year. This summers' car sales may be particularly strong if consumers decide to stock up in anticipation of a strike in early autumn. The car market has still to catch up with its longterm normal levels, and new 1971 small-car models should provide some lift. Home-goods sales, already rising again after a poor 1969, should do well in 1971.

The volume of food purchases, presently $126-billion a year, will go up. The Department of Agriculture's data suggest that supplies will be increasing, and they'll be needed, to the tune of 3 percent a year, in part to meet the expansion of food-stamp and welfare programs. The volume of consumer services purchased, now at the $262-billion rate, has lately shaded below its 4 percent annual uptrend, but should get back on trend during 1971.

The balance of payments

The U.S. trade balance has improved modestly over the past year, by a couple of billion in the annual rate, and is now in the black by about $2 billion. The trade balance usually benefits when a business slowdown here curbs imports while continued strength in business abroad helps exports (e.g., steel). With economic growth trends here and abroad likely to be more similar in the period ahead, the trade balance should be more stable.

Meanwhile, the over-all U.S. balance of payments is running in heavy deficit, both on the usual "liquidity" calculation and on official settlements. The gap may be $6 billion for 1970, on both accountings. Economists are tending increasingly to attribute this weak performance in the official balance of payments to the difference between government credit policies at home and those abroad. Governments abroad are leaning more to restraint of inflation, even as U.S. credit policy has loosened up somewhat; as a result. Unless the U.S. price performance improves greatly, the pile-up could prompt pressure on U.S. monetary authorities. This could be a check on credit policy in 1971.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANCES PARKINSON KEYES

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I was deeply grieved this week to learn of the death of the great American authoress, Frances Parkinson Keyes. Mrs. Keyes enriched our culture and her passing leaves a void in the American literary world.

Out of my personal respect for Mrs. Keyes, wife of the late Governor of New Hampshire and U.S. Senator, Henry Wilder Keyes, I would like to reflect for a few moments on some notable aspects of her life and career.

Born at the University of Virginia, where her Boston-bred father was a professor of Greek, Mrs. Keyes was tutored by a governess and later attended Miss Carroll's School and the Windsor School in Boston, Mass., and Miss Dardelle's School in Switzerland.

Frances Parkinson Keyes was an associate editor and travel columnist for Good Housekeeping from 1923–35 and edited the Daughters of the American Revolution National Historical magazine from 1937–39.

She wrote 16 books before Fielding's Folly—1940—made the best seller list. There were 28 more to follow on religious subjects, romance and adventure, cooking and travel, and several published diaries, especially Letters from a Senator's Wife—1924—and Capitol Kaleidoscope—1937. Her most famous novels were River Road—1945—Came a Cavalier—1947—Joy Street—1950—and Dinner at Antoine's—1948. All grew out of her great sensitivity to and awareness of people and places. When not writing at her New Hampshire home, Pine Grove Farm in North Haverhill, she traveled extensively each year to Europe or Latin America where she was able to communicate easily in any of her four languages.

Mrs. Keyes was active in the National Society of Colonial Wars, the National Society of Colonial Dames, the Fragment Society—Boston, Sulgrave Club—Washington, D.C., the Orleans Club—New Orleans, La., as well as the National Women's Press Club, National Society of Women Geographers, and the American Society of the French Legion of Honor.

This elegant, sophisticated favorite among Washington society cultivated her interests in the reconstruction of old houses and collecting costumes, fans, old maps, and veilleuses while always holding uppermost her roles in public life as an authoress and as the wife of a U.S. Senator. Of the latter role she wrote in "Letters From a Senator's Wife":

> Almost the first question asked about a man holding public office is naturally enough, "Well, what sort of man is he?" And the next question, nowadays, seems to follow quite naturally, "Well, what sort of wife has he?" The importance of a woman's place in her husband's career cannot be overestimated; this has always been known; now it is not only known, it is acknowledged. No woman in the country today has a greater opportunity than a Senator's wife. No woman shares a greater responsibility. p. 14.

A responsibility she embraced and fulfilled splendidly. From the same diary:

> I have been out on my balcony to get a little breath of air before I finish this letter and say goodnight. It is very hot, but there is a slight breeze from the South, the stars are out, and I can see the statue of Jeanne d'Arc that I love so shining in the moonlight in the park across the street. The Washington Monument with a searchlight falling full upon it, glistens like snow against the soft dark sky. The dome of the Capitol is illuminated, and at the very top of the special globe, which shows that the Senate is in Session, is still burning. And it is midnight! p. 239.

She spoke with understanding of the various roles of women, and, particularly, those who contribute without recognition. On Memorial Day, 1922, she wrote:

> And in doing the best we can, on this and every other day lies, I believe—and believe it more and more firmly the older I grow—the real test of success. It may not take a man, as it took Lincoln from a log cabin to the White House; it may not take a woman from a farmhouse to a palace; but it takes them somewhere. If they know in their hearts that they are doing their very best, I do not think that it particularly matters whether anyone else knows it or not. We are altogether too prone to forget the balm that comes from a clear conscience, and worry over 'What will people say?' The woman who sings a great song or writes a great poem receives more recognition, of course, than the one who cooks a good dinner, or makes a simple garmet well, or nurses a sick child back to health; but she does not deserve any more. I am sure that 'the end will be all right' for one as well as the other. p. 277.

Not so with Frances Parkinson Keyes. She was well recognized for her excellence. Her honorary degrees included a Litt. D.—doctor of letters—from George Washington University in 1921, another from Bates College in 1934, and an L.H.D.—doctor of humane letters—from the University of New Hampshire in 1951. She received the Siena Medal as outstanding Catholic woman in the United States—1946—and the Diploma of Amis de Samour—1948.

She was presented the Medal of Honor of the General Council of the Seine—1950—for work as a novelist and journalist and friendship for France, the Silver Medal of French Recognition—1951—in recognition of aid in the reconstruction of the Abbey of the Benedictines at Liseux, France, and the Legion of Honor—1962—for work in France.

For her book, "Bernardette of Lourdes," Mrs. Keyes received the Christopher Award—1953—and in recognition of work in Spain she was awarded the Order of Isabella the Catholic—1959.

Indeed, the most fitting remembrance of Frances Parkinson Keyes was left by the author herself, the great legacy of her work.

Her books, the profiles and portraits of our life and times which they created, reflect the image of their authoress; the perceptive, productive, adventurous great lady and fine American, Frances Parkinson Keyes.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this week, in accordance with a joint resolution passed by Congress in 1959, we are observing Captive Nations Week.

This is the week, each year, when those of us fortunate enough to have been born free, and determined enough to have remained free in a very dangerous century, paused to consider the fate of those less fortunate.

It is for us the fortunate to consider the fate of 100 million East and Central Europeans who today are suffering as they have suffered in the past under Communist despotism.

This is the week in which we should rededicate ourselves to improving the fate, and working for the final liberation of the brave peoples who did not receive liberty at the end of World War II, the people for whom the ending of one despotism signaled the advent of a new despotism. These are the people for whom this year, marking as it does the 25th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, has a specially bitter meaning. These are the people whose many sacrifices have been most poorly rewarded.

Mr. President, whenever we are told the cold war is over, and that continued concern for the peoples in the captive nations is dated and irrelevant, we should remember two things. We should remember the cold, hard number of 100 million. That is the number of men, women, and children who today still suffer from Communist domination in European nations which by all rights should be free.

Moreover, we should remember the vivid newsreel films of Communist tanks rumbling through the streets of Prague 2 short years ago.

If we remember these things we will not be tempted to doubt that, from the point of view of those 100 million human beings who still suffer so much, the active support and concern of free peoples is very much a source of hope in their dark night of tyranny.

For this reason I am proud to join with other Senators, and with all Americans, in expressing renewed dedication to the cause of freedom in the captive nations.

GROWING SUPPORT FOR GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in recent months there has been a groundswell of support for the ratification of the convention on genocide. Many groups throughout the United States have expressed their support for immediate ratification of the treaty. On April 27, the United Methodist Church presented testimony to the Special Subcommittee on Ratification of the Genocide Convention of the Committee on Foreign Relations and urged ratification of the treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD as a further indication of the need for speedy action on the genocide convention.

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

STATEMENT ON THE CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE

The churches of the United States were deeply shocked and aroused by the terrible toll in suffering and death inflicted by the Nazis upon the Jewish people of Europe and upon other racial, ethnic, national and religious groups just prior to and during World War II. These actions were highly offensive to the religious conviction that, as creatures of God, all persons are possessed of essential human rights which are inherently theirs and which no government or group has the right to violate.

Therefore, The United Metholist Church and its predecessors (The Methodist Church and The Evangelical United Brethren Church) have consistently supported the protection of human rights internationally as well as nationally. The following statements are the position of The United Methodist Church as set forth by the General Conference, the highest authoritative organ of the denomination, The General Conference of The United Methodist Church is a representative body composed of some 1,000 delegates equally divided between laymen and clergy.

"We commend the United Nations for its success in reconciling differences, promoting human rights, lifting the levels of health, education, and welfare, and advancing self-government among the nations . . .

"We urge the early ratification by all nations of the fourteen conventions on human rights developed and approved by the United Nations or its specialized agencies . . ."

Adopted by the General Conference of the United Methodist Church, Dallas, Texas, May 9, 1968.

An earlier statement of the General Conference of one of the predecessor denominations, The Methodist Church, is even more specific:

"We urge the early ratification by all nations of the conventions on human rights developed and approved by the United Nations, including: The Genocide Convention, The Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, The Convention of the Political Rights of Women, The Convention on the Stateless Person, The Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor."

Adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Church, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1964.

In the light of the preceding statements, we join in urging the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate as a Whole to consent to the accession of the United States of America to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

Bishop Charles F. Golden, President, A. Dudley Ward, General Secretary, Board of Christian Social Concerns of The United Methodist Church.

Bishop Lloyd C. Wicke, President, Tracey K. Jones, General Secretary, The Board of Missions of The United Methodist Church.

Transmitted by the Board of Christian Social Concerns, 100 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the past 18 months, President Nixon has been transforming the American economy to a stable peacetime equilibrium. He has attempted to bring fiscal responsibility to the economy he inherited after years of deficit financing and war under the Democratic administrations. He has reversed the trend to ever-increasing defense budgets. Thus allocating more funds for domestic programs.

Every day we see signs that the President's economic policies are paying off. One of the prime indications of any expanding economy is the rate of interest of loans. Already this monetary indicator has dropped. According to financial analysts, the decline should continue making more and cheaper money available to all Americans.

A perceptive article by Lee M. Cohn on this big turnaround in the economy was published yesterday in the Washington Sunday Star. 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:

INTEREST DIP HINTS TURN IN ECONOMY

(By Lee M. Cohn)

Interest rates have slipped below their record peaks and financial analysts predict the decline will continue.

Unless new international or domestic crises change the outlook drastically, they say, credit gradually will become cheaper and more easily available through this year and into 1971.

If the experts are right, the present trend is the start of one of the great turnarounds in the nation's financial history—and could blunt a key issue that has threatened to hurt Republican candidates in November's congressional elections.

Inflation, tight monetary policies, budget deficits and a collapse of confidence in financial markets raised interest rates generally to their highest levels in more than a century around mid-June.

RECENT DECLINE MODERATE

Rates have declined moderately since then and further reductions are expected, basically because the inflationary boom appears to be cooling off and the Federal Reserve has committed itself to easing money and credit.

If the economy recovers from its slump in the second half of this year, as the Nixon administration predicts, rates probably will decline further only slightly, according to experts.

They forecast substantial rate reductions if the economic slump persists or worsens.

In any case, they say, rates are not likely to climb back to their peaks.

Rates on some categories of high-quality corporate bonds have declined from about 9¼ to 8¾ percent so far. A standard index of tax-exempt state and local bonds has dropped from 7.12 to 6.59 percent. Rates on Treasury notes and bonds, which had climbed above 8 percent in some cases, are down to a range of about 7 to 7½ percent.

In forecasting lower rates, analysts are talking mainly about bond and money markets. Rates paid on mortgages, bank loans and savings deposits move more slowly, but eventually follow market rates.

Many experts predicted lower interest rates in March but the trend was abortive. There is broad agreement, however, that the current decline is more solidly based and signals a trend.

"This is the real thing," an expert said.

The glow of March turned into gloom partly because hopes for abatement of inflation were disappointed.

Now there is a growing consensus that, while inflation will continue, the rate of price increases gradually will slow down.

PRICE INDEX

Forecasters are especially encouraged by the slower rise of the wholesale price index in recent months. This index has risen no faster than 0.2 percent a month—an annual rate of 2.4 percent—since February.

As wholesale prices seep down to the retail level, analysts expect, increases in the consumer price index will slow to an annual rate of 4 or 4.5 percent, down from 6 percent or more earlier this year.

Confusion about Federal Reserve policy was another factor in the re-escalation of interest rates after March.

It became evident by March that the Federal Reserve had started easing the extremely tight monetary policies applied during 1969 to fight inflation. That is, the Federal Reserve was beginning to pump more money into the economy, permitting interest rates to decline.

But the Federal Reserve changed its techniques for carrying out policy, emphasizing the rate of growth of the money supply more than in the past, instead of concentrating almost solely on influencing interest rate and the market's "tone."

This shift of focus resulted in false signals from some traditional indicators of policy, leading some to suspect that the Federal Reserve was tightening money and credit again.

The money managers have clarified their intentions recently, so there no longer is any doubt that policy is easing.

With assurances about monetary policy and renewed hope for a slowing of the price spiral, the key to the outlook for interest rates is the pace of the economy.

When the economy booms, demand for credit rises as businesses invest heavily in expansion of plants and equipment and build up inventories. Strong borrowing demand bids interest rates up.

When the economy is sluggish business curtails spending and borrowing, pulling rates down.

That's what analysts believe is happening now.

Most notably, businesses are scaling down their plans for expenditures on new plants and equipment because profits are declining and sales prospects are weak.

SHIFT IN DEMANDS SEEN

A leading expert, Henry Kaufman of Salomon Brothers & Hutzler, a top Wall Street bond firm, predicted a big shift in credit demands when he testified before the Senate-House Economic Committee last week.

Net new issues of corporate bonds will decline to $6.6 billion in the second half of this year from $12 billion in the first half, he estimated.

"An abatement of this massive volume of business financing in the months ahead should gradually help to reduce the strains in the bond market, lower interest rates and redirect savings flows into other sectors," he said.

For example, he said, reduced bond sales by corporations will free enough money to permit a net increase in mortgage credit—a sector that has been starved for funds—from $6 billion in the first half to $11.6 billion in the second half.

DEFICIT A SOUR NOTE

One sour note in the outlook for rates is the deepening federal budget deficit. The budget's shift from surplus to deficit contributed to the rise of rates after March.

Treasury borrowing to finance deficits bids rates up. Furthermore, deficits can be inflationary and can discourage the Federal Reserve from easing monetary policy.

Even if this fiscal year's deficit exceeds the official forecast of $1.3 billion, as seems likely, however, most analysts believe the impact on interest rates will not be severe.

They reason that the markets and the Federal Reserve will not worry so much about a deficit when the economy is weak. Nevertheless, a big deficit—more than about $8 billion or $10 billion—could interfere with interest rate reductions.

If the economy pulls out of its decline and output rises at an annual rate of about 3 percent in the second half of this year, as the administration hopes, credit demand will be curtailed only slightly and the Federal Reserve probably will stick to its policy of "moderate" ease.

RATES WOULD EDGE DOWN

In that case, analysts predict, interest rates will edge down only slowly.

But if the economy remains stagnant or slides into a serious recession, demand for credit will shrink substantially and the Federal Reserve will pump money into the economy more aggressively.

The result could be fairly sharp interest rate declines, according to experts.

Hedging their forecasts, however, they say all bets are off if new crises—domestic turmoil, re-escalation of the war in Southeast Asia, hostilities in the Middle East—shatter the confidence of investors.

Aside from economic and financial factors, the sharp rise of interest rates in May and early June was attributed to an almost panicky feeling in the markets that the authorities were losing control of events.

THE HARD-HITTING KANSAS SENATOR

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, whatever will be the final assessment of history of the ability of a minority to fight back and to defend the Nixon administration, which is not represented by a majority in either the House or Senate, note will certainly be taken of the outstanding work of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE).

Republicans, although outnumbered by Democrats in Congress, are not outmanned when it comes to countering the thrusts of the majority party.

No one in the newest class in the U.S. Senate has won the admiration—or gained the grudging respect—depending on which side of the issue one is on, as has Senator BOB DOLE.

Mr. President, to that end, I ask unanimous consent that an article about Senator DOLE, published in the Washington Sunday Star of July 12, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Star, July 12, 1970]

THE HARD-HITTING KANSAS SENATOR

(By Loye Miller Jr.)

Sen. Robert J. Dole has a crippled right arm and a Purple Heart ribbon in his left lapel, but there is nothing handicapped about his performance in the Senate these days.

Indeed, his slashing, combative style already has established the freshman senator from Kansas as one of the rough floor fighters in that normally august body.

A tall, lean plainsman with long dark sideburns and flashing brown eyes, Dole reminds some people of the old Dodge City gunslingers in his native state.

Even though he has been in the Senate barely 18 months, some of his colleagues are beginning to give him just as wide a berth.

"He's one of the toughest men I've ever met, the kind of guy I'd like to stand back-to-back with in a knife fight," says Sen. Robert Packwood, R-Ore.

A militant conservative, Dole has built his formidable reputation by emerging as a self-appointed sheriff, patrolling the Senate floor for the Nixon administration.

ON THE FLOOR

He began this about a year ago, out of frustration at hearing Democratic senators' criticisms of the President go unchallenged.

"I got tired of hearing people like (Edward M.) Kennedy and (Edmund S.) Muskie and (George S.) McGovern getting up and browbeating the President about Vietnam," Dole says. "I thought we Republicans ought to keep reminding them every day that the war was already there when Nixon was elected."

While most senators keep to their offices and committee meetings except when bills of special interest to them are being considered, Dole made it a point to stay on or near the floor so long as the Senate was in session. Even an offhand remark which seemed critical of the administration would bring him to his feet to do battle.

Before long, a key administration staffer noticed what the senator was doing. "I told the White House that Mr. Dole was turning out to be the President's man in the Senate, whether the President liked it or not," says this source, "so we might as well make use of him."

In the months since, the Kansas senator has zestfully fought for the administration day in and day out in both major battles and picayune skirmishes. He is sometimes the willing recipient of speeches and statements suggested by the White House, but most often makes war on his own.

Dole did yeoman service both on and off the floor in the bitter—and unsuccessful—battles to confirm Nixon Supreme Court appointees Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell. He was the most evident administration wheelhorse in the grinding seven-week fight against the dovish Cooper-Church amendment which finally ended last week.

TRICKS FULBRIGHT

Indeed, it has become the subject of some comment in the Senate that Dole sometimes spends more time holding down the GOP leadership chair on the center aisle than either of the party's elected chieftains, minority leader Hugh Scott, R-Pa., and Minority Whip Robert Griffin, R-Mich.

And he reached the peak of his prominence recently when he successfully stole the Senate doves' thunder in a lightning maneuver that left Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman William Fulbright, D-Ark., sputtering with frustration.

Fulbright had planned to follow the Cooper-Church marathon debate with another drawn-out debate pegged to repeal of the 1964 Tonkin Gulf Resolution, which President Johnson cited as congressional approval of expansion of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

But Dole snatched away that future plan by successfully sponsoring the Tonkin repeal as an amendment to the military sales bill during the Cooper-Church debate.

In doing so, he displayed the blunt force, cutting sarcasm and quick wit that characterize his floor maneuvering.

When Fulbright vehemently objected to

Dole's unorthodox rupture of normal Senate procedures, the Kansan shot back acidly: "Is it a rule of the Senate that one must clear everything with the Senator from Arkansas?"

Later, when the defeated Fulbright complained that Dole had "stolen my cow," Dole quipped, "No . . . we just milked it a little."

"Dole is always trying to find out what you can do to seize the initiative and make the other guys look bad," says a White House aide.

"The policy and the leadership remains with Scott and Griffin, of course, but when you want somebody to pick a fight, Dole's always ready and willing."

Dole insists that he has modified his conservation tendencies to accommodate the President, and notes that for the first time in eight years he has failed to win the annual plaque awarded true conservatives by the Americans for Constitutional Action.

He feels that on the "real gut issues" his moderate and liberal Republican colleagues also ought to swallow hard and stay loyal to the President. "There comes a time when you have to respond to the call of party responsibility."

Now 46, Dole was born in Russell, Kan., the son of a grain elevator operator. In the closing days of World War II he was leading his infantry platoon in a push through the mountains of northern Italy when his right shoulder was shattered by an explosive shell fragment, and cracked vertebrae left him totally paralyzed.

It was 15 months before he recovered enough use of his limbs to feed himself again, but gradually Army doctors restored everything except his crippled right arm and shoulder.

While hospitalized, he married an occupational therapist who had been treating him, and his wife then took notes for him and wrote the examination answers he dictated as he made his way through law school. Later, he taught himself to write with his left hand.

After serving in the Kansas legislature and as Russell County attorney, Dole was elected to the House in 1960 for the first of four terms. He won his Senate seat in 1968.

Despite his lack of seniority, Dole has come so far so fast in the Senate that there is already talk of making him Republican leader—an unprecedented move.

This idea has been kicked around by a group of conservative GOP senators who unsuccessfully backed Sen. Howard Baker, R-Tenn., when Scott won the leadership post last September.

"I was for Baker then, but Dole's my man now," says Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz-. "He's the first man we've had around here in a long time who will grab the other side by the hair and drag them down the hill."

SCARRED EGO

But there is ample evidence that Dole's cut-and-shoot style may have hurt him almost as much as it has helped him, for it already had left scars on many of the monumental senate egos.

Thus, some of his Republican colleagues regard him as "intemperate" and "too rough."

"To be a leader, you must be able to approach different types of people in different ways," says one GOP senator. "But Dole approaches everyone the same way with a sledge hammer."

But whatever his future in the Senate, it is clear that Dole is held in highest regard by the White House.

His toils in the Senate have brought him a stream of grateful notes and warm telephone calls from the President. He is included on the White House guest list for ceremonial dinners; he has fared well in recommending Kansans for administration jobs.

And there is a personal Nixon touch that has left Dole with a warm feeling over the years he has known the President.

"When he greets me, he always remembers to put out his left hand."

THE WASHINGTON STAR COVERAGE OF HONOR AMERICA DAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on July 4, hundreds of thousands of Americans gathered in Washington for Honor America Day. They came to pray, to wave the flag and to demonstrate peaceably that they were proud to be Americans.

On the same day, a few hundred other Americans also gathered in Washington. Their purpose was not to honor America, but to show disgust and disrespect for America. They desecrated the symbol of America, the flag, and attacked the Washington police.

The activities of both groups were news, but should the action of hundreds overshadow the presence of the hundreds of thousands? I think not. Apparently the Washington Star believes it should, for their coverage of honor America Day emphasized the disorderly hundreds nearly as much as it did the orderly hundreds of thousands.

This distorted emphasis of the day's coverage did not go unnoticed by the Star's readers. I ask unanimous consent that several letters to the editor from the July 12, 1970, Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STAR AND JULY 4

SIR: After perusing The Sunday Star of July 5 and its report on "Honor America Day," I've had it! With hundreds of thousands of traditionally patriotic, well behaved American citizens participating in Saturday's program, your paper had only space for the putrid fringe.

One truthful sentence occurred in your entire coverage to the effect that people left that celebration more firmly convinced of what they believe than ever before. Whatever allowances some of us might have made previously for dissident youth was eradicated Saturday. The contrast between the unkempt bodies and minds of the dissidents and the truly beautiful members of YAF who contributed gracious manners, respect for all ages and general pleasantness to the affair, was so marked as to create a real polarization.

As a parent, a citizen, a taxpayer and a veteran, sir, I've had it. No allowances from now on, no doing business with the promoters of violence and dissent; no more putting up with permissiveness and propagandizing in my children's schools. I believe that you will, I hope to your financial distress, find many others whose minds are made up now. We are out to fight for our country, sir, and, as The Rev. Billy Graham said: "Never give in, never, never, never."

VIRGINIA M. BERG.

SIRS: Having not attended the "Honor America" festivities personally, I was anxious to read the newspaper accounts in Sunday morning's Star. I was disappointed and disgusted to find the dissenters received almost equal coverage as "Honor America" news. There were three pictures of the troublemakers in the reflecting pool. One picture would have been too much! These dissenters got full coverage by your newspaper last November. July 4th was "our" day. "Honor America Day" made sufficient news in itself—it didn't need additional articles concerning the "bums."

Newspapers are in business to print news, not garbage! Your Sunday coverage was a disgrace.

MRS. C. W. LYNAM.

SIR: Three hundred thousand Americans standing three hours in the boiling sun listening to inspirational messages at the Honor America Day celebration . . . and The Star's front page presented filthy yippies in the Reflecting Pool.

What a perverted sense of presentation of the news!

How sad that you couldn't find one picture to take of the thousands of dedicated Americans parading down Constitution Avenue or the edifying scenes at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument Grounds, and the Ellipse Flag Ceremonies.

Daily, the evidence mounts, how much America needs the voice and leadership of Vice President Agnew, to tell it like it is.

JOSEPHINE H. MAYER.

SIR: I, as well as many other subscribers to The Star, was shocked to see the best you could do to cover the lovely festivities at the Lincoln Memorial on July 4 was the picture of the "dirty" Reflecting Pool. The Sunday Star did have a nice picture of Kate Smith, etc., but of course right below it another diatribe by your abusive Mary McGorry.

MRS. E. L. CORRY.

ADDRESS BY ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG AT WESTERN RESOURCES CONFERENCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, delivered an address at the Western Resources Conference meeting at the University of Denver.

His address dealt with "Modern Developments in Comprehensive River Basin, Interbasin, and Regional Planning." It examined, with clarity and skill, the many advances we have made in these fields, and the relevance of these advances to our fight for a better environment.

Commissioner Armstrong made an especially useful contribution to our understanding when he pointed out that our water policies have a crucial impact on our urban planning.

In addition, Senators will be interested in the Commissioner's timely remarks about the way technology developed in the space program has been useful in water resources management.

So that all Senators can profit from Commissioner Armstrong's thinking, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

MODERN DEVELOPMENTS IN COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN, INTERBASIN, AND REGIONAL PLANNING

(Remarks by Ellis L. Armstrong)

The trend in water resources planning over the years has been to broader and broader concepts and to larger and larger geographic areas as the units for planning. Today water resource regions composed of a single large river basin or groups of smaller contiguous basins are generally accepted as the most suitable units for comprehensive planning. Certainly the need for water and the importance of environmental and ecological protection in development of new supplies requires a broader concept and, at the same time, more careful detailed planning than ever before.

The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 has been instrumental in expanding the scope of comprehensive planning. It provided for the establishment of River Basin Commissions under the supervision of the Water Resources Council, to coordinate water resources planning. Four such commissions, all encompassing multiple river basins, have been established to date: the Great Lakes Basin Commission, New England River Basins Commission, Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission and Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins Commission.

For those areas of the Nation not covered by River Basin Commissions, comprehensive planning by water resources regions is being or will be coordinated by Federal-State interagency committees under the auspices of the Water Resources Council.

The Water Resources Planning Act also provided for grants to States to assist them in water resources planning. Many of the States are using such funds to develop State water plans which will, in effect, become incorporated into comprehensive regional water plans.

Congressional enactments during the past five years may well set the trend for even larger units of planning. The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 directed the Secretary of the Army to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development and utilization of the water and related resources of the Appalachian region, an area encompassing all or parts of 13 Eastern States and numerous watersheds and river basins.

In 1968, the Colorado River Basin Project Act directed the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, under Reclamation law, full and complete reconnaissance investigations for the purpose of developing a general plan to meet the future water needs of the Western United States, defined in the Act as the eleven contiguous Westernmost States—those that lie wholly or partially west of the Continental Divide.

Another factor in this trend towards broader planning has been the torrent of proposals put forth in recent years by engineering firms, individuals, and others for long-distance interregional water transfers. A number of these schemes envision importing water from Canada and even Alaska to serve water-short areas throughout the United States and northern Mexico. While these proposals are mainly paper studies aimed at the long-range future, they do illustrate a trend in comprehensive water planning.

Today's multi-agency, multi-objective approach to water resources development has resulted in a new look in regional comprehensive planning. No longer is water resource planning the singular domain of the civil or hydraulic engineer and the design or construction engineer.

Today's comprehensive planning effort incorporates the multi-discipline efforts of biologists, sociologists, geographers, economists, landscape architects, recreation specialists, environmentalists, and ecologists as equal partners in the planning process. We are experiencing an accelerating shift in control from the basically construction oriented planner to planning teams able to examine and solve problems from a variety of perspectives. Agencies which were previously competitive, if not antagonistic, are now working together. They are finding that they are doing a better job than they were able to do separately.

Along with the accelerated attention to regional planning has been the development of new planning concepts and new tools. The comprehensive framework studies under the aegis of the Water Resources Council utilize for the first time regional and subregional projections of population and economic indicators that have been broken out and separated from national projections prepared jointly by the Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, and the Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture.

For some 200 subregions of the Nation, projections have or will be made of the population, income, employment, and gross production that are expected to prevail for the target dates of 1980, 2000, and 2020.

Such projections previously have been used in planning but have been prepared on isolated area bases and by various entities, including universities, consulting firms, and Federal and State agencies. As such they lacked uniformity, one with another, and had little relationship or value to a national outlook.

The present projections used in the comprehensive framework plans, while not completely accepted by all State, regional, and local interests, do attempt to picture realistically and on a uniform basis the future growth and composition of the Nation's economy, area by area. Thus, they serve as guideposts for estimating future water and related land resource requirements and as a base against which the economic consequences of alternative plans for development can be measured.

This new tool is not perfect, but it will be refined with use and represents a major step in the right direction.

A new analytical tool that promises to shed further insight into economic evaluation and is fast coming into widespread use is the technique of input-output analysis. This method can trace the impact of a given area of activity in any economic sector such as a change in industrial production or development of a natural resource throughout the economy of any geographic area.

For example, in industrial use, the input-output analysis can immediately translate a projection of an increase of 1,000,000 automobile sales to the related specific impact on the steel industry, the textile industry, the glass industry, the tire industry, and so forth.

In natural resources development, the provision of irrigation can be translated into increases in gross production for an area such as a State, together with increases in job opportunities created and specific impacts on related industries such as processing plants, fertilizers, farm equipment, transportation, and any other type of business or activity you care to name.

As an aid in economic evaluation of resources planning, the input-output analysis has several advantages. It can be useful in measuring the so-called indirect or secondary benefits which in my opinion are just as important and valid as the direct benefits.

It can measure the impact of resource development on many sectors of an area's economy. It can assess the effectiveness of various types of resource development in curing or relieving economic distress.

Use of the input-output analysis requires grappling with an enormous quantity of empiracal data. Fortunately, modern computer technology now makes this type of analysis feasible. Watch for its expanding use.

As the scope of river basin planning grows, so grows the complexity of the analyses. As factors are added which determine the feasibility of future development, the possible relationships and trade-offs between these factors increase exponentially. Extremely complex problems then arise which must be solved.

Fortunately, some techniques for electronic computer analyses have been developed which make problems more manageable and solvable. Exploitation of computers is undergoing change. The early years of computer use concentrated on calculating such problems as backwater profiles, flood routing studies and repayment studies. These were time-consuming and uninteresting tasks when accomplished by manual means. Thus, these calculations were automated first.

Now that we have learned to live with computers and look upon them as tools, we are focusing on newer approaches to make our problems manageable. We are armed with computer technology on one hand, new analytical techniques on the other hand, and our goals ahead of us.

Just as there are analogies between hydraulics and electricity, so there are also analogies between industrial planning and water resources planning. There is not a great deal of difference between scheduling shipments of goods from warehouses to optimize profits and distributing water from reservoirs to optimize water quality and efficiency in a river system as far as mathematical models are concerned. New ways are being sought to apply operations research and systems analyses techniques to the solution of planning problems.

As important as mathematical and computer techniques are to the solution of complex problems, the ability to manage the capabilities is of equal or greater importance. The considerable management experience which the space program has gained should not be ignored, for many of the same problems are common to planning as far as scheduling work and coordinating team efforts are concerned.

A serious problem of duplicated effort may arise in large-scale planning if efficient management methods are not utilized. We have some powerful tools at our disposal and we should take full advantage of them.

Environmental protection and its role in resource planning and development occupy national attention and emphasis. I prefer to think positively about our environment and consider ways of enhancing the natural environment for the benefit of mankind. Man is here to stay and we must use the vital elements of the biosphere in such a way as to enhance life.

Long before the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-190), water and land resource agencies of the State and Federal Governments recognized the need to incorporate environmental factors into the planning process. The major Federal and State resource development agencies have for many years worked closely with sister agencies concerned with environmental factors to assure that plans for resource development meshed with needs for resource protection and enhancement. In the main, water and related resource development has had a tremendously beneficial effort in enhancing the environment of man.

However, legislative authority to fully accommodate environmental factors in the resource development process has not kept pace with the flow of good intentions.

By its nature, the development of any single resource will have impacts upon other naural resources. To the extent that these impacts are adverse, adequate authority exists to mitigate, to the highest degree possible, the damage that might be done. But there is only limited authority to expend funds for environmental enhancement that could otherwise easily be accomplished as an integral part of multi-objective planning and development.

Some of the problem arises from the long-established tradition that the expenditure of public funds must pass the test of economic feasibility on the basis of hard dollar returns. How do you assign a dollar value to aesthetics? How do you conduct an economic test of the merits of preserving or enhancing a wild or scenic area, a unique wildlife habitat, a desert vista, a freeflowing stream, or a particular species of flora or fauna? These must be viewed in the light of social preference, and in light of the present and future effects on our environment.

In this respect, the Water Resources Council is developing new principles, standards, and procedures for evaluating water and related land resource developments. These new approaches are aimed at better identification and measurement of a wide range of social, regional, and environmental effects of resource development as well as the traditional economic indicators that have been so influential in the past. They hold out the hope for much broader and more effective evaluation of water resource developments.

One other development that will affect comprehensive planning is the national assessment prepared by the Water Resources Council. The first assessment, directed by the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, was completed in 1968. It presented an inventory of water and related land resource availability and needs for the entire Nation, highlighted national water problems, and identified certain regional and subregional problems.

Future assessments can be expected to be more refined and should tie in closely with regional comprehensive planning endeavors.

The Bureau of Reclamation has been deeply involved in the comprehensive river basin studies that have been carried out in recent years in the West, by both the River Basins Commissions and by the Federal Interagency Committees. In addition, it is engaged in two other broad studies that I would like to describe briefly.

The first is the West Texas and Eastern New Mexico Import investigation. This investigation, started in 1967, examines in reconnaissance detail the potentials for importing surplus water from the Mississippi River system to satisfy requirements in west Teaxs and eastern New Mexico. These requirements are estimated to range from 600,000 acre-feet annually for basic municipal and industrial use to a total of some 18,000,000 acre-feet annually for irrigation and maximum municipal and industrial use by the year 2020.

The investigation is being conducted jointly with the Corps of Engineers and the Mississippi River Commission. The Corps and the Commission will determine the availability of surplus Mississippi River flows, the conditions under which such surplus could be diverted, and the best route and means of delivering it to some point west of the Louisiana-Texas line, presently contemplated as a locale near Dallas, Texas.

Reclamation studies are directed to planning for the transport of that water from near Dallas to the areas of need in the high plains of west Texas and eastern New Mexico. The total cost of the studies by all participants is estimated at over $5,000,000 and they are scheduled for completion in Fiscal Year 1972.

Not only will the results of the study be important to west Texas and eastern New Mexico, but their main value may well lie in the insight they will provide into the factors and problems related to the long distance conveyance of large quantities of water. Never before have studies of diversions of this magnitude been made in comparable detail.

Much is expected to be learned about costs, pumping power supplies, realistic buildup of water service schedules, repayment prospects, impacts upon the importing area, environmental and ecological effects, and similar items. Upon completion of this study we should be able to judge better the practicality of other long-range water transport proposals that have been advanced on the basis of paper study only.

The other broad study in which Reclamation is engaged is the Western United States Water Plan which I mentioned earlier. This study is just getting underway and must be completed by June 30, 1977. It will cover the eleven contiguous Western States and develop, to reconnaissance standards, a plan to meet future water needs of that entire area. Of special note is the provision of the Colorado River Basin Project Act, which authorized and directed the study, prohibiting study for ten years of any plan for importing water to the Colorado River Basin from any river basin lying outside of the Colorado River Basin States.

Comprehensive basin framework plans are now being developed for the river basins encompassing most of the area of the eleven Western States. Also most of the States are preparing individual State water plans. These studies will comprise foundation blocks for the Western States study and will not be duplicated.

The investigation will be carried out in cooperation with the affected States and other Federal agencies. A high degree of participation by all concerned is expected.

A detailed study plan is just now being developed. It will be a dynamic document, evolving as studies progress with provisions for continuing review and modification in response to study findings, coordination processes, and changing needs of the Western States.

This investigation presents both an opportunity and a challenge to plan water resources development on a geographic scale and in detail heretofore not attempted.

In keeping with the theme of this conference "Urban Demands on Natural Resources," I would like to close my remarks with observations on two urban considerations that are relatively new in comprehensive regional water resources planning.

Perhaps the most perplexing question concerns the possibility of using water planning to limit urban and metropolitan growth. Traditionally water planners have projected future water demands and then developed long-range plans to meet the needs.

Today, with the highly publicized problems of growing urban sprawl, smog, and other urban blights there are those who insist that placing limitations on water supply could halt urban growth where desirable and thus relieve some of the chronic and growing urban problems. This theme is heard particularly in reference to Southern California, although there are other urban centers where it could well apply.

While the goal of controlling the overcrowding urban sprawl is commendable and, in the long run, necessary, I foresee it as an evolutionary process which will be accomplished in decades. Certainly it is politically and socially infeasible in a free society for this to be forced overnight by simply shutting off the supply of water or not providing necessary new supplies. In the meantime the water planner must continue in his time-tested role of meeting water demands as they arise.

The more important urban consideration in comprehensive water planning that is receiving increasing attention is the potential of using water supply to stimulate the formation of new urban communities or to expand others where desirable. This, of course, will indirectly aid the objective of curbing further sprawl in existing metropolitan areas.

Water alone is not an adequate base for economic growth. But water combined with land, or with coal, or with oil shale, or with other natural resources can establish an economic base capable of stimulating new urban growth. The potentials for moving water over long distances to combine with other natural resources is the key in this consideration.

In comprehensive regional water planning, as in other fields, new developments are constantly changing outlooks and broadening goals. The past decade has been of particular significance in this respect.

Looking to the decade of the seventies I can foresee even greater progress. Promising research in desalting of sea water and in weather management forecast two new areas of water planning and management that will be of great importance in this decade and the remainder of this century.

These and other new improvements on the horizon will continue to make the job of the comprehensive regional water planner a challenging one indeed.

THE LAST OF THE GREAT CANALS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal is one of the Nation's great historical and recreational assets. For almost a decade I have been sponsoring legislation to establish the canal as a national historical park, to expand its acreage, to restore its unique engineering features, and to enhance its recreational value. I am very pleased that the Department of the Interior recently endorsed my bill (S. 1859) and the comparable House legislation introduced by Representatives SAYLOR, GUDE, and BEALL of Maryland.

In his column, "The Naturalist," in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 12, Irston R. Barnes strongly endorsed the pending bills and urged the Congress to act promptly this year. As Mr. Barnes wrote:

> Nowhere in the East will so small an appropriation of public monies provide so much in historic preservation, in conserving natural values, and in providing varied recreation as in creating a C & O Canal National Historical Park. Washington and the entire Potomac Valley deserve this consideration from the present Congress.

Mr. Barnes' column is an excellent summary of the case for the canal. 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:

THE NATURALIST: THE LAST OF THE GREAT CANALS

(By Irston R. Barnes)

Has the time at last come to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal as a National Historical Park? This has been the objective of conservation and outdoors organizations for 20 years; indeed, the Park proposal was the subject of several of my earliest columns in The Washington Post.

In the judgement of Rep. Gilbert Gude of Maryland, the recent endorsement of the National Historical Park proposal by the Interior Department sets the stage for park supporters to press for hearings before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate (Henry M. Jackson, chairman) and the House (Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman). Bills to establish a C&O Canal National Historical Park have been introduced by Reps. Saylor (H.R. 658), Gude (H.R. 11988) and Beall (H.R. 17950) and by Senator Mathias (S. 1859).

There are many reasons why the C&O Canal should be made a National Historical Park: As a historical monument, the C&O Canal Park offers the public a unique natural history museum, a profile of the geology and the ecological communities along 180 miles of the Potomac from tidewater to the mountains. A C&O Canal Park will provide unparalleled recreational opportunities for the Nation's Capital and for all communities throughout the Potomac Valley. Without National Park status, neither this outstanding historical monument nor the valued natural features of the Potomac Valley will be preserved.

The C and O Canal is the only remaining example, other than the Erie Canal, of the early 19th Century attempt to expand beyond the Alleghenies by cheap water transportation (rivers supplemented by canals). It was built to enable the Middle Atlantic region to participate in the development of the Middle West in competition with the northern region served by the Erie Canal. The development of the railroads brought the canal era to an early end, and the C and O Canal was used only to bring coal and other bulk products from the Western Potomac Valley.

As an historical monument, the C and O Canal structures should be preserved, and where possible, restored. The locks, the lock houses, and the taverns should be brought back to their original condition. Some units, such as the Monocacy aqueduct ("the biggest and most beautiful in the United States" according to William Davies of the U.S. Geological Survey) are in a fine state of preservation; others, such as the Catoctin Creek aqueduct and many lock houses are beyond repair and require rebuilding (it would be worth the cost) or replacement. The C and O Canal, with water restored wherever possible, with the towpath repaired and with the locks and other facilities in place, will recall more vividly than any museum exhibit the days of the first great westward expansion.

The C and O Canal as a nature museum offers superlative opportunities for field studies in all branches of natural history. To residents of the Valley and to visitors to the Nation's Capital, intepretative exhibits could effectively depict past and present patterns of land use, the impact of man on the environment, with cogent examples of environmental abuse and environmental harmonies, and the geological history and wildlife communities of the region.

As a National Historical Park, the C and O Canal would have the attention of competent park naturalists with a mandate to preserve its natural values. A first step should be a survey, preferably with the help of qualified specialists from regional organizations such as the Audubon Naturalist Society, which would permit effective planning.

All of these potentials for the C and O Canal will never be developed, the historic monument will be exposed to incompatible commercial encroachments unless the Congress acts promptly to confer National Park status and to provide funds to round out the tract and to undertake necessary restorations and preservation.

Nowhere in the East will so small an appropriation of public monies provide so much in historic preservation, in conserving natural values, and in providing varied recreation as in creating a C and O Canal National Historical Park. Washington and the entire Potomac Valley deserve this consideration from the present Congress.

CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS IN AMERICA TODAY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of our most distinguished historians, Mr. Henry Steele Commager, has written a most important article entitled "Is Freedom Dying in America?", published in Look magazine for July 14.

Mr. Commager, professor of American history at Amherst College, writes about current conditions and trends in this country and states:

Not since the days when Sen. Joseph McCarthy bestrode the political stage, fomenting suspicion and hatred, betraying the Bill of Rights, bringing Congress and the State Department into disrepute, have we experienced anything like the current offensive against the exercise of freedom in America. If repression is not yet as blatant or as flamboyant as it was during the McCarthy years, it is in many respects more pervasive and formidable.

Mr. Commager's article is one that merits the serious consideration of all Americans. 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:

IS FREEDOM DYING IN AMERICA?

(By Henry Steele Commager)

(A distinguished historian warns we can lose our Bill of Rights)

"There are certain words,
Our own and others', we're used to—words we've used,
Heard, had to recite, forgotten,
Rubbed shiny in the pocket, left home for keepsakes,
Inherited, stuck away in the back-drawer,
In the locked trunk, at the back of the quiet mind.

Liberty, equality, fraternity,
To none will we sell, refuse or deny, right or justice.
We hold these truths to be self-evident.

I am merely saying—what if these words pass?
What if they pass and are gone and are no more . . .?
It took long to buy these words.
It took a long time to buy them and much pain."

—*Stephen Vincent Benét.*

From "Nightmare at Noon" in "selected works of Stephen Vincent Benét." Vol. 1, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc. Used by permission of Brandt & Brandt.)

"Those, who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety," said Benjamin Franklin, two centuries ago," deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Today we are busy doing what Franklin warned us against. Animated by impatience, anger and fear, we are giving up essential liberties, not for safety, but for the appearance of safety. We are corroding due process and the rule of law not for Order, but for the semblance of order. We will find that when we have given up liberty, we will not have safety, and that when we have given up justice, we will not have order.

"We in this nation appear headed for a new period of repression," Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York recently warned us. We are in fact already in it.

Not since the days when Sen. Joseph McCarthy bestrode the political stage, fomenting suspicion and hatred, betraying the Bill of Rights, bringing Congress and the State Department into disrepute, have we experienced anything like the current offensive against the exercise of freedom in America. If repression is not yet as blatant or as flamboyant as it was during the McCarthy years, it is in many respects more pervasive and more formidable. For it comes to us now with official sanction and is imposed upon us by officials sworn to uphold the law; the Attorney General, the FBI, state and local officials, the police, and even judges. In Georgia and California, in Lamar, S.C., and Jackson, Miss., and Kent, Ohio, the attacks are overt and dramatic; on the higher levels of the national administration, it is a process of erosion, the erosion of what Thomas Jefferson called "the sacred soil of liberty." Those in high office do not openly proclaim their disillusionment with the principles of freedom, but they confess it by their conduct, while the people acquiesce in their own disinheritance by abandoning the "eternal vigilance" that is the price of liberty.

There is nothing more ominous than this popular indifference toward the loss of liberty, unless it is the failure to understand what is at stake. Two centuries ago, Edmund Burke said of Americans that they "snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze." Now, their senses are blunted. The evidence of public-opinion polls is persuasive that a substantial part of the American people no longer know or cherish the Bill of Rights. They are, it appears, quite prepared to silence criticism of governmental policies if such criticism is thought—by the Government—damaging to the national interest. They are prepared to censor newspaper and television reporting if such reports are considered—by the Government—damaging to the national interest! As those in authority inevitably think whatever policies they pursue, whatever laws they enforce, whatever wars they fight, are in the national interest, this attitude is a formula for the ending of all criticism, which is another way of saying for the ending of democracy.

Corruption of language is often a first sign of a deeper malaise of mind and spirit, and it is ominous that invasions of liberty are carried on, today, in the name of constitutionalism, and the impairment of due process, in the name of Law and Order. Here it takes the form of a challenge to the great principle of the separation of powers, and there to the equally great principle of the superiority of the civil to the military authority. Here it is the intimidation of the press and television by threats both subtle and blatant, there of resort to the odious doctrine of "intent" to punish anti-war demonstrators. Here it is the use of the dangerous weapon of censorship, overt and covert, to silence troublesome criticism, there the abuse of the power of punishment by contempt of court. The thrust is everywhere the same, and so too the animus behind it: to equate dissent with lawlessness and nonconformity with treason. The purpose of those who are prepared to sweep aside our ancient guarantees of freedom is to blot out those great problems that glare upon us from every horizon, and pretend that if we refuse to acknowledge them, they will somehow go away. It is to argue that discontent is not an honest expression of genuine grievances but of willfulness, or perversity, or perhaps of the crime of being young, and that if it can only be stifled, we can restore harmony to our distracted society.

Men like Vice President Spiro T. Agnew simplistically equate opposition to official policies with effete intellectualism, and cater to the sullen suspicion of intellectuals, always latent in any society, to silence that opposition. Frightened people everywhere, alarmed by lawlessness and violence in their communities, and impatient with the notion that we cannot really end violence until we deal with its causes, call loudly for tougher laws, tougher cops and tougher courts or—as in big cities like New York or small towns like Lamar—simply take authority into their own hands and respond with vigilante tactics. Impatient people, persuaded that the law is too slow and too indulgent, and that order is imperiled by judicial insistence on due process, are prepared to sweep aside centuries of progress toward the rule of law in order to punish those they regard as enemies of society. Timid men who have no confidence in the processes of democracy or in the potentialities of education are ready to abandon for a police state the experiment that Lincoln called "the last best hope of earth."

The pattern of repression is, alas, all too familiar. Most ominous is the erosion of due process of law, perhaps the noblest concept in the long history of law and one so important that it can be equated with civilization, for it is the very synonym for justice. It is difficult to remember a period in our history in which due process has achieved more victories in the courts and suffered more setbacks in the arena of politics and public opinion than in the last decade. While the Warren Court steadily enlarged the scopes and strengthened the thrust of this historic concept, to make it an effective instrument for creating a more just society, the political and the law-enforcement agencies have displayed mounting antagonism to the principle itself and resistance to its application. The desegregation decision of 1954 has been sabotaged by both the Federal and local governments—a sabotage dramatized by the recent decision of the Justice Department to support tax exemption for private schools organized to frustrate desegregation.

There are many other examples. Pending legislation, including the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969, provides for "preventive detention" in seeming violation of the constitutional guarantee of presumption of innocence; limits the right of the accused to examine evidence illegally obtained; permits police to batter their way into a private house without notice (the no-knock provision); and provides sentences of up to 30 years for "dangerous special offenders." And the government itself, from local police to the Attorney General, persists in what Justice Holmes called the "dirty business" of wiretapping and bugging to obtain evidence for convictions, though this is a clear violation of the right of protection against self-incrimination.

Equally flagrant is the attack on First Amendment freedoms—freedom of speech, press, petition and assembly—an attack that takes the form of intimidation and harassment rather than of overt repudiation. The President and the Vice President have joined in a crusade designed to force great newspapers like the New York Times and the Washington Post to moderate their criticism of Administration policies, and to frighten the television networks into scaling down their coverage of events that the Government finds embarrassing; a position that rests on the curious principle that the real crime is not official misconduct but the portrayal of that misconduct. Mr. Agnew, indeed, has gone so far as to call on governors to drive the news purveyed by "bizarre extremists" from newspapers and television sets; it is an admonition that, if taken literally, would deny newspaper and TV coverage to Mr. Agnew himself. All this is coupled with widespread harassment of the young, directed superficially at little more than hairstyle, dress or manners—but directed in fact to their opinions, or perhaps to their youthfulness. And throughout the country, government officials are busy compiling dossiers on almost all citizens prominent enough to come to their attention.

Government itself is engaged increasingly in violating what President Dwight D. Eisenhower chose as the motto for the Columbia University bicentenary: "Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof." The USIA proscribes books that criticize American foreign policy at the same time that it launches a positive program of celebrating the Nixon Administration and the conduct of the Vietnam war through films and a library of "safe" books selected by well-vetted experts. The Federal Government spends millions of dollars presenting its version of history and politics to the American people. The Pentagon alone spends $47 million a year on public relations and maintains hundreds of lobbyists to deal with Congress, and the Defense Department floods schools and clubs and veterans organizations with films designed to win support for the war.

Meantime, the growing arrogance of the military and its eager intervention in areas long supposed to be exclusively civilian gravely threaten the principle of the superiority of the civil to the military power. Military considerations are advanced to justify the revival of the shabby practices of the McCarthy era—security clearances for civilians working in all establishments that have contracts with Defense—a category that includes laboratories, educational institutions and research organizations. What the standards are that may be expected to dictate security "clearance" is suggested by Vice President Agnew's proposal to "separate the [protest leaders] from our society—with no more regret than we should feel over discarding rotten apples from a barrel." That is, of course, precisely the philosophy that animated the Nazis. Military considerations, too, are permitted to dictate policies of secrecy that extend even to censorship of the *Congressional Record*, thus denying to congressmen, as to the American people, information they need to make decisions on foreign policy. Secrecy embraces, not unnaturally, facts about the conduct of the war; Attorney General Mitchell, it was reported, hoped to keep the Cambodian caper secret from Congress and the people until it was a *fait accompli*. So, too, the CIA, in theory merely an information-gathering agency, covers its far-flung operations in some 60 countries with a cloak of secrecy so thick that even Congress cannot penetrate it. The Army itself, entering the civilian arena, further endangers freedom of assembly and of speech by employing something like a thousand agents to mingle in student and other assemblies and report to the Army what they see and hear. This is, however, merely a tiny part of the some $3 billion that our Government spends every year in various types of espionage—more every year than the total cost of the Federal Government from its foundation in 1789 to the beginning of the Civil War in 1861!

It would be an exaggeration to say that the United States is a garrison state, but none to say that it is in danger of becoming one.

The purpose of this broad attack on American freedoms is to silence criticism of Government and of the war, and to encourage the attitude that the Government knows best and must be allowed a free hand, an attitude Americans have thought odious ever since the days of George III. It is to brand the universities as a fountainhead of subversion and thus weaken them as a force in public life. It is to restore "balance" to the judiciary and thereby reverse some of the great achievements of the 16 years of the Warren Court and to reassure the Bourbons, North and South, who are alarmed at the spectacle of judicial liberalism. It is to return to a "strict" interpretation of the power of states over racial relations and civil liberties—a euphemism for the nullification of those liberties.

The philosophy behind all this, doubtless unconscious, is that government belongs to the President and Vice President; that they are the masters, and the people, the subjects. A century ago, Walt Whitman warned of "the never-ending audacity of elected persons;" what would he say if he were living today? Do we need to proclaim once more the most elementary principle of our constitutional system: that in the United States, the people are the masters and all officials are servants—officials in the White House, in the Cabinet, in the Congress, in the state executive and legislative chambers; officials, too, in uniform, whether of the national guard or of the police?

Those who are responsible for the campaign to restrict freedom and hamstring the Bill of Rights delude themselves that if they can but have their way, they will return the country to stability and order. They are mistaken. They are mistaken not merely because they are in fact hostile to freedom but because they don't understand the relation of freedom to the things they prize most—to security, to order, to law.

What is that relationship?

For 2,500 years, civilized men have yearned and struggled for freedom from tyranny—the tyranny of despotic government and superstition and ignorance. What explains this long devotion to the idea and practice of freedom? How does it happen that all Western societies so exalt freedom that they have come to equate it with civilization itself?

Freedom has won its exalted place in philosophy and policy quite simply because, over the centuries, we have come to see that it is a necessity; a necessity for justice, a necessity for progress, a necessity for survival.

How familiar the argument that we must learn to reconcile the rival claims of freedom and order. But they do not really need to be reconciled; they were never at odds. They are not alternatives, they are two sides to the same coin, indissolubly welded together. The community—society or nation—has an interest in the rights of the individual because without the exercise of those rights, the community itself will decay and collapse. The individual has an interest in the stability of the community of which he is a part because without security, his rights are useless. No community can long prosper without nourishing the exercise of individual liberties for, as John Stuart Mill wrote a century ago, "A State which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hand . . . will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished." And no individual can fulfill his genius without supporting the just authority of the state, for in a condition of anarchy, neither dignity nor freedom can prosper.

The function of freedom is not merely to protect and exalt the individual, vital as that is to the health of society. Put quite simply, we foster freedom in order to avoid error and discover truth; so far, we have found no other way to achieve this objective. So, too, with dissent. We do not indulge dissent for sentimental reasons; we encourage it because we have learned that we cannot live without it. A nation that silences dissent, whether by force, intimidation, the withholding of information or a foggy intellectual climate, invites disaster. A nation that penalizes criticism is left with passive acquiescence in error. A nation that discourages originality is left with minds that are unimaginative and dull. And with stunted minds, as with stunted men, no great thing can be accomplished.

It is for this reason that history celebrates not the victors who successfully silenced dissent but their victims who fought to speak the truth as they saw it. It is the bust of Socrates that stands in the schoolroom, not the busts of those who condemned him to death for "corrupting the youth." It is Savonarola we honor, not the Pope who had him burned there in the great Piazza in Florence. It is Tom Paine we honor, not the English judge who outlawed him for writing the *Rights of Man*.

Our own history, too, is one of rebellion against authority. We remember Roger Williams, who championed toleration, not John Cotton, who drove him from the Bay Colony; we celebrate Thomas Jefferson, whose motto was "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God," not Lord North; we read Henry Thoreau on civil disobedience, rather than those messages of President Polk that earned him the title "Polk the Mendacious"; it is John Brown's soul that goes marching on, not that of the judge who condemned him to death at Charles Town.

Why is this? It is not merely because of the nobility of character of these martyrs. Some were not particularly noble. It is because we can see now that they gave their lives to defend the interests of humanity, and that they, not those who punished them, were the true benefactors of humanity.

But it is not just the past that needed freedom for critics, nonconformists and dissenters. We, too, are assailed by problems that seem insoluble; we, too, need new ideas. Happily, ours is not a closed system—not yet, anyway. We have a long history of experimentation in politics, social relations and science. We experiment in astrophysics because we want to land on the moon; we experiment in biology because we want to find the secret of life; we experiment in medicine because we want to cure cancer; and in all of these areas, and a hundred others, we make progress. If we are to survive and flourish, we must approach politics, law and social institutions in the same spirit that we approach science. We know that we have not found final truth in physics or biology. Why do we suppose that we have found final truth in politics or law? And just as scientists welcome new truth wherever they find it, even in the most disreputable places, so statesmen, jurists and educators must be prepared to welcome new ideas and new truths from whatever sources they come, however alien their appearance, however revolutionary their implications.

"There can be no difference anywhere," said the philosopher William James, "that doesn't make a difference elsewhere—no difference in abstract truth that doesn't express itself in a difference in concrete fact. . . ."

Let us turn then to practical and particular issues and ask, in each case, what are and will be the consequences of policies that repress freedom, discourage independence and impair justice in American society, and what are, and will be, the consequences of applying to politics and society those standards and habits of free inquiry that we apply as a matter of course to scientific inquiry?

Consider the erosion of due process of law—that complex of rules and safeguards built up over the centuries to make sure that every man will have a fair trial. Remember that it is designed not only for the protection of desperate characters charged with monstrous crimes; it is designed for every litigant. Nor is due process merely for the benefit of the accused. As Justice Robert H. Jackson said, "It is the best insurance for the Government itself against those blunders which leave lasting stains on a system of justice. . . ."

And why is it necessary to guarantee a fair trial for all—for those accused of treason, for those who champion unpopular causes in a disorderly fashion, for those who assert their social and political rights against community prejudices, as well as for corporations, labor unions and churches? It is, of course, necessary so that justice will be done. Justice is the end, the aim, of government. It is implicitly the end of all government; it is quite explicitly the end of the United States Government, for it was "in order to . . . establish justice" that the Constitution was ordained.

Trials are held not in order to obtain convictions; they learned by experience that unless we conduct trials by rule and suffuse them with the spirit of fair play, justice will not be done. The argument that the scrupulous observance of technicalities of due process slows up or frustrates speedy convictions is, of course, correct, if all you want is convictions. But why not go all the way and restore the use of torture? That got confessions and convictions! Every argument in favor of abating due process in order to get convictions applies with equal force to the use of the third degree and the restoration of torture. It is important to remember that nation after nation abandoned torture (the Americans never had it), not merely because it was barbarous, but because, though it wrung confessions from its victims, it did not get justice. It implicated the innocent with the guilty. It outraged the moral sense of the community. Due process proved both more humane and infinitely more efficient.

Or consider the problem of wiretapping. That in many cases wiretapping "works" is clear enough, but so do other things prohibited by civilized society, such as torture or the invasion of the home. But "electronic surveillance," said Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., "strikes deeper than at the ancient feeling that a man's home is his castle; it strikes at freedom of communication, a postulate of our kind of society. . . .Freedom of speech is undetermined where people fear to speak unconstrainedly in what they suppose to be the privacy of home or office."

Perhaps the most odious violation of justice is the maintenance of a double standard: one justice for blacks and another for whites, one for the rich and another for the poor, one for those who hold "radical" ideas, and another for those who are conservative and respectable. Yet we have daily before our eyes just such a double standard of justice. The "Chicago Seven," who crossed state lines with "intent" to stir up a riot, have received heavy jail sentences, but no convictions have been returned against the Chicago police who participated in that riot. Black Panthers are on trial for their lives for alleged murders, but policemen involved in wantonly attacking a Black Panther headquarters and killing two blacks have been punished by demotion.

Turn to the role and function of freedom in our society—freedom of speech and of the press—and the consequences of laying restrictions upon these freedoms. The consequence is, of course, that society will be deprived of the inestimable advantage of inquiry, criticism, exposure and dissent. If the press is not permitted to perform its traditional functions of presenting the whole news, the American people will go uninformed. If television is dissuaded from showing controversial films, the people will be denied the opportunity to know what is going on. If teachers and scholars are discouraged from inquiring into the truth of history or politics or anthropology, future generations may never acquire those habits of intellectual independence. An enlightened citizenry is necessary for self-government. If facts are withheld, or distorted, how can the people be enlightened, how can self-government work?

The real question in all this is what kind of society do we want? Do we want a police society where none are free of surveillance by their government? Or do we want a society where ordinary people can go about their business without the eye of Big Brother upon them?

The Founding Fathers feared secrecy in government not merely because it was a vote of no-confidence in the intelligence and virtue of the people but on the practical ground that all governments conceal their mistakes behind the shield of secrecy; that if they are permitted to get away with this in little things, they will do it in big things—like the Bay of Pigs or the invasion of Cambodia.

And if you interfere with academic freedom in order to silence criticism, or critics, you do not rid the university of subversion. It is not ideas that are subversive, it is the lack of ideas. What you do is to silence or get rid of those men who have ideas, leaving the institution to those who have no ideas, or have not the courage to express those that they have. Are such men as these what we want to direct the education of the young and advance the cause of learning?

The conclusive argument against secrecy in scientific research is that it will in the end give us bad science. First rate scientists will not so gravely violate their integrity as to confine their findings to one government or one society, for the first loyalty of science is to scientific truth. "The Sciences," said Edward Jenner of smallpox fame, "are never at war." We have only to consider the implications of secrecy in the realm of medicine: What would we think of doctors favoring secrecy in cancer research on the grounds of "national interest"?

The argument against proscribing books, which might normally be in our overseas libraries, because they are critical of Administration policies is not that it will hurt authors or publishers. No. It is quite simply that if the kind of people who believe in proscription are allowed to control our libraries, these will cease to be centers of learning and become the instruments of party. The argument against withholding visas from foreign scholars whose ideas may be considered subversive is not that this will inconvenience them. It is that we deny ourselves the benefit of what they have to say. Suppose President Andrew Jackson had denied entry to Alexis de Tocqueville on the ground that he was an aristocrat and might therefore be a subversive influence on our democracy? We would have lost the greatest book ever written about America.

There is one final consideration. Government, as Justice Louis D. Brandeis observed half a century ago, "is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example." If government tries to solve its problems by resort to large-scale violence, its citizens will assume that violence is the normal way to solve problems. If government itself violates the law, it brings the law into contempt, and breeds anarchy. If government masks its operations, foreign and domestic, in a cloak of secrecy, it encourages the creation of a closed, not an open, society. If government shows itself with due process, it must expect that its people will come to scorn the slow procedures of orderly debate and negotiation and turn to the easy solutions of force. If government embraces the principle that the end justifies the means, it radiates approval of a doctrine so odious that it will in the end destroy the whole of society. If government shows, by its habitual conduct, that it rejects the claims of freedom and of justice, freedom and justice will cease to be the ends of our society.

Eighty years ago, Lord Bryce wrote of the American people that "the masses of the people are wiser, fairer and more temperate? any matter to which they can be induced to bend their minds, than most European philosophers have believed possible for the masses of the people to be."

Is this still true? If the American people can indeed be persuaded to "bend their minds" to the great questions of the preservation of freedom, it may still prove true. If they cannot, we may be witnessing, even now, a dissolution of the fabric of freedom that may portend the dissolution of the Republic.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I wish to remind Congress of our responsibility in facing and dealing with the serious crime problem in the District of Columbia, since Congress has chosen to retain virtually exclusive governmental authority within the District.

To this end, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of crimes committed within the District yesterday, as reported by the Washington Post. Whether the list grows longer or shorter depends on Congress.

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

MARYLAND MAN, 78, FOUND BEATEN TO DEATH

A 78-year-old Maryland man was beaten to death Saturday in Northeast Washington, apparently during a robbery, police said.

Louis Cornelius Brown, of 791 58th Ave., Fairmount Heights, was pronounced dead at D.C. General Hospital early yesterday. He was found late last night in front of 618 56th St. NE, police said.

Dr. William James Brownlee, deputy D.C. coroner, ruled the death a homicide after an autopsy yesterday. The victim died of a "severely contused (bruised) brain and suffered a fractured cheekbone caused by beating," Dr. Brownlee said.

Brown, who was retired, had spent the evening visiting a friend and was on his way home when the incident occurred, police said.

ROBBED

Jessie's Restaurant, 238 Rhode Island Ave. NW, was robbed by a man carrying a revolver who entered at 3:30 p.m. Friday and told owner Jessie B. Lee, "This is a stickup." She opened the cash register and the man removed an undetermined amount of money.

Basham's Gulf Station, 22nd Street and Virginia Avenue NW, was robbed by two men in a car who pointed guns at employee Gaylord Frazer, of Washington, and demanded money at 1:10 a.m. Saturday.

James E. Hart, of Washington, was robbed by a man armed with a revolver who told him, "Give me your money or I'll blow out your brains," in the unit block of 8th Street SE at 11:15 p.m. Friday.

Ida V. Holley and her husband, were robbed in their home in the 1500 block of North Carolina Avenue NE when three men entered at 9:15 p.m. Saturday. Holley was on the telephone, and one man took it from him and said, "He will talk to you later," and hung it up. Then one man produced a revolver and told the Holleys to go upstairs. When they did, the men took money from Mrs. Holley's purse and ran out the rear door.

Highs Dairy products store, 5002 1st St. NW, was robbed of an undetermined amount of money by a man who entered at 8:25 p.m. Saturday and gave clerk Beverly C. Davis a note that read, "Put all the money in a bag and you will not get shot." She put an unknown amount of bills in the bag and gave it to the man, who told her to go to the rear of the store. There, the man removed more money in bills from a table and left.

Charles Washington, of Washington, an attendant at the Shell gas station at 3701 12th St. NE, was approached by two men at 10:45 Saturday. One man produced a handgun and said "Where's the money?" Washington pointed to his shirt pocket, and one of the men removed bills from the shirt. The pair then fled.

Johnny P. Sates, of Washington, was robbed while sitting in his car in the 300 block of Rhode Island Avenue NW at 9:35 p.m. Saturday. A man asked for a light, and when Sates complied, the man produced a handgun and asked for his watch.

Holt Thamps, of Washington, was knocked to the ground and robbed by four men in the 1300 block of 3rd Street NW at 4:30 p.m. Saturday.

Daualat Singh, of Washington, and Tuneja Tilak, of Silver Spring, were robbed and Singh was beaten by four men, one carrying a handgun, at Hopkins Place and P Street NW at 3:40 a.m. yesterday. The gunman said, "Keep your hands up," and when Singh refused he struck him about the head and face and knocked him down. Singh lost a wallet containing money and papers and Tilak lost his checkbook.

Bernard Gerald Leonard, of Washington, was struck in the face by one man while another took his watch and a wallet containing money and papers in an incident at 2424 Pennsylvania Ave. NW at 4 a.m. yesterday.

Phillip Dibble and Jeffrey Parker, both of Washington, and Michael Jampson, of Alexandria, were robbed by five men, one carrying a revolver, while they were loading their auto at Vermont and N Street NW at 11:10 p.m. Saturday. The men took money and a watch from Dibble, money from Parker and money and a watch from Jampson.

Carol Hardnett, of Washington, was struck in the face and robbed of her purse containing money and papers by a man in the rear of the 2200 block of 12th Place NW at 10:05 p.m. Saturday.

James A. Hall, of Washington, was robbed by a man carrying a gun who took money from his pockets in the 200 block of S Street NW at 4:30 p.m. Saturday.

Larry Farrell, of Washington, was yoked by two men who removed money from his pocket in the 2800 block of Jasper St. SE at 1:30 a.m. yesterday.

Kenneth Elliott, of Washington, was playing behind Anacostia High School when a man grabbed him and took his watch at 12:50 a.m. yesterday.

Dan Johnson, of Washington, was driving an ice cream truck in the area of 50th Street and Call Place SE at 2:15 a.m. yesterday when two men entered the truck, pointed guns at him, forced the safe on the truck open and removed an undetermined amount of money.

Lewis Lazares, of Washington, was yoked by four men who dragged him into a vacant lot in the 1900 block of New Hampshire Avenue NW and took money from his wallet at 1:05 a.m. yesterday.

Robert Wilker, of Washington, was beaten and robbed by six men while walking in the 2600 block of Adams Mill Road NW at 12:30 a.m. yesterday. One man pushed him into a hedge and demanded money, and when Wilker refused, five others jumped and beat him.

Linch Williams Jr., of Washington, was robbed of his watch and wallet by a man with his hand in his pocket in an alley near 14th and T Streets NW at 3:30 a.m. yesterday.

Elwood I. Waers, of Washington, was robbed of $70 by two men, one armed with a pistol, and a woman at 8th and Jefferson Streets NW at 8:10 p.m. Saturday.

Tyria Lester Tweedy, of Washington, was robbed by a man who appeared to have a gun under his shirt at 7th and O Streets NW at 10 p.m. Saturday.

Tom Roudebush, of Washington and Carrie Ortega, of Arlington, were robbed by three men while walking in the 2000 block of New Hampshire Avenue NW at 11:15 p.m. Thursday. One man placed a hard object at Roudebush's back and demanded his money. He took a wallet and papers from Roudebush and money from the woman.

Joseph Back and his wife, Rivil, of Silver Spring, and Selma Levine, of Washington, were robbed by three men, one carrying a revolver, at 39th and Warren Streets NW early yesterday morning. The men told Back, "Give me your wallet and keys," and he complied. His wife was forced to turn over her purse and keys, and Selma Levine handed over a purse. The man then ran off.

Geraldo Laboy Lopez, of Washington, was attacked and robbed by three men in the 2700 block of Woodley Place NW at 2:15 a.m., Sunday. One man held a shotgun and said, "Give it all to me." When Lopez yelled, the man struck him on the head with the shotgun and took his keys and key case. When he yelled again the men fled to a waiting auto.

Wellington Nynagon and Carol Belk, of Washington, were held up while walking at 6th Street and Howard Place NW at about 9:40 p.m. Friday by two men who approached them carrying sawed-off shotguns. They took cash, then fled on foot.

Gustave Augusta Welk, of Washington, was robbed at about 9:30 p.m. Friday by two men who forced him into an alley while he was walking in the 1400 block of 17th Street NW, hit him on the head and took his wallet.

Andrew V. Leh, of Camp Hill, Pa., was robbed at about 11:20 p.m. Friday when a man approached him while he was standing in the 100 block of 9th Street SE and asked him where the nearest bus stop was. When Leh replied he couldn't hear him, the man drew a gun and said, "Don't yell. Just give me your wallet." The man took Leh's wallet and fled south on 9th Street.

Nello Hawkins, George R. Hudson, Charles Ingram, Charles McDonald and Bolder Junior Smith, all of Washington, were robbed at about 11 p.m. Friday while in a garage at 20 Decatur St. NE by five men who entered the garage.

One man, brandishing a shotgun, said, "This is a holdup," and told the men to put their money on the floor. As the other four bandits picked up the money, the man with the shotun fired one shot at Hawkins, who had moved his hands, hitting him on the right little finger. The robbers then fled west on Decatur Street. Hawkins was treated at Washington Hospital Center for his wounded finger.

ASSAULTED

A Washington woman, 27, was forced at gunpoint into the trunk of a car at Georgia and Iowa Avenues NW at 1 a.m. She was driven to an apartment development in the Seat Pleasant area, blindfolded, and taken into an apartment, where she was raped. The victim was then driven to Cabin Branch Road, Seat Pleasant, where she was let out.

A Pittsburgh, Pa., woman was raped Saturday night after she and a companion returned to a Washington apartment to find it burglarized and two men within. While one of the men guarded the woman's companion, the other intruder took her into another room and raped her. After the assault, the man returned to the first room, told the victim's companion not to move, and fled with the second intruder.

A Washington woman was raped by a man who entered her Northwest home through a kitchen window at 4:30 a.m. Saturday. The man ransacked a room, then entered the victim's room. When she asked, "Who is it?" the intruder said, "Shut up and keep this pillow over your face." He then slapped and raped her before fleeing.

Rosette McMillon, of Washington, was struck about the head and shoulders by a man while she was in the swimming pool at 4th and Van Buren Streets NW.

Gregory John Greer, of Washington, was cut during an altercation with a man in a hallway in 1326 Harvard St. NW at 8:47 p.m. Saturday.

Charles Green, of Washington, was struck several times on the head by a man who approached him from the rear in the 1200 block of Wylie Street NE at 11:45 p.m. Saturday.

Louise Brown, of Washington, was shot at by another woman after they began fighting at 1:12 a.m. yesterday.

James H. Ross, of Washington, was knocked to the ground by an unknown person while walking in the 100 block of H Street NE at about 7:15 p.m. Saturday.

Joseph T. Hampton, of Washington, was shot in the right side by a man during an altercation in the 1700 block of T Street NW at 2:05 p.m. Saturday.

Jessie Bell Thomas, of Washington, was struck on the head with a chair by a man while in the yard at his home at 8 p.m. Saturday.

STOLEN

A shotgun and $3,000 in assorted bills and change were reported stolen from the Square Deal Liquor Store, 701 8th St. SE, sometime between 12:30 and 2:30 p.m. yesterday.

DEEPENING FRUSTRATION OF MEXICAN AMERICANS STIRS FEARS OF VIOLENCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a feature article in the Wall Street Journal of June 11, 1970, suggests that we all may have to pay a price for the many years of economic and political exploitation suffered by Mexican Americans in this Nation.

The article suggests that it may be "too late for the gringo," and that their poverty and despair may cause unrest throughout the Nation. The article vividly describes the plight of "vast numbers of Mexican Americans (who) remain mired in seemingly hopeless poverty. Cut off from the society at large by language and cultural barriers, poorly educated, lacking job skills, often discriminated against on an ethnic basis, these people cluster in the Mexican-American slums—or barrios—found in practically every Southwestern city."

As chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, I have on several occasions taken the floor of the Senate to urge my colleagues to more seriously consider the plight of migrant and seasonal farmworkers, many of whom are Mexican Americans. The systematic exclusion from, or at best only partial inclusion in, practically every major social and worker benefit program enacted into law at both the Federal and State level is well known, and the traumatic physical and psychological effects on human beings are well documented.

Yet we have yet to truly respond to these people. Our attentions remain preoccupied by an expanding war in Indochina, by SST's and space shuttles, and by fighting a war-fed inflation. Meanwhile, the dispossessed, the powerless, and the forgotten become more frustrated and alienated.

Must we ignore the cause of these people until the danger of violence awakens us? Must we force the Mexican American to ignore and reject a system which cannot be responsive?

Mr. President, so that my colleagues are aware of the growing crisis in the Mexican-American community, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal entitled, "Deepening Frustrations of Mexican Americans Stirs Fears of Violence," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ANGRY CHICANOS: DEEPENING FRUSTRATION OF MEXICAN AMERICANS STIRS FEARS OF VIOLENCE

(By Richard A. Shaffer)

SAN ANTONIO.—Every Texan remembers the Alamo, and Beto Martinez is no exception. But the man he admires is Santa Anna, the Mexican commander who massacred 187 defenders of the old mission here.

He had the right idea of what to do with white men," says Martinez, who predicts: "The day will come again when any gringo in this part of the county will be shot on sight."

Martinez, 32, is an unemployed high school dropout who wears a goatee and shabby clothes, and rarely takes off his sunglasses even in the darkest bars. He is minister of war for Mexican-American Nationalist Organization (MANO), a clandestine group that insists all "whites" are racist enemies who should be driven out of the Southwest, by force if necessary. Martinez, who has served time in Texas prisons for possession of marijuana and for sodomy, says most members of MANO are ex-convicts like himself and that others are Vietnam veterans with experience in demolition techniques and guerrilla warfare.

WE'LL BE READY

"Right now, we're strictly for self-defense. We're just waiting," he calmly tells an interviewer while rolling his own cigaret. "But when something starts, we'll be ready."

It's hard to say just how much of a threat MANO really poses to law and order in San Antonio Martinez claims his group has 300 members. But police in this seemingly tranquil city, where historical monument draw a constant stream of tourists, say MANO is "nothing to be afraid of—just Beto and a few crazy kids."

Whatever MANO's numerical strength, many knowledgeable observers say the belligerence displayed by Martinez is all too typical of a deepening undercurrent of anger and frustration among the nation's Mexican-Americans. To some, it seems inevitable that violence will result, and they believe it may well come this summer.

One Federal official responsible for gauging the mood of minority groups puts it this way: "There's an awful lot of ferment among the Mexican-Americans, a rising level of militancy among the young, with more demonstrations and more challenging of authority—all the preliminary stages of outright violence."

UNUSUALLY LARGE PROPORTION

If trouble comes, many experts believe, it could well occur here in South Texas. Many areas of the Southwest have large concentrations of Mexican-Americans, but the proportion is unusually large here. San Antonio counts 300,000 Mexican-Americans in its total population of 650,000, making it second only to Los Angeles in the number of Mexican-Americans.

Many Mexican-Americans, to be sure, have little cause for unhappiness. Throughout the Southwest, Mexican-Americans are prominent in business and various professions, including politics, and the number of well-educated Mexican-Americans moving into middle-class society is growing.

But vast numbers remain mired in seemingly hopeless poverty. Cut off from the society at large, by language and cultural barriers, poorly educated, lacking job skills, often discriminated against on an ethnic basis, these people cluster in the Mexican-American slums—or barrios—found in practically every Southwestern city.

In San Antonio the barrio is a sprawling collection of dilapiated wooden houses on the wrong side of town. Many of the barrio's streets remain unpaved, and many of the houses are jammed with big families—or sometimes several families. The yards are tiny, often surrounded by fences and decorated with birdbaths and plaster religious statues.

MANY MIGRANT WORKERS

Many of those who live in the San Antonio barrio and in other areas of South Texas are migrant farm workers, usually spending months in the Midwest during the growing and harvest seasons and returning here for the winter.

Those who fear violence here this summer say it could well be triggered by the impact of growing mechanization on the jobs of such migrant workers. In the Midwest alone, one Federal report estimates, 40,000 migrant farm laborers will be displaced this year—and a large percentage of these will be Texans. Luis De Leon, who works in the Laredo, Tex., office of an eight-state migrant-assistance group known as the Colorado Migrant Council, predicts: "There's going to be a lot of frustration and anger."

Jose Angel Gutierrez, a youthful activist who works with migrants and holds a master's degree in political science, says he is convinced that "after this summer, a farm laborer won't even have enough money to get drunk on. Things may not explode completely this summer. But that's when it's going to begin."

When he wrote his master's thesis two years ago, Mr. Gutierrez concluded that "the empirical conditions for revolution" exist in South Texas. Today, he says, "the chances for violence are better than ever."

There have, of course, been a number of manifestations of Mexican-American unrest already in various parts of the nation. The campaign led by Cesar Chavez to unionize the grape-field workers in Delano, Calif., has largely been a "chicano"—or Mexican-American—movement, and confrontations of various sorts have occurred with less publicity in Lansing, Mich., Kansas City, Denver, Chicago and other places where the Spanish-speaking have settled after fleeing the poverty along the Mexican border.

But much of the agitation has remained beneath the surface. Most Mexican-American groups in San Antonio, for example, publicly deplore even nonviolent demonstrations. During two boycotts of public schools by Chicano students and a strike by city garbage collectors (nearly all Mexican-Americans) there was not a single arrest. As a result, city leaders are confident things will remain calm.

"This has always been a liberal town," says Walter W. McAllister, the 81-year-old mayor, who has an autographed picture of Herbert Hoover in his office. "I don't expect trouble. Americans of Mexican descent here have made real progress in recent years."

But a Federal observer here warns, "There are 'brown power' militants who are as full of hate and violence as anything the black power movement ever saw. It wouldn't surprise me to see things really come to a head in San Antonio. Maybe here before anywhere else."

One reason for the peaceful facade, as MANO's Beto Martinez sees it, is that the radicals have learned a lesson from those who have gone before. For example, when a supposedly nonviolent group headed by Mr. Gutierrez and known as the Mexican-American Youth Organization (MAYO) began making such public statements as "We must eliminate the gringo. . . . We have to be revolutionary in our demands," it was widely accused of racism.

U.S. Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez of San Antonio, a Mexican-American with a consistently liberal voting record in Congress, blasted MAYO as drawing "fire from the deepest wellsprings of hate." The Ford Foundation refused to renew a grant to MAYO, and Mr. Gutierrez was fired from another Ford Foundation-sponsored project.

"We're not so stupid," says Martinez. "We went underground right after the cops murdered all those Black Panthers." Now, he says, no more than four or five members of MANO meet at one time. Membership lists have been destroyed.

Martinez tells his recruits: "Get guns wherever you can, preferably from addicts who steal them. Don't buy them if you can help it. And don't carry them. Stay off dope. Don't use the telephone. Don't make public speeches. Get a job, if you can, and try to look harmless. This is how the Minutemen have survived. We will, too." (The Minutemen is a secret paramilitary group on the extreme right.)

NO RAMPAGES EXPECTED

On the basis of detailed reports on MANO and the mood of the Mexican-American populace here, Federal observers don't expect a riot like those that occurred in the Watts section of Los Angeles and in some other cities, with rampages of looting and burning.

Instead, they fear a shootout between militants and police, a replay of the Cleveland battle between blacks and police that took 11 lives in the summer of 1968. In maintaining that the chances for such violence are high here, sources cite the conclusion by Cleveland Mayor Carl B. Stokes and a county grand jury that the outbreak there was not the result of a revolutionary plot or conspiracy but rather represented "spontaneous action taken by a group who were armed and emotionally prepared to do violence."

If there is such "emotional preparation" in Texas, it is not hard to trace its roots. Sen. Joseph M. Montoya (D., N.M.) told a Senate subcommittee last summer that Mexican-

American poverty is worse in Texas than in any other area for which statistics are available.

In Texas 46.5% of the Mexican-Americans live in housing regarded as overcrowded or dilapidated, while only 9.4% of the "white" population lives in such conditions. The median annual family income for Mexican-Americans is $2,914, compared with $4,884 for whites. The average educational level is 6.2 years for Mexican-Americans but 11.4 years for whites. Of the total population in Texas, 3.4% has no schooling at all. This compares with 5.3% among Negroes in Texas and 16% among Mexican-Americans.

The Mexican-American also suffers more severely at the hands of official justice in South Texas than in any other area in five Southeastern states, according to studies made by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in 1968.

The commission said it found that "Mexican-American citizens are subject to unduly harsh treatment by law enforcement officers, that they are often arrested on insufficient grounds, receive physical and verbal abuse and penalties which are disproportionately severe. We have found them to be deprived of proper use of bail and of adequate representation by counsel. They are substantially underrepresented on grand and petit juries and excluded from full participation in law enforcement agencies, especially in supervisory positions."

Government efforts to improve the plight of Mexican-Americans have caused some disillusionment. "People are beginning to realize that these programs have promised more than they can deliver," says Richard Avena, field director for the Civil Rights Commission here.

HIGH JOBLESS RATE

Unemployment remains high—nearly 30% on the Mexican-American West Side of San Antonio—despite a Labor Department "concentrated employment program" that has been under way for three years, and the city Urban Renewal Authority is prevented by state law from using its land for badly needed public housing. The only two projects the authority has completed in 13 years were devoted to commercial interests and headquarters for local government.

There's some hope political successes will offset the forces for strife in the streets.

Mexican-Americans in some nearby rural communities have been fashioning their own political machine, the Raza Unida (United People) Party, which has either sponsored or supported more than a dozen candidates and not lost an election. Even in San Antonio, where city government has been controlled since the mid-1950s by the conservative Good Government League and where the Spanish-speaking vote is largely restricted to a single county commissioner district, candidates with militant support have won in at least five elections.

Even so, Mr. Gutierrez, chief strategist of the Raza Unida victories, says, "It's too late for the gringo to make amends. Violence has got to come."

OUTSTANDING SCIENTISTS FAVOR BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on June 12, 1970, field hearings were held on S. 4, my bill to establish a 100,000-acre Big Thicket National Park. The hearings were conducted in Beaumont, Tex., by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Some 35 witnesses appeared to testify at these hearings, and the overwhelming majority were in favor of the proposed legislation to preserve this unique area of Texas. Among the witnesses were distinguished botanists, biologists, ecologists, limnologists, and other knowledgeable and learned persons concerned with conserving this rich "biological crossroads of America," as it has been so aptly described.

A most distinguished witness at the hearings was Dr. Clarence Cottam, a nationally known biologist, who is presently director of the Welder Wildlife Foundation of Sinton, Tex. I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues Dr. Cottam's testimony in favor of the Big Thicket National Park.

Another distinguished witness who testified in favor of the Big Thicket National Park was the eminent botanist, researcher, author of many works on botany, Dr. Donovan S. Correll of the Texas Research Institute at Renner, Tex.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the compelling testimony of these two outstanding scientists concerning the need to preserve the Big Thicket of Texas be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK, TEX.

(By Clarence Cottam)

My name is Clarence Cottam of Sinton, Texas. I am Director of the Welder Wildlife Foundation of Sinton. I was formerly Senior or principal Biologist of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and for eight years Assistant Director of that agency. I also served as Professor of Biology and Dean of the College of Biology and Agriculture at Brigham Young University in Utah. I speak here today as a professional biologist and conservationist, entirely and solely representing myself and not any agency with which I have been or am now associated.

I believe sincerely that it is in the best public interest to establish the Big Thicket National Park and recreation area. A major purpose for establishing a national park, recreation area or a National Monument is to preserve in perpetuity the natural history, scenic, historic and recreation or other public values for the people of this nation.

Studies of existing parks, monuments and national recreation areas in contrast to other great areas that should have been preserved, have shown convincingly that too often many of these public values have been lost when they are not placed under public trust and administration. Studies of existing parks and other outstanding national recreation areas have shown that these areas have effectively boosted the local and regional economy.

It is not surprising that communities in the vicinity of proposed national parks and recreation areas usually are, and should be, concerned about the possible loss of tax revenue, if lands and properties are taken off the tax rolls or if other sources of revenues should be lost.

When the issues of Padre Island National Seashore and Recreational Area were being considered Cape Hatteras Sea Shore in Dare County, North Carolina was studied to determine what its economic impact on the adjacent communities had been. A reporter from the Eugene, Oregon, *Register-Guard* visited this area and submitted his findings. He examined the tax records of Dare County where this National Seashore is largely located. He found that total assessed valuations within this sparcely settled rural county had more than doubled from 1950 to 1958, from $11 million to $25 million. Contemporary with this, the tax rates were reduced from $1.000 to $.80 per hundred. Tourism doubled within a six-year period in communities adjacent to the National seashore. Bank deposits doubled during the period. Land remaining on the tax rolls often increased from 50 to 100 times because the park stimulated economic growth and activity.

It is true that land usually is taken off the tax rolls when a park or other federal institution is created. When the Cape Hatteras (Pea Island) Seashore area became government property nearly one million dollars of taxible property was removed from the County books. This amount however now represents only about one percent of the County governments income. This is far out weighed by a much higher income resulting directly from the establishment of the recreational park.

Before the Seashore was established fishing represented the principle source of income. Today fish landings have significantly increased both by weight and volume; still, it represents only a little over 10% of the total income. The tourist industry new represents 57.5% of the basic income of the people while Federal and state governments comprise another 20%.

Attached hereto is a condensed report prepared in 1961 by the U.S. National Park Service on the economic history following the establishing of a number of our national parks.

Tourism is one of the major economic industries of this nation. It is either first or second in importance in a number of states and third in the nation. Because of her favorable geographic position, excellent climate, superior scenery, abundance of natural resources and unexcelled highways and other means of transportation and communication Texas is in a strategic and unique position to capitalize on this economic asset—providing the state has the necessary parks and recreation areas of caliber that will attract people. The potential and the demands are here and I believe the state leadership is aware that far too little has yet been done to meet our growing recreational and tourist needs or meet the potential that now exists.

Texas now does not have sufficient parks and recreation areas to meet the growing needs of its own people without considering the constantly expanding demands and needs of the nation as a whole. As the leisure time increases and our population expands the needs for parks and recreational areas will become increasingly more urgent, yet more costly to acquire and develop. The longer we postpone taking vigorous action the more difficult it will be to acquire the necessary areas.

The important Park Service Mission 66 showed clearly that the demand far exceeds national areas along this line. In estimating park attendance ten years hence (1956) this service later found that they were about 33% under actual park visitations in 1966.

Attendance at parks and other public areas—state and community parks, wildlife refuges, national and state forests, fishing lakes and streams and public domain land—all showed tremendous increased public use.

That there is an increasing public demand for parks and natural areas is shown from the fact that visitation to most areas are increasing from five to well over ten percent each year.

Some examples of these demands follow:

In 1966 there were 117 million visits to National Parks—an increase of about 8% a year since then.

In 1959 there were 96 million visits to National Forests.

In 1964 there were 137½ million visits to National Forests.

In 1959 there were 9⅓ million visits to National Wildlife Refuges.

In 1968 there were 14 million visits to National Wildlife Refuges.

In 1968 there were 296½ million visits to State Parks and State recreation areas—an 8.6% increase annually in 1969 & 1970.

In 1965 there were more than 50 million fishermen and hunters 12 years old or older in America and they spend some $4 billion pursuing that recreation each year.

It is obvious that visitation by many people have an exceedingly important economic impart on all adjacent communities and to a lesser degree to areas far removed from the park, forest or other natural history area. In a report prepared by William B. Beyers to the National Park Service in February of 1970 on the "Economic Impact of Mt. Rainier and Olympic National Park" in 1963 he showed that for Olympic National Park, visitors that year were estimated to have spent a total of $21.8 million in the U.S. on their park visits. Approximately $18.3 million of these expenditures were made in the state of Washington. Non-Washington residents spent a total of $10 million on their park visits, with $6.5 million of their expenditure being made in the state of Washington. "The $18.3 million in visitor expenditures made in Washington State, and the operations expenditure of the National Park Service created about $16.7 million in income in Washington State and supported the annual equivalent of approximately 2800 jobs. In the U.S. as a whole, income of $69.9 million was created by Olympic National Park visitors and operation expenditures. Thus, far every dollar of visitor and park operations expenditure, $3.02 in income was generated in the U.S. economy."

Mr. Ranier National Park visitors were estimated to have spent $14.9 million in 1968 on their visits of which $12.6 million was spent in the state of Washington. Out-of-state visitors spent . . . $4.7 million on trips to this park of which $2.9 million was spent in the state.

It is clear that our national parks and similar areas which were set aside to preserve units of our most magnificant natural environment have also become of great importance to both the local and national economy. If the Big Thicket in Texas becomes a National Park, as I hope it does, I have no doubt it too will add significantly to both the local, state, and national economy.

The Big Thicket area of East Texas is unique in many respects and originally comprised about 3½ million acres and represented parts of eleven Texas counties. The area is beautiful and of great scientific and cultural value. It has rather appropriately been described as the "biological crossroads" of North America. This is because its unique and unparralleled flora (and funa) are representative of characteristic floras of diverse belts such as the Appalachian highlands, the coastal plains, Piedmont forests, open woodlands and even the everglades.

The diversity of plants and animals in close proximity is the result of several factors: (a) a rather high rainfall of about 60 inches annually, (b) a warm humid gulf climate, and (c) a geographic location where there is an overlap between the north and south and also east and west. Botanists and ecologists have here described eight major plant communities: Upland, Savanna, beech-magnolia, baygall, palmetto-baldcypress-hardwood, bog, steam bank and flood-plain forests.

This area is unique because these diverse associations of plant communities live in surprisingly close proximity to each other. The animal communities are largely dependent upon the plant environments. Consequently, they too are amazingly diverse and complex in this unique area.

Several species of trees here seem to reach their finest and most luxurant development. A number of world record or near record sized trees and shrubs are, or were found here. These included giant specimens of the American holly, eastern red cedar, bald cypress, Chinese tallow, American sycamore, magnolia, giant palmetto palm, sparkleberry, sweetleaf, and 2-winged silverbell.

Because of diverse soil types from acid bogs to relatively dry sandy ridges and diverse and varied water relationships from bog, marsh, lake, flowing streams and fluctuating water levels to upland prairie sod, nature has developed a fantastically rich flora of both flowering and lower non-flowering plants. These are said to include some 25 species of ferns, many and probably some undescribed species of algae, moss, fungi and lichens. Four of America's five native insectivorous plants are found here including the attractive pitcher plant, bladderwort, sundew and bog violet. Hundreds of species and varieties of flowering plants abound.

Dr. D. S. Correll, eminent botanist, of the Texas Research Foundation has described this area as a "region of critical species change." He added that "the variations are often so great that the plant has to be segregated as a distinct species." This characteristic is somewhat typical of transition biotic zones where related species come together and there is an interchange of genes in the crossings. It is probably also an expression of the unique habitat variations and the efforts of the flora and fauna to adapt to the varied and changing environments.

Wherever one finds an abnormally rich and amazingly varied flora he may be sure of finding also a surprisingly rich and varied fauna associated with it as the flora, in large measure, limits or determines the bounds of the varied animal communities.

Well over 300 species of birds have been recorded from the Big Thicket and a surprisingly large number of mammals, reptiles and amphibians. It is a rich area for migrants and it also contains many resident and nesting species of birds. The endangered alligator and the rare eastern Black bear are uncommon but found here. The extinct Carolina Paraquet (Louisiana race) and the Passenger pigeon undoubtedly occurred here.

If recent reports are correct the most notable extant bird species making its home here is the Ivory-billed Woodpecker, America's largest bird of the woodpecker family. This area has been a favored haunt of this rare and gravely endangered bird. If reports of reputable scientists and ornithologists are correct some seven to ten individuals of this majestic bird are making their last stand here; primarily in the Neches River bottomlands.

The Ivory-bill is a bird of very restricted habitat requirements and it is quite unadaptable. It requires extensive virgin old timbered land to survive. It seems to me that this great nation of ours cannot afford to let any more of our endangered species become extinct. This should be an added inducement to save the Big Thicket from further destruction.

This remarkable and uniquely rich area, from the standpoint of American flora and fauna, is rich in early Texas history. We will lose an irreplaceable heritage if further delay is permitted to prevent acquisition of this area. Whatever land we can obtain and preserve there will not be enough for those who will come after us. We are told that selfish private interests—some lumbermen, pipeline companies, and real estate promoters—are exploiting this area so destructively that 50 acres per day are falling to the ax and bulldozer. Immediate action is called for to save any of the last 300,000 acres that have not been largely ruined. The area is so productive that even though much destruction has occurred in time Nature, under sound management, will heal most of the present scars.

I urge that in the interest of this great state and nation, of which we are all proud to be a part, as much land as possible in the Big Thicket area be declared a National Park. The problem is too big now for the state alone to handle. Our concern for those who come after us should stimulate immediate and affirmative action.

TESTIMONY BY DONOVAN S. CORRELL IN FAVOR OF THE CREATION OF A BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

I would like to go on record in support of a Big Thicket National Park that should be created in southeastern Texas, not only as an aesthetic region of great recreational value but also as an out-of-doors biological laboratory for the biologist and naturalist.

Although the boundaries of the Big Thicket, both Lower and Upper, are only roughly defined, most authorities agree that the region is centered in Hardin County with extensive areas in Polk, Tyler and other adjacent counties. The limitation of distribution of individual plant species are even more difficult to define than the boundaries of the Thicket, itself. For this reason it is essentially impossible to enumerate plant species that may be solely confined to the Big Thicket, since most plants may be generally distributed in southeast Texas, a floristically rich region.

Therefore, when I speak of plants of the Big Thicket I am referring to plants of southeast Texas.

The forests of east Texas represent the western extremity of the vast woodlands that cover southeastern United States. Practically all of the species that comprise the vegetation composition of this area have reached their westerly migration in the Big Thicket. Because of this, many of the species reveal variation in some of their characteristics from plants of the same species found farther east; for instance, those in Georgia and Alabama. The Big Thicket shows much evidence as being a region of speciation. This is supported by the fact that a number of plants have been described from this area that show distinct relationsihp with species that occur farther east. It can therefore be considered a haven where plants have become and are becoming adapted to a rather unique environment.

Although the composition of both the woody and the herbaceous elements is distinctly southeastern, there are some endemics that occur in the Big Thicket.

In my forays throughout most of southeastern United States from North Carolina to southern Florida and east Texas, I do not recall any other area that can be said to be identical to the Big Thicket. The Florida Everglades and the Okeefeenokee Swamp in Georgia are different from this region. The rolling Piedmont forests and the more open woodlands of the coastal plains of these more eastern regions are also different. In fact, in the Big Thicket we not only have ecologic representations of all of the above regions, but we have immense areas that resemble tropical jungles to be found in such areas as the states of Tamaulipas and Vera Cruz, Mexico.

A point that might escape the casual observer is the fact that although the Big Thicket is considered a southeastern woodland, and it connotes to the average individual a coastal plain flora, there are some species in the Big Thicket area that have not been reported from Louisiana eastward but are connected with the Appalachian flora from northeastern Arkansas northeastward. The occurrence of these species so far westward, in an almost direct line from the Appalachian area, is another puzzling factor in plant distribution. I do want to emphasize that the Big Thicket is not just another woodland that is so common to most of southeastern United States.

It is unthinkable to knowledgeable biologists that a good representation of this unique area may not be saved for future generations. The region is not only one of great aesthetic value to the naturalist and nature lover, but it is literally an out-of-doors laboratory for the biology student. More than 200 trees and shrubs are indigenous to southeast Texas, of which the Big Thicket forms a prominent part. Many of the trees attain their maximum size in the Big Thicket, especially along Pine Island Bayou and the Neches River. Among these are basket oak, gum and cypress. The beech, which in northeastern United States is to be found on north-facing slopes, grows along streams and on gently rolling lands in the Big Thicket to form forests of magnificent trees. Southern magnolia is known to be ancient and of enormous growth in the Big Thicket. Numerous unique herbaceous plants are to be found in the Big Thicket, including 34 species of ferns and fern allies and 30 species of native orchids. Many plants that are rare to other sections of the country are often common to the area.

My personal opinion is that in order to assure the utmost protection and perpetuation of the flora and fauna of this unique area, a block of at least 75,000 acres should be set aside and maintained as a National Park. If any part of the park is to be maintained as a nature preserve and haven for indigenous plants and animals it should be large enough to include a protective or buffer zone. Otherwise, the area will soon become contaminated by the introduction of weedy plants and domestic animals. Also, any watercourse that is to be a part of a natural preserve should have its headwaters protected from all outside interference and disturbance.

One argument used against the formation of a National Park, and one that I would like to refute most emphatically is based on the assumption that once a forest is disturbed or cut over it is forever lost as a park area possibility. This is a short-sighted and untrue argument that is often used by those who are against the formation of a Park preserve in the Big Thicket. This fallacy also has been the basis for apparent systematic, purposeful demolitions in some choice areas of the Big Thicket, after which opponents can proudly boast that "there is nothing worth saving in the Big Thicket". This selfish argument should never be accepted as a deterrent to the acquisition of lands for a park. For instance, there is little doubt that most of the present so-called "pristine" forest of the Big Thicket has been cut over at least once, if not more. Also, very little, if any, of what are now the Smoky Mt. Park and Shenandoah Parkway escaped logging in the early days. Yet, today, these National Parks, formed primarily of second-growth trees, are great aesthetic assets for not only the Americans along the eastern seaboard, but for all of our people. As long as the ecological phenomenon of "succession" remains a fact we can depend upon a cut-over forest to return eventually to its ultimate climax state if it is set aside and protected. For this reason, if need be, it would be well to include some cut-over forests within the Park area, not only for the above reason but also because such lands should be less costly to obtain. Studies have shown that quick recovery and rapid growth occur in most of the Big Thicket after logging. In any case, the creation of a park should never be colored by a desire for expediency and immediate results but rather it should be motivated by needs of the future and a desire to preserve something of our inheritance to be enjoyed by those who come after.

To reiterate, I would say that several of the most salient points, from a botanical standpoint, to support setting aside a portion of the Big Thicket for posterity are: 1) The area is the western extremity of the distribution of southeastern United States plants; 2) Critical speciation appears to be occurring there; 3) The region is a haven for a unique composition of plant species; 4) Some elements of the Big Thicket flora are directly related to the Appalachian flora; 5) Several species of trees, including the American holly, American beech and southern magnolia, attain their finest development and largest size in the Big Thicket.

ARMY SURVEILLANCE OF CIVILIAN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday last, I placed in the RECORD Mr. Christopher Pyle's most recent article concerning the Army's surveillance of civilian political activities.

Since bringing this article to the attention of the Senate, I have received in the mail a copy of an Air Force memorandum entitled "Reporting Subversive Activities," issued May 25 at Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.

Although it is not clear whether this memorandum applies to military personnel only or whether it includes civilians as well, I think it makes little real difference, for the basic question at issue is to what extent any branch of the Armed Forces may infringe on basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution to each and every citizen, whether in military or civilian life.

Perhaps the most rudimentary of all our constitutional guarantees are those which seek to insure every individual's right to express openly his political beliefs and to participate actively in the political process itself.

The Air Force memorandum which I received clearly shows little regard for any of these constitutional guarantees; it directs the base's "organizational commanders" to instruct their personnel to report on a variety of attitudes and activities, including:

First. Personnel having indebtedness being approached with offers of financial aid.

Second. Personnel making statements which indicate disloyalty to the United States.

Third. Personnel making sympathetic statements in support of antiwar demonstrators.

Fourth. Congregation of unauthorized persons.

Fifth. Persons attempting to spread antiwar sentiments in public places on Sheppard Air Force Base.

Sixth. Persons making statements with racial overtones.

In the Air Force memorandum, all of these items are carried under the subject heading "Reporting Subversive Activities."

Mr. President, I consider this memorandum an outrage: at best it directs the military personnel on one Air Force base to maintain a semisurveillance on the political attitudes and activities of their colleagues; at worst, it indicates a program that may be going on throughout the military and one which is being applied to civilians as well.

At its worst or at its best, what is envisioned by this memorandum has no place in our society. And if it werre to go unquestioned, I think it would be an open invitation to the Pentagon to play as fast and as loose with basic individual freedoms as it sees fit.

Because this Air Force memorandum raises so many fundamental constitutional issues, I have sent a copy of it to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Mr. ERVIN—who is probably the most distinguished constitutional lawyer in this body. I hope that the subcommittee will look into this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Air Force memorandum which I received and my letter to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1970.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of an Air Force memorandum entitled "Reporting Subversive Activities" issued May 25, Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, which I received a few days ago. I have no reason to question its authenticity.

The person who sent it to me was, I think, understandably outraged by it and, in view of the fact that the memorandum raises a number of basic issues bearing directly on individual rights and freedoms, I thought that the matter should be brought to the attention of your Subcommittee.

While some may disagree on whether the Air Force or any branch of the Armed Forces should be actively engaged in reporting and collecting information on political attitudes and activities, the enclosed memorandum is, I think, particularly shocking because of the kinds of attitudes and activities it so casually labels as "subversive." In this regard, the memorandum directs that ". . . organizational commanders will brief their personnel to report any of the following activities . . ." including

1. "Personnel having indebtedness being approached with offers of financial aid."

2. "Personnel making statements which indicate disloyalty to the United States."

3. "Personnel making sympathetic statements/support of antiwar demonstrators."

4. "Congregation of unauthorized persons."

5. "Persons attempting to spread antiwar sentiment in public places on Sheppard Air Force Base."

6. "Persons making statements with racial overtones."

You will note that it is not clear whether the memorandum applies to reporting on military personnel only or whether it includes civilians as well. In either case, I view this situation with great concern and I wish to express the hope that you and the members of your Subcommittee may be able to look into this matter and determine, among other things, the extent to which such surveillance or semi-surveillance operations are being conducted throughout the military establishment; the military's authority for conducting such operations; the manner in which the information is collected, evaluated, and used; and the degree to which basic Constitutional rights are jeopardized by a continuation of these operations.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Reply to atten of: XPO-DP/8 (MSgt Roten/6212).

Subject: Reporting Subversive Activities.

To: Distribution B Plus Tenent Organizations.

1. The possibility of civil demonstrators disrupting activities at Sheppard Air Force

Base is remote; however, to be prepared for such a possibility, directors of center staff agencies and organizational commanders will brief their personnel to report any of the following activities to their supervisor who should insure the information reaches an action agency; i.e., OSI, Security Police, Sheppard Command Post.

a. Personnel having indebtedness being approached with offers of financial aid.

b. Persons making conversation about "overthrow" of the United States Government.

c. Personnel being threatened with black mail.

d. Personnel making statements which indicate disloyalty to the United States.

e. Personnel making sympathetic statements/support of the antiwar demonstrators.

f. Acts of sabotage or suspected acts of sabotage.

g. Personnel making threats against the President of the United States or other high government officials or high ranking military personnel.

h. Congregation of unauthorized persons.

i. Persons attempting to spread antiwar sentiments in public places on Sheppard Air Force Base.

j. Persons making statements with racial overtones.

JACK JANUARY, Jr.,
Colonel, USAF, Acting Director, Plans/Operation.
(For the Commander).

FOLK LIFE FESTIVAL BRINGS US TOGETHER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Fourth Annual Folk Life Festival which was held in Washington on July 1 through July 5, 1970, was an outstanding success. The festival was sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution and organized by the Institution's Division of Performing Arts. It is estimated that more than 700,000 people visited and enjoyed the festival this year.

The Folk Life Festival and similar events satisfy a strong need on the part of the citizens of this Nation. We are searching for a common ground upon which we can unite. We have found this common ground in the celebration of our diverse cultural heritage.

Even as we learned to appreciate the unique customs, skills, and ways of life of the people who conducted the exhibits, those of us who attended the festival learned that we could enjoy and share this experience regardless of the length of our hair or the diversity of our political views.

We should do all that we can to foster an attitude of tolerance and respect for diversity. The study and appreciation of folk life is an excellent way in which to accomplish this.

Mr. President, on March 20, 1969, I introduced S. 1591, a bill to establish an American Folk Life Foundation. The Foundation will be an agency of the Smithsonian Institution and will seek to develop and encourage a great public awareness of American cultural diversity and the value of American traditional culture.

The prompt enactment of this legislation would provide a means through which the folklife of our Nation can be preserved, enjoyed, and celebrated for the benefit of all our citizens.

An interesting article about the Folk Life Festival and the need to continue and expand such activities appeared in the July 12, 1970, issue of the Washington Sunday Star, on page H-5. The article was written by Mr. Donald Smith and is entitled "Folklife Festival Helps To Bring Us All Together."

Mr. President, I recommend this article to the Senate and 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:

[From the Washington Star, July 12, 1970]

FOLK LIFE FESTIVAL HELPS TO BRING US ALL TOGETHER

(By Donald Smith)

Early in the morning on the second day of the Smithsonian Institution's Festival of American Folklife earlier this month, festival director Ralph Rinzler received a telephone call from a middle-management level government employe who had attended the children's concert on the Mall the day before. He praised the program and then added:

"One thing that really astounded me was that, as I was sitting there listening, a bunch of hippies with long hair and no shoes came marching through playing kazoos and beating drums. I thought they were going to start a riot. Then I saw that they were a garbage detail. I'd never seen such a joyous garbage collection. I was really impressed by them."

The young people, residents of a Vermont commune who had been hired to help keep the grounds clean, were by no means the only long-haired youths at the festival. One of the most remarkable aspects of that week was its attraction for people of all descriptions, from free-wheeling students to solid middle Americans.

"The kids and the older people and their families all sat down next to each other and chatted, and there was a nice feeling between them," Rinzler says.

EXTEND FESTIVAL

In view of the fragmentation and divisiveness that fills most of our days, one can hardly think of a better argument for extending the folklife festival beyond the five days it occupied this year. But there are several others.

From a purely practical standpoint, an extended program would enable more people—tourists and residents of the Washington area alike—to participate. Organizers estimated that more than 700,000 people passed through the festival this year. This is a healthy number, but it represents only a fraction of the tourists who visit Washington every year.

The festival has grown enormously since its beginnings in the fall of 1966, when S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian, assigned James Morris, director of the Institution's newly-established Division of Performing Arts, to put together some treatment of ethnic cultural material, primarily music, in the manner of Ripley's "living museum."

Morris, who had produced a large festival in Ashville, N.C., in 1963, recruited Rinzler as the director. Rinzler at the time was doing field research for the Newport Folk Festival. The first edition of the Smithsonian festival was squeezed into the space of one weekend. It still attracted 350,000 people.

Plans for next year's festival already are underway. They include again featuring the folklore of one state and that of one Indian group, as well as the culture of some other ethnic minority. Italian, Irish and Jewish-American programs are being considered.

The possibility of extending the festival's time has been raised periodically since the first year. Rinzler is concerned that the aspect of comparing two or more folk cultures in juxtaposition be preserved, and the spacing out of "exhibits" might weaken this. There is no question but that the effect of being able to wander a few steps away from an Indian ceremonial dance and walk into a group listening to a string band from Arkansas is dramatic.

One alternative proposed by Morris is to retain the central festival, but to present smaller demonstrations over a longer period of time before and after.

The most intriguing possibility is to turn the Mall into a year-around festival area. Naturally, the major problem would be money. The budget for this year's festival was about $120,000, not counting the large numbers of volunteers who helped produce and administer the program.

Larger funding might be possible under a bill that has been introduced by Senators Ralph W. Yarborough, D-Tex., and J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., calling for the establishment of a foundation for the study and preservation of American folk culture. Hearings on this bill are expected to begin in the House in the next few weeks.

The idea of establishing a year-around festival area on the Mall, with pavilions and public accommodations, represents a significant departure in the historical concept of Washington as the city of grand vistas.

When Pierre Charles L'Enfant, the 37-year-old French engineer officer, Revolutionary War veteran and aristocrophile, laid out the federal city in the 1790s, he followed the precepts of the baroque style of landscape architecture, which was then at its zenith of popularity. In particular, he was fond of the plan of Louis XIV's Versailles, which contemplated monumental views at the expense of accommodating people. The vista was paramount: long, broad avenues rendered large extents of land visible. The avenues were made to intersect at equal angles to form *pattes d'oie,* producing the effect of visibility in multiple. One critic has said that the whole plan of Versailles was focused on Louis XIV's bedroom, where the vistas intersected and allowed him to imagine he controlled the whole natural world by seeing it through his vista-ways.

It also has been noted that L'Enfant designed Washington with a population of 800,000 in mind, all of them not only well-to-do, but patently rich.

As late as 1963, a secretary of the Interior was saying that the office of National Capital Parks' main task was to preserve L'Enfant's concept of the parks as places "to be used not primarily for 'pleasuring' but to heighten the visual impact of the federal buildings and national monuments."

For the Mall itself, L'Enfant planned the grandest vista of all, a 400-foot wide, mile-long, tree-lined promenade on the order of the Champs Elysees, occupied on either side by embassies.

George Washington dismissed the temperamental Frenchman before his work was completed, and his designs disappeared with him. The main elements of the city were laid out on the basis of a plan that was reconstructed by memory.

PLACE FOR PEOPLE

It remained for the McMillan Commission, named after the chairman of the Senate District Committee in 1902, to revive interest in completing the plan with some modifications. One of these was to grade the Mall and plant it with grass, thus preserving the grand view, but making it even more inaccessible than the public promenade L'Enfant had planned.

Only recently, under the guidance of former regional park director Nash Castro, have Washington Parklands come to be regarded as places for people to congregate—even at the expense of cluttering up the view.

Lewis Mumford several years ago remarked that the design L'Enfant made for the new capital "was in every respect what the architects and servants of despotism originally had conceived." Another critic noted: "One might ponder the relevance of baroque planning—conceived largely as an expression of absolutism—in a democratic society."

The presence of the Folklife Festival during this time of re-evaluation seems almost serendipitous. Its attraction for virtually all elements of American society, its ability to draw large numbers of people of diverse backgrounds together into a common meeting ground, is a unique recommendation for its full-time occupancy of L'Enfant's American vista.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 16915) making appropriations for the legislative branch 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 New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, which is now before the Senate, recommends appropriations for the current fiscal year in the amount of $413,874,653. This bill provides the funding to support the operations and functions of the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, and the General Accounting Office. The sum recommended by the committee is $67,225,423 above the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. It has been the custom for many years for the House to exclude items in this bill relating strictly to the Senate. Of this increase over the House-passed bill, $65,510,390 represents items which were not considered by the House under this customary procedure. When these Senate items are eliminated from the increase, the bill is only $1,715,033 over the House bill and this sum relates to increases for the General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress, and some joint items.

I would like to point out to the Senate that the bill exceeds the appropriations for 1970 in the amount of $52,850,326. Since this is a considerable sum, I think it should be made clear to the Senate that most of this increase results from the inclusion in the bill of $15,610,000 to commence construction of the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building and $25 million for the Government Printing Office including a $22 million contribution to the GPO revolving fund. There is also a $6.1 million increase for the General Accounting Office. The report is before each Member, and at the conclusion of the report there are tabular pages which give complete comparisons for each item in the bill. Consequently, I will confine my remarks to some of the major matters which came before the committee this year.

First, the committee has seen fit to transfer the positions of comptroller and secretary to the comptroller to the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate. You will recall that last year the comptroller position was created within the Office of the Secretary of the Senate. However, it was the feeling of the committee that the individual charged with the responsibility for audit of vouchers should not be under the individual responsible for making disbursements. This is true in any major operation that has come to my attention. It is true with respect to the executive branch of the Government. The Comptroller General of the United States is not responsible for the Treasury Department's Division of Disbursement. Under this transfer, the comptroller will be responsible to the most senior Member of the Senate and, consequently, will be directly responsible to the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MONTOYA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Who is now performing the duties that will be performed by this comptroller?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Brenkworth is now performing those duties.

Mr. CURTIS. All of them?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Are any of those duties performed by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration or by the committee itself?

Mr. MONTOYA. The Committee on Rules and Administration actually makes policy and Mr. Brenkworth carries out those recommendations when it comes to fiscal policies.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it true or is it not true that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration signs all vouchers in all of these matters?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct, and he still would.

Mr. CURTIS. He still would?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. It does not change that?

Mr. MONTOYA. It does not change any powers of the Committee on Rules and Administration at all.

Mr. CURTIS. To what extent will there be a duplication?

Mr. MONTOYA. There will be no duplication at all. In substance, the duties of the comptroller would be to perform auditing functions over all disbursements of the Senate, and he would be an official separate and apart from the office of the Secretary of the Senate. The comptroller would be under this body for all intents and purposes and he would be appointed by the President pro tempore.

Mr. CURTIS. How large an office does the Senator anticipate this would be? What is this going to cost?

Mr. MONTOYA. We provide here for an appropriation for his salary and the salary of a secretary; two people altogether.

Mr. CURTIS. Two people. Does this proposal have the approval of this disbursing office?

Mr. MONTOYA. It has the unanimous approval of the committee and we were in consultation not only with the Secretary of the Senate, but also with the leadership of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Would that include the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. MONTOYA. No, it did not.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in accordance with the request of the Secretary of the Senate, language has been included in the bill which will authorize the Secretary to fix salaries at not to exceed the rate of compensation authorized for the particular position. This will afford to the Secretary authority to reduce the position gross of any position which might fall vacant if in the judgment of the Secretary the position should be filled at a lower salary level. In addition, language has been included in the bill changing the name of the position "Custodian of Records" to "Assistant Legislative Analyst," and the position "Assistant Secretary" to "Receptionist." The purpose of this language is to redefine positions where the condition and needs have changed considerably. Should the Secretary desire any additional changes in the names of positions, the committee will be glad to consider any such recommendations next year.

Under the office of the Sergeant at Arms, the committee has recommended the creation of 27 new positions. Thirty-six Members of the U.S. Senate have addressed themselves to the Sergeant at Arms concerning the delays encountered in connection with the mailing of official documents and newsletters by the Service Department. On the recommendation of the Sergeant at Arms, the committee created 14 additional positions in the Service Department and the Sergeant at Arms intends to institute a double shift immediately. In view of the increase in the use of automatic typewriters, it has been found necessary to create two additional positions of "automatic typewriter repairmen." The Senate Recording Studio has now moved to its new quarters in the old subway tunnel and the necessary equipment to provide video tape recordings has been installed, which has created a requirement for a video tape recording engineer and an assistant video tape recording engineer, which two new positions the committee recommends. Based upon the recommendations of the Chief of the Capitol Police and the Sergeant at Arms, the committee has created five additional "sergeant" positions in the Capitol Police Force, and on the recommendation of the joint leadership and the Sergeant at Arms, four additional pages have been authorized. The salaries of the employees in the Daily Press Gallery, Radio-Television Gallery, Periodical Press Gallery, and Press Photographers' Gallery have been increased to comparable salaries in the House of Representatives—this, on the recommendation of the Correspondents' Committees of the four Senate news galleries, which was endorsed by the joint leadership.

For the Joint Economic Committee, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $577,900. This is an increase of $35,000 over the House allowance and over the 1971 budget estimate. This additional sum will provide for two positions to satisfy the need for additional evaluation of economic priorities in the public sector.

For the Joint Committee on Printing, the committee has increased the House bill by $36,133, and this additional amount will provide $17,000 for compiling the revised edition of the "Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1970", as provided by Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, approved in the Senate on June 18, 1970. It will also provide $19,133 for additional staff that the vice chairman of the committee pointed out was necessary in the light of the constantly growing use and importance of high-speed electronic photocomposition, with particular reference to congressional needs.

The committee concurs in the figure of $938,800 for the office of the Architect of the Capitol, which sum includes $16,000 for a "sanitarian." This latter position was requested by the Attending Physician so that the food service areas, and possibly other public service areas in the Capitol complex of buildings, might be given closer inspection and supervision.

The committee has included in the bill $510,000 for the extension of the additional Senate Office Building site. These funds will be used to purchase the Plaza Hotel property, and the authorization for this purchase was reported by the Committee on Public Works and approved by the Senate on May 21, 1970. The authorizing bill is now pending in the House of Representatives.

The committee has also concurred with the House and recommends an appropriation of $15,610,000 for the commencement of construction of the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

For the Library of Congress, the committee recommends an appropriation of $50,505,400, which is $1,340,600 under the budget estimate. However, it is $563,400 above the House allowance. These additional funds will authorize the Librarian to employ 55 additional employees over the number provided in the House bill and will provide a Library-wide total of 3,073 employees. Twenty-five of these additional employees will be financed under the appropriation, "Salaries and Expenses"; five under the appropriation, "Copyright Office"; and the balance of 25 positions will be for the Legislative Reference Service. The House provided 25 additional positions for the Legislative Reference Service, and with the recommendation of the Senate committee, the Service will have a total manpower complement of 378 employees. The committee believes this number should be sufficient to meet the most pressing areas of activity within the Service.

For the Government Printing Office, the committee concurs with the House and recommends a total appropriation of $65,382,000, which is $5,657,000 under the budget estimate. Most of the reduction herein relates to the approximately $4 million requested for selection of site, and general plans and designs of buildings. No consideration could be given to this request since the site for the new printing plant has not been acquired.

For the General Accounting Office, the committee recommends an appropriation of $74,750,000. This sum in $1,038,000 over the House allowance and is the full amount of the budget estimate. The Comptroller General requested 260 additional employees in view of the growing workload, which was well documented in the justifications and in the testimony before the committee. The House had provided 175 of these employees, and with the additional sum recommended by the committee, the Comptroller General will be in a position to employ 260 new personnel, to provide a total work force of 4,829.

Details of the savings attributable to the auditing and review work of the General Accounting Office can be found on pages 621–622 of the Senate hearings.

Mr. President, that concludes my prepared remarks with respect to this bill. I shall be glad to answer any questions which any of the Members may have.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

At the top of page 2, insert:

"SENATE"

On page 2, after line 1, insert:

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND LEADERS OF THE SENATE

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS

"For compensation of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, $4,707,-200."

On page 2, after line 8, insert:

"MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS

"For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, $58,370."

On page 2, after line 12, insert:

"EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT, AND MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

"For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, $3,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, $3,000; in all, $16,000."

On Page 2, After Line 17, Insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:"

At the Top of Page 3, Insert:

"OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, $367,263."

On Page 3, After Line 2, Insert:

"OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

"For office of the President Pro Tempore, $44,165: *Provided*, That, effective August 1, 1970, the President Pro Tempore is authorized to appoint a Comptroller of the Senate at a salary of $36,000 per annum, and the Comptroller may appoint a Secretary to the Comptroller at a salary of not to exceed $13,688 per annum, which appointments shall be in lieu of the two appointments authorized by the second proviso contained in the paragraph 'Office of the Secretary' under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970: *Provided further*, That the Comptroller of the Senate shall prepare budgets and amendments to the budgets of the Senate and shall audit all financial records of the Senate relating to the expenditure of appropriated funds. The Comptroller shall have complete access to all information he determines necessary to carry out his budget and auditing duties."

On Page 3, After Line 19, Insert:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

"For offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders, $176,514."

At the Top of Page 4, Insert:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

"For offices of the Majority and Minority Whips, $90,228."

On Page 4, After Line 3, Insert:

"OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN

"For office of the Chaplain, $18,615: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1970, the compensation of the Chaplain shall be $10,208 per annum and the compensation of the secretary to the Chaplain may be fixed at not to exceed $8,584 per annum."

On page 4, after line 9, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For Office of the Secretary, $1,816,240, including $68,145 required for the purpose specified and authorized by section 74b of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That effective August 1, 1970, the Secretary may employ and fix the compensation of an administrative assistant at not to exceed $22,040 per annum, an assistant legislative clerk at not to exceed $27,376 per annum a second assistant legislative clerk at not to exceed $20,648 per annum, a special assistant at not to exceed $16,704 per annum, a receptionist at not to exceed $11,826 per annum in lieu of an assistant secretary at not to exceed $11,826 per annum, and an assistant legislative analyst in the library at not to exceed $11,169 per annum in lieu of a custodian of records at $11,169 per annum: *Provided further*, That any specific rate of compensation established by law, as such rate has been increased or may hereafter be increased by or pursuant to law, for any position under the jurisdiction of the Secretary shall be considered as the maximum rate of compensation for that position, and the Secretary is authorized to adjust the rate of compensation of an individual occupying any such position to a rate not execeeding such maximum rate."

On page 5, after line 6, insert:

"COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, $4,420,734."

On page 5, after line 10, insert:

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $127,239."

On page 5, after line 14, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $127,239."

On page 5, after line 17, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS

"For administrative and clerical assistants to Senators, $27,909,141."

On page 5, after line 21, insert:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $5,713,520: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1970, the Sergeant at Arms may employ a video engineer at $20,880 per annum, an assistant video engineer at $17,632 per annum, three automatic typewriter repairmen at $10,672 per annum each in lieu of one automatic typing repairman at $10,672 per annum, a driver-messenger for attending physician at $10,672 per annum, eight laborers in the service department, at $6,728 per annum each, five additional sergeants, police force at $10,904 per annum each if not qualified as provided by section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1969 or $11,600 per annum each if qualified as provided therein, four additional pages at $6,960 per annum each, a night foreman, duplicating department at $10,904 per annum, three additional offset press operators at $9,976 per annum each, one additional mimeograph operator at $7,424 per annum, one additional inserting machine operator at $7,656 per annum, and the per annum compensation of the following positions shall be increased as indicated: superintendent of press gallery $21,576 in lieu of $19,256; first assistant superintendent of press gallery $19,256 in lieu of $17,400; second assistant superintendent of press gallery $15,080 in lieu of $13,920; third assistant superintendent of press gallery $13,456 in lieu of $12,064; fourth assistant superintendent of press gallery $10,672 in lieu of $9,744; secretary, press gallery $9,744 in lieu of $8,120; superintendent of radio press gallery $21,576 in lieu of $19,024; first assistant superintendent in radio press gallery $19,256 in lieu of $14,848; second assistant superintendent in radio press gallery $15,080 in lieu of $12,992; third assistant superintendent in radio press gallery $13,456, in lieu of $11,136; superintendent, periodical press gallery $19,256 in lieu of $17,400; assistant superintendent, periodical press gallery $13,456 in lieu of $11,136; superintendent, press photographers gallery $19,256 in lieu of $14,848; and assistant superintendent, press photographers gallery $13,456 in lieu of $10,440."

On page 7, after line 9, insert:

"OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY

"For offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, $216,372."

On page 7, after line 13 insert:

"OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

"For salaries and expenses of the office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, $415,130."

On page 7, after line 17, insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"SENATE POLICY COMMITTEES

"For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $261,430 for each such Committee; in all, $522,860."

On page 7, after line 22, insert:

"AUTOMOBILES AND MAINTENANCE

"For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of four automobiles, one for the Vice President, one for the President Pro Tempore, one for the Majority Leader, and one for the Minority Leader, $55,220."

On page 8, after line 2, insert:

"FURNITURE

"For service and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, $31,190: *Provided*, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government."

On page 8, after line 7, insert:

"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

"For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including $456,625 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, $7,341,580."

On page 8, after line 14, insert:

"FOLDING DOCUMENTS

"For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding $2.99 per hour per person, $51,015."

On page 8, after line 18, insert:

"MAIL TRANSPORTATION

"For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $16,560."

On page 8, after line 22, insert:

"MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

"For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $6,188,736, including $497,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87–82, approved July 6, 1961."

On page 9, after line 2, insert:

"POSTAGE STAMPS

"For postage stamps for the offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, $240; Comptroller, $100; and for air mail and special delivery stamps for the office of the Secretary, $350; office of the Sergeant at Arms, $215; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, $119,328; in all, $120,233."

On page 9, after line 9, insert:

"STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

"For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, $363,600; and for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $14,500; in all, $378,100."

On page 9, after line 13, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Effective July 1, 1970, and thereafter, the contingent fund of the Senate is made available, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, for the reimbursement to Senators and the President of the Senate of strictly official telephone and telegraph communications charges incurred by them or on their behalf, not exceeding $150 per annum each, to be in addition to reimbursement or payment authority contained in any other law."

On page 10, after line 7, insert:

"For payment to Dorothy H. St. Onge, widow of William L. St. Onge, late a Representative from the State of Connecticut, $42,500, to be immediately available."

On page 17, line 18, after the word "Committee", strike out "$542,900" and insert "$577,900".

One page 17, line 24, after the word "Printing", strike out "$236,110" and insert "$255,243"; and, in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, insert a semicolon and "and for salaries and expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the 1970 edition of the Biographical Congressional Directory, $17,000; in all, $272,243."

On page 24, line 18, after the word "Capitol", strike "$2,431,600" and insert "$2,442,526".

On page 24, after line 19, insert:

"Not to exceed $125,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1970 is hereby continued available until June 30, 1971."

On page 25, after line 9, insert:

"SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

"For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and for personal and other services; including eight attendants at $1,800 each; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), prevention and eradication of insect and other pests without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as amended; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $3,855,000, of which $250,000 shall remain available until expended and of which $80,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1972."

On page 26, after line 3, insert:

"EXTENSION OF ADDITIONAL SENATE BUILDING SITE

"To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to acquire on behalf of the United States, in addition to the real property heretofore acquired under the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1028) as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate, and under Public Law 85–591, approved August 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 495–496) and Public Law 85–429, approved May 29, 1958 (72 Stat. 148–149), for purposes of extension of such site or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds, and authorized to be acquired for such purposes by Public Law 91–145, approved December 12, 1969 (83 Stat. 352–353), by purchase, condemnation, transfer or otherwise, for purposes of further extension of such site or for addition to the United States Capitol Grounds, all privately owned property contained in lots 845 and 832 in square 724 in the District of Columbia, as such square appears on the records in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia as of the date of the approval of this Act: *Provided*, That any proceeding for condemnation brought under this Act shall be conducted in accordance with the Act of December 23, 1963 (16 D.C. Code, secs. 1351–1368): *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this Act, square 724 shall be deemed to extend to the outer face of the curbs surrounding such square: *provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any parts of streets contained within the curblines surrounding square 724 shall, upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the Senate Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That, upon acquisition of any real property pursuant to this Act, the Architect of the Capitol, when directed by the Senate Office Building Commission to so act, is authorized to provide for the demolition and/or removal of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to use the property for Government purposes or to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to incur any necessary expenses in connection therewith: *Provided further*, That the jurisdiction of the Capitol Police shall extend over any real property acquired under this Act and such property shall become a part of the United States Capitol Grounds; and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $510,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 28, after line 5, insert:

"SENATE GARAGE

"For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, $80,000."

On page 30, line 4, after "$350,000", insert a colon and "*Provided*, That these funds shall be transferred by the Architect of the Capitol to the Librarian of Congress for expenditure in accord with Public Law 91–280, approved June 12, 1970."

On page 31, at the beginning of line 17, strike out "$21,330,000" and insert "$21,573,000".

On page 31, line 25, after the word "copyrights", strike out "$3,548,000" and insert "$3,594,500".

On page 32, line 5, after "(2 U.S.C. 166)", strike out "$5,013,000" and insert "$5,286,800".

On page 39, line 5, strike out "$73,712,000" and insert "$74,750,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 18, strike out the language "he determines necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the words "as may be necessary."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the clerk read that amendment again?

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 18, strike out the words "he determines necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the words "as may be necessary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I would like to give an explanation of the amendment for the RECORD.

This amendment will make clear that while the Comptroller may have access to information pertinent to his duties, as they may be defined by the Senate, his authority will be discharged within the context of his overall responsibilities to the Senate as a whole. It seems to me desirable that the law shall not assign to any appointed staff employee an authority over the Senate's records which we would be loath to assign to a single Senator. This amendment will insure, therefore, that if questions of interpretation as to the nature and extent of the Comptroller's authority arise, they will be discussed by the President pro tempore and the joint leadership or, as necessary, decided by the Senate as a whole and not by a single staff employee, which would otherwise be the case if this bill were adopted without the amendment.

Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, lines 20 and 21, change the figure to "$12,528", and on page 4, lines 22 and 23 strike the numeral and insert "$11,832."

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, this is a technical correction and resulted from an error in including the rates of pay prior to the 6-percent pay increase. These positions are currently paying $12,528 and $11,832.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I now call up the next amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 9, immediately following the words "Administrative Provisions" on line 14 insert the following paragraph:

"Effective August 1, 1970, the last paragraph under the heading 'Senate' in the First Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1926 (2 U.S.C. 64a) is amended to read as follows:

"In the event of the death, resignation, or disability of the Secretary of the Senate, the Financial Clerk of the Senate shall be deemed his successor as a disbursing officer, under his bond as Financial Clerk, and he shall serve as such disbursing officer until the end of the quarterly period during which a new Secretary shall have been elected and qualified, or such disability shall have been ended."

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment to retain within the office of the Secretary the emergency succession of the disbursing authority and is necessary since the position currently designated as successor is transferred to another office in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 18, strike out the figure "$577,900" and insert in lieu thereof "$667,900."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would provide an additional $90,000 to the Joint Economic Committee. The committee provided $35,000. We would like to have $125,000 so we could have a beginning capability for making economic analyses of various programs.

In this bill the General Accounting Office is given something like 220 or 230 or 240 additional, I repeat additional employees. That is good, because they do a fine job. They determine whether or not laws are being enforced legally. They determine whether or not they are being enforced honestly. We all know how they have saved a great deal more money than they have cost.

So I am not objecting to the fact that they are getting more people. I think they can use them, and use them well. But I am asking for just three additional professionals, so that, in addition to knowing whether or not these laws we pass are being carried out honestly and legally, we will know whether or not we should appropriate funds at all, whether it makes economic sense to do so; and in order to do that, we have to have some kind of economic capability, a staff that is capable of determining what the benefits are and what the costs are, to give us some hard answers.

EVALUATION OF PRIORITIES—ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Mr. President, I have the honor to serve as vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee at the present time. It is a committee whose leadership alternates between House and Senate. In the previous Congress, I was the chairman.

In my 12 years as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I have always been deeply impressed with the contribution that it makes to the economic knowledge of the Congress. Of course, that is what it should do, inasmuch as the committee was set up for the purpose of appraising the President's economic policies and advising the Congress on all matters of economic policy on a continuing basis. In the course of my work on the committee, I have become deeply concerned about the need for more attention, in the economic policy field, and to the economic impact of public expenditures. When we stop to consider the fact that $200 billion—20 percent of our national income—is collected and spent by the Federal Government, we realize how massive an effect on the economy Federal spending exercises.

But, that is not all. The Federal Government intervenes in the economy in many other ways besides direct spending. Congress provides extensive subsidies for a great variety of activities. Subsidies, by redirecting the stream of economic resources, greatly affect the economy. Moreover, regulatory policy has a pervasive effect on the way we use our national resources. At a recent hearing, it was mentioned that the Federal Communications Commission, for example, which spends about $20 million a year affects national production in the amount of approximately $20 billion. I do not think it is any exaggeration to say that well over half of our gross national product is affected either directly or indirectly by public policies.

Considering this massive effect, one might expect that the Congress would devote a good deal of attention to assessing the impact of these activities on our economy, on national production, on our wealth and its distribution, and on our price structure.

But that is not the case. The fact is that we have to make decisions on these matters without any analysis. Nowhere is there available to the Congress a body of program analysis that would show us some of the true costs and true benefits of public programs and of alternative approaches to public objectives. We operate in the dark.

It was for this reason that I called for the creation of a top flight, highly qualified staff unit in the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee to provide the Congress with detailed studies of the relative costs and priorities of administration proposals. More specifically, I proposed that the Joint Economic Committee set up a staff of economists skilled in program analysis to provide the Congress with the economic analysis it needs to make wise decisions and to evaluate properly the proposals of the executive branch.

We all know that Congress has ceded far too many decisions to the executive branch. As a matter of fact, with our very modest staff resources we are often at the mercy of executive departments who are aided by huge staffs. Moreover, as our society becomes ever more complex and the Federal budget edges upward, we are faced more and more with evaluating and probably approving policies for which we have much too little knowledge. It seems obvious that the Congress has urgent need for such a highly qualified group of analysts to provide us directly with the facts we need to determine spending priorities, and information as to the economic costs and benefits to be expected from new proposals.

The committee, in recent years, has undertaken a few case studies to explore the field of economic analysis and its relation to Government efficiency. As a matter of fact, a report filed in February of this year by the Subcommittee on Economy in Government—of the Joint Economic Committee—contains some insights on various programs which we undertook to appraise—admittedly in a sketchy way—to show how the task of program analysis might be handled. That report also sets forth a number of conclusions dealing with the need for more explicit statement of program objectives and more careful analysis of alternative means of attaining them. It expressly recommends that Congress achieve a capability to provide objective policy analysis and program evaluation studies on a continuing basis.

In line with our recommendations, the Joint Economic Committee in its budget request in April of this year asked for an additional $125,000 to permit extension of our work in the field of program analysis and evaluation of priorities. This amount was intended to give us a start—just a start, Mr. President—in furnishing the Congress with the aforementioned type of analysis that it so badly needs. The funds would have permitted us to add three qualified professional personnel to be assigned exclusively to evaluation of public programs and priority assessment—along with necessary clerical and secretarial help.

I do not pretend that this amount would permit us to do the job in any complete way but I do believe that it represents a manageable first-step which would certainly repay itself, I might say a hundredfold and I could say a thousandfold and easily mean it, when you consider the fact that $125,000 would give us a beginning economic analysis of $200 billion in Federal spending, and then, when you consider the impact on regulatory policy, and so forth, it seems to me the payoff could be very, very great indeed. I think it is significant that the Department of Defense, which the Joint Economic Committee has criticized on numerous occasions for wasteful spending practices has stated that the Joint Economic Committee should be equipped to do more work in evaluating spending priorities.

It was interesting, when we were having our C-5A debate last year, that one of the revelations our committee was able to obtain was that an analysis by the Office of Systems Analysis of the Defense Department had shown that it was unwise to proceed with what the administration was recommending we proceed with—an additional squadron of C-5A planes. That was what their own analysis showed.

Secretary Laird told me:

> You should have your own capability, because if you come to the Department of Defense to ask what our analysis shows, you are going to compromise our office. I cannot very well be expected to have a staff which makes an analysis of a program in which we are interested, and then feel bound by that staff report in making an official decision which may disagree with the staff findings.

So if we use their analysis, we can make it difficult for the Secretary to secure an objective analysis which may on occasion contradict his position. The result was that Secretary Laird indicated we would be far better served as a Nation, and Congress would be better served, if we had our own analysis capability.

Mr. President, this urgent need is not something that has revealed itself exclusively to the members of the Joint Economic Committee. Many Members of this body are acutely aware of how handicapped we are in the absence of the kind of analysis I am talking about. Indeed, there are alternative proposals to provide it. In my opinion, these alternative proposals would be far more costly and cumbersome than would my proposal to increase the staff of the Joint Economic Committee. I say this because the Joint Economic Committee already has a highly trained staff and has years of extensive analytical experience behind it. The three specialists I asked for would consequently fit into a very fine going concern which would surely produce the most productive environment for them and permit them to work closely with the committee members who have had the benefit of long-term exposure to economic policy problems.

Just one further example, Mr. President. In the coming months, we will be considering a transportation bill. We will be considering whether we should go ahead with an additional authorization of $8 billion required for the Interstate Highway System. Congress will probably decide to go ahead. Then, in the near future, there will be the consideration of whether we should proceed with tens of billions of dollars of highway expenditures, whether we should reduce or eliminate the Federal highway gasoline tax, or whether we should broaden this program in some way.

We are going to make those decisions without any economic analysis, really, at least without any comprehensive analysis. There are a number of fine committees that have responsibilities in these areas, but those committees include a committee that, in one case, has responsibility over mass transit; that is the Banking and Currency Committee, on which I serve. Another committee, the Public Works Committee, has a responsibility over the highway program to some extent. The Commerce Committee has its own responsibilities with regard to much of the rest of transportation policy. And none of these committees is in a position to take a comprehensive look. A joint committee, which can evaluate proposals and make recommendations to all the constituent committees, it seems to me, would be highly desirable.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this in line with the present policy of the joint committee?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understood the Senator to ask if this would increase the authority of the Joint Economic Committee. It would not.

Mr. CURTIS. How many economists are now on the staff?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We now have six professional economists, plus a staff director and a director of research. We have eight professional economists on the majority side, and I think we have two minority economists. That makes 10.

Mr. CURTIS. Are they not now performing what the Senator proposes here?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. They are very helpful in giving us analyses in a number of fields. We have a tremendous overall responsibility. We take the President's Economic Report each year and try to make an analysis of it from our own standpoint and make congressional recommendations.

In addition, these economists are necessary to back up and provide the staff work necessary for the Fiscal Policy Subcommittee, for the Balance of Payments Subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, and many other areas of that kind. We do not have a capability now for making the kind of economic analysis I was talking about.

Mr. CURTIS. Why not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Because we do not have enough people to do it. There are gifted people who are able and willing to come to the committee. We have a number of applications from people who are competent economists, Ph. D.'s who have had substantial experience in business or in Government, who would like to come to the committee. So we can get competent people, but we do not have them on the staff now because we do not have the funds for it; we do not have appropriations to move ahead.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the more people involved, the greater will be the disagreement?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, of course, the committee itself would make any policy decisions. The staff would be factfinding and would make an analysis as to whether or not a particular program had benefits that exceeded the cost and which program seemed to be preferable on an economic basis. But the decisions would have to be made by the Democrats and Republicans on the committee—the House and Senate Members. As the Senator knows, it is a joint committee. Then, in turn, the final decision would be made by the entire House and Senate; and, very important, along the way would be the decisions made by the particular committees recommending specific legislation to Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the entire joint committee gone on record in favor of this amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The committee is aware. I wrote members of the committee to inform them that I was doing this. We do have a report which was made earlier this year in which the committee recommended that we proceed in this area. No specific amount was recommended, but the $125,000 I am asking for would be a small first step, and it would be a modest accommodation to the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Do the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee support this amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have not had an opportunity to consult with the members. So far as I know, there is no opposition to it. I have talked with some of them and told them I was putting it in. Those with whom I have talked have indicated support. I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with all of them. This is a 20-member committee—10 House Members and 10 Senate Members.

I feel confident, I tell the Senator from Nebraska, in saying that there would be no opposition from members of the committee. I cannot say that on the basis of having talked with every one and having given the particular amendment to them; but I am confident that there would not be any opposition.

Mr. CURTIS. How many staff members would this provide?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Three full-time professional experts plus the kind of stenographic and secreterial assistance which would be necessary to make them effective.

Mr. CURTIS. By whom would they be appointed?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the first instance, the chairman of the committee. The way we operate now, the chairman of the committee would recommend to other members of the committee the staff personnel we would appoint. There have been occasions in the past when the chairman's recommendations have been questioned, and the chairman has withdrawn them and appointed others.

Mr. CURTIS. Who is the chairman?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The chairman now is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, and the chairman next year if Republicans control the Senate would be Senator JAVITS, if he chose to be chairman. He is the ranking Republican member of the committee. If the Democrats continue to control the Senate next year, I would be chairman.

Mr. CURTIS. The $125,000 is for three positions?

Mr. PROXMIRE. For three positions, plus the secretarial support.

Mr. CURTIS. How many secretaries?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Two additional secretaries and some additional funds for a part-time clerk.

Mr. CURTIS. What would the pay of those economists be? It seems to me that it is a great deal of money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would be approximately $25,000. As the Senator knows, competent economists come high.

Mr. CURTIS. I know their advice is usually high.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. If you follow it, it costs you a lot of money. If you follow their advice, it costs you quite a lot of money.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I think the Senator's questions are very constructive, and it is useful to have this kind of dialog, so that we can know just what we are doing.

Mr. President, I regret to report that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to provide only $35,000 for this purpose. I am as outspoken as any in the interest of keeping down expenditures, but this token amount is not enough. It was with a good deal of soul searching that our committee came up with the original figure of $125,000. We felt that this was as minimal as could be and still permit us to get off the ground in providing Congress with a vital service. I urge my colleagues to reconsider this very small request and to give the Joint Economic Committee the $125,000 originally requested. I guarantee that it will be amply repaid to the Public Treasury.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York, who is the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to support the Senator's plea to the Senate. As he has said, the amount is not large, but I think that the Joint Economic Committee very thoroughly earns its keep around here.

The President, for example, has adopted a recommendation of the minority with respect to how to make some move toward seeking to exercise a little control over wages and prices and unusual increases. Many other initiatives have started in the Joint Economic Committee, such as a review of the economy.

Aside from its strict statutory functions, I think it serves as a great forum for economic deliberation which is the key to the work of many other committees, including those of which I am a member—the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where we spend over $20 billion in Government operation, and even the Committee on Foreign Relations, where we have enormous trade problems.

Senator PROXMIRE has been one of the very hardworking and fine leaders of that committee. I express the hope that, as so often happens, we do not starve ourselves for small sums which disable us from giving consideration to the multibillion-dollar programs which are subject to scrutiny, and where we just do not have the staff or the factual background unless we have these rather marginal areas of support from the Senate.

I hope very much that the committee will listen sympathetically to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from New York. He is a most remarkable Senator. I have had a considerable amount of graduate education in economics, but the Senator from New York knows as much about the subject as anybody else on that committee, or more, and as much or more than anybody on the staff. He has been a tremendous asset to the committee, and I think he fully understands how constructive this modest amount can be for the Senate, for Congress, and for the country.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, when the committee reduced the request or refused to grant all of the request, it did not have in mind the very able work that is being done on this committee by the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that the Senator from Wisconsin and his colleagues on the committee have established a great reputation in overseeing the expenditures of Government and also in overseeing the economy of this country and the recommendations which have emanated from this fine committee have certainly been great pieces of work which have guided the Senate and the House of Representatives in its deliberations on economic policy. The committee was mindful and expressed itself in no uncertain terms that truly the Senator from Wisconsin has done a fine job on the committee. The action we took in no way reflects any denigration on our part of his fine efforts or of his role as a fine leader on the committee.

However, it was unfortunate that the increase which was requested by the Senator from Wisconsin came in after the House had closed its hearings. It came to the Senate and the House did not have the opportunity to pass on the propriety of the requested increase. In spite of the late filing of the request with the committee, we gave an additional $35,000 over and above the House figure, and now the Senator from Wisconsin, through his amendment, is asking for an additional $90,000 which, if granted, would make it an increase of $125,000.

To place this matter in its proper context as further justification for the action of the committee, we should bear in mind that the money which the committee received during the past few years would clearly indicate that the increase is exorbitant against the background of what was allowed in previous years. That was a strong guiding factor in the committee's judgment.

In 1964, the Joint Economic Committee received an appropriation of $235,000. That is the starting point, for the purposes of this analysis.

In 1965, the committee received $265,-080, an increase of $30,080.

In 1966, it received $369,000, an increase of $104,000.

In 1967, it received $383,000, an increase of $14,000.

In 1968, it received $401,620, an increase of $18,000.

In 1969, it received $430,650, an increase of $29,000.

In 1970, it received $468,165, an increase of approximately $38,000.

So that now, when the committee is asking for $125,000, it is way out of proportion with the allowed increase in previous years.

However, I have consulted with the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee and we would be willing to give the Senator the additional $15,000 over and above the $35,000, subject to the consent of the Senate, if the Senator from Wisconsin would be agreeable to that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I very much appreciate his sympathy and help. This is the kind of increase the committee has allowed in the past. This, however, is for a brandnew function, a purpose which has not been tried before; so that we are trying for a new capability. As I say, the $125,000 was deliberately cut down to make it a modest first step.

However, under the circumstances, and in view of the fact that, as the Senator points out, this has not been considered by the House, I am willing to modify my amendment. Mr. President, I ask that I may do so now, and make the figure $592,900, and I think that would accomplish what the Senator from New Mexico is proposing.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The increase will then be $50,000 altogether, $15,000 over the $35,000; is that correct?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments 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. SPONG. Mr. President, I had prepared an amendment to bring up at this time which would have required Members of the Congress and their key assistants, as well as nonincumbent candidates for congressional office, to make full public disclosure of their financial assets and liabilities, sources of income, and purchases of stocks and real estate.

Even though it is legislative in character, I believe the amendment would be germane given the fact that the legislative appropriations bill historically has been used to provide statutory authority for many congressional activities. This year's bill is no exception.

Nevertheless, after much thought and consultation with other concerned Senators—including the senior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), who is the chief sponsor of a comprehensive financial disclosure bill, and some of the cosponsors of that bill, including the senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), and the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD—I have elected not to offer the amendment at this time, but to press instead for early action on separate legislation. For many reasons, this seems to me a more desirable course.

First, an amendment to this bill necessarily would have to be restricted to Members of the Congress and their staffs. The need, however, is to promote public confidence in all branches of the Federal Government—executive, judicial, and legislative—and that can only be done through the kind of comprehensive bill which has been introduced by Senator CASE and cosponsored by 20 other Senators, including myself.

It is desirable, too, that on legislation of this importance, there be an opportunity for full public hearings and debate before the matter comes to a vote. Obviously, a floor amendment does not permit that kind of careful deliberation.

I emphasize, however, that while I consider it more desirable to take up this legislation as a separate bill, I believe it is essential that the Senate consider some legislation. For that reason, I will reserve my right to offer this amendment at another time to another bill if that appears to be the only way of getting action.

Not long ago, the Senate rejected the nomination of Judge Clement Haynsworth to be Supreme Court Justice principally because he had not disclosed certain financial interests which had a bearing on cases before his court. I disagreed with the Senate's action but it was taken nevertheless.

As I said at that time—

> I would hope that there will not be many more instances of deliberation by this body when it will be called upon to sit in judgment upon others, when we have failed to apply similar standards to ourselves by adopting the principle of full, public financial disclosure.

Mr. President, the committee report on the bill before us notes that the Legislative Appropriations Act historically is used to provide for many congressional "housekeeping functions." I believe it is time we put our house in order with respect to financial disclosure as well. Nothing is more essential, in my judgment, than that Congress come to grips with this problem in a way that will restore sagging public confidence and respect in their elected and appointed leaders.

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

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Virginia had to say, and I agree with him wholeheartedly. Had the amendment been offered to the bill, I could have voted for it, just as he would have, but I would have done so with the thought in mind that we should include the judiciary and executive branches of the Government, because if we are going to set up a set of rules, we should follow the formula laid out by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) in the bill which he and the distinguished Senator from Virginia cosponsored which, as I recall, would be applicable to all members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches earning $18,000 or more per year.

To me, that is a step in the right direction. I would hope that hearings would be held shortly. As the majority leader, I am prepared to dispatch a communication to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), and I am also prepared to join the distinguished minority leader, in sending a letter to the chairman and the ranking minority member, in the hope that legislation would be forthcoming shortly so that we could have the kind of bill which the Senator from Virginia envisaged, and arrive at some kind of conclusion.

I agree with him thoroughly when he says that we ought to apply the same standards to ourselves that we apply to others.

I have doubts, very grave doubts, about the methods used by the Senate in the matter of treating presidential nominees as we do and implying, as a matter of fact, that they are dishonest and that they have to prove their honesty.

If we are going to have something, let us have hearings right now, this week or next week, before the Rules Committee. Let us get a bill out and let us bring it to the floor of the Senate.

I want to assure the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Jersey that I will do everything I can to see that the matter is carried out, because their wishes are my wishes.

I happen also to be a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. SPONG. I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for his support and to acknowledge his leading role in the effort to obtain a financial disclosure bill.

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

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I too am a cosponsor of the bill. I rise only to express the hope that the committee which hears the bill will consider the whole question of the economics of being a Senator and will consider it not only from the point of view of Senators from States which have relatively small populations, but also from the point of view of Senators from States which have huge populations.

For example, to give one of the anomalies, I do not believe I have ever personally paid any income tax on my salary. Whatever the salary was, it was always absorbed by the necessary costs of being a Senator, in spite of the enormous allowances.

There was agitation by the bar association with regard to a limitation on the nature of practice of many of us who are lawyers and have some connection with the law in order to earn a living.

These are very critical questions. We try. I know that the Senators know I am very cautious about the kind of case undertaken by my firm, let alone by me. I keep them completely out of Washington.

It is not only true of people in the law practice, but it is also true of almost any kind of business, any kind of security ownership. The whole question is involved. We must consider when we should or should not vote on a matter or make a disclosure. For example, together with other Senators, I have filed for years a list of my investments—those of my own, and those in trust for my family so that everyone would know what securities we even have an interest in in connection with anything I do here.

The important thing is not just the disclosure. The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) is himself a very skilled lawyer and represents very large interests because he was a member of a large law firm. The Senator from New Jersey understands the matter only too well.

I hope that the committee that considers this matter will consider the total economics of being a Senator and will give its judgment on the disclosure question—and there is no question that there should be disclosure—and will also consider the aggregate position of a man who is a Senator, and of course always bear in mind that one of the most fundamental guarantees of our freedom is that this great honor should not be denied to people because they cannot afford it. On the contrary, it should be made eminently available to everyone, no matter how little he can afford it.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, what I am seeking is early hearings. I should think the new ruling by the American Bar Association would be given full discussion in such a hearing.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey who is one of the principal patrons of the legislation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia. I am enormously grateful to him, as I am sure all Members of the Senate and citizens far from this body must be for having raised the matter in this appropriate way.

I am grateful also to the majority leader for the assurance of his very important assistance in getting to hearings on the bill and in bringing it quickly to the Senate floor. I am sure that many others will support it. I firmly believe that we will have a majority ready to do so when the matter comes before the full Senate.

I am quite conscious of the importance of what the Senator from New York—who, by the way, is also a cosponsor of the bill—has said about the total economics of being a Senator. I would go a little further and include the total economics of getting elected to the Senate and maintaining himself in office as well as in doing the job when one is in office. It is all part of the same ball of wax.

We may or may not deal with it in its totality on every occasion. But certainly we should keep working on the entire problem.

I give my personal assurance to the Senator from New York that my interest in the aspect of the matter which he has so properly raised will be very comprehensive and continuing.

I have been interested in this matter for many years as the Senator has been good enough to point out. It was more than a decade ago that I introduced a bill to require annually full public disclosure by Members of Congress, as well as top officials in the executive branch, of their income—including gifts—assets and liabilities, transactions in real and personal property.

In the years since then a number of Senators have joined with me in sponsoring this bill which we amended last year to cover the judicial branch along with the executive and legislative branches. More than a fifth of the Senate, including both majority and minority leaders, are sponsors of S. 1993.

Last fall hearings were scheduled by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to which the bill was referred. They were subsequently called off, however, because of a lack of affirmative responses to the subcommittee chairman's invitation to testify.

At that time the subcommittee chairman indicated his willingness to reschedule hearings if members and outside witnesses were interested in testifying.

Senator HART, chief cosponsor, and I then wrote to other cosponsors. In all, 12 sponsors replied that they would welcome an opportunity to speak for the bill. I am sure others outside the Senate would also be glad to testify. I can understand that officials in the executive branch may hestitate to endorse a requirement that they feel might be taken as indicating a lack of confidence in their colleagues and subordinates. I could understand that feeling. It is a natural one that Members of Congress have also expressed with regard to their colleagues.

But they are wrong, I believe. To permit this feeling to determine the action on S. 1993 is not, in my view, a service to our colleagues, ourselves, or the executive and judicial branches. For a public financial disclosure requirement is by far the most efficacious and most direct way of protecting the good name of top officials in all three branches of Government. It avoids the necessity, to take the legislative branch for example, of Members sitting in judgment on their colleagues whose basic responsibility is to their own constituents.

Above all, it offers affirmative protection of the integrity of governmental processes by a method which most of us, I am sure, support, prevention rather than punishment. Our bill is not punitive. Rather it relies on the certainty of eventual public knowledge to deter wrongdoing, to make Government officials stop and think before they take actions that might be misinterpreted and to encourage public officials to be alert to the implications of their conduct.

In the last 2 years Members and officials in all three branches of Government have figured in headlines involving possible conflicts of interest or the use and misuse of official position for private purposes. So far in the Senate we have adopted a rather crablike approach in amending our own rules. But the problem, not just for the Congress but the executive and judicial branches as well, is not going to go away until we deal forthrightly with it. How much better to face up to it directly not only for us but for the executive and judicial branches, as S. 1993 would do.

I welcome, therefore, the assurances that hearings will be held on our bill and I appreciate the initiative of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG).

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey. Mr. President, I might say that the Senator from New Jersey has been a pioneer in this field. I know that he joins all of us in pressing for early hearings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join in the general commendation of the Senator from Virginia for presenting this matter at this time.

I agree with what is stated implicitly in his remarks, that the Senate has dragged its feet and unless someone, such as the Senator from Virginia, calls up an amendment to a bill—which he indicates he will do if we do not have other action—the Senate will never act.

This is the kind of thing that the Senate does not like to do. I suggest that if we look at what has happened when there has been disclosure, we will see that there really has not been any significant sacrifice involved.

In the State of Wisconsin for 30 years from 1923 to 1953 we had open, public inspection of State income tax returns. Everyone's income tax returns were open free for public inspection. That practice was taken advantage of very freely by some of the newspapers. But I recall no real abuse and no serious embarrassment.

The Senator from Virginia has chosen a good way to stimulate action on disclosure.

I do think that what we are seeking here is an excellent objective in view of the point the Senator makes. One of the principal reasons why many of us voted against Clement Haynsworth to be a member of the Supreme Court is that we felt that the disclosures on his part had not been complete.

I feel that if we as Senators are not willing to make disclosures of this kind with the power we exercised, we are not being fair to the public. We are being hypocritical.

I congratulate the Senator from Virginia.

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

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I express my complete agreement with the Senator from Virginia, as well as with the Senator from New Jersey, on the need for a public disclosure law for Members of Congress as well as for other people in the legislative branch of our Government.

I personally, before I started my campaign, made a public disclosure to the people of New Mexico. I also stated that, being in the real estate business, my holdings were a matter of public record. I named the counties in which they were.

I also want to say that when I started my membership in the Senate, I made a public statement concerning all my connections with the practice of law. I have not practiced 1 day in court since then.

But I think that public disclosure makes a healthy contribution toward good government and confidence in good government. The voters are entitled to an accounting by each and every Member of Congress of all their financial interests so that they may be aware of areas of public policy in which his decision might be affected by such interests. Disclosure would provide the necessary evidence constituents must have to make an objective judgment in this matter. Disclosure would tend to bolster respect for the integrity of individual legislators, as well as for the legislative bodies of which they are members, and help curb the uneasy feeling of "shadow dealing."

Being a Member of Congress is a full-time job. Disclosure of private interests would help the electorate judge whether or not their Congressmen are devoting themselves to that job. Members of Congress are not ordinary citizens. They consider and vote on legislation affecting every segment of the economy. The state of their finances should not be considered as being in the same category as the state of the finances of a private citizen.

Disclosure is the most feasible method of attacking problems of conflict of interest. The public evidently favors disclosure. A Gallup poll published in the Washington Post on March 14, 1964, asked if the American people would approve requiring Congressmen to make public disclosure of their financial holdings and income every year. The results were 65 percent in favor, 23 percent opposed, and 12 percent no opinion. Disclosure would make clear to the public that Members of Congress do not condone the selfish actions of a few.

As former Senator Kenneth Keating of New York said at one time:

> One of the reasons the prestige of Congress has fallen in the eyes of the public is our refusal to come to grips with problems of conflict of interest. I know most Members of Congress are conscientious and dedicated public servants but a few bad cases can cause immense damage to a whole institution.

Many present and former Government officials support the principle of disclosure. Former President Harry S. Truman, for example, declared in 1951:

> Public office is a privilege, not a right, and people who accept the privilege of holding office in the government must of necessity expect their entire conduct should be open to inspection by the people they serve.

Disclosure of financial standing would not harm an honest and ethical legislator. It would, instead, help to protect him as well as the public interest against the individual whose aim is private gain. Public disclosure would discourage individuals and organizations from trying to tempt Members of Congress.

Mr. President, that is why I commend the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Jersey for offering this type leadership toward a very worthwhile objective—good, clean, unsuspicious, or unsuspected government.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SPONG. I am pleased to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to join in the commendations for the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Jersey for their leadership in this particular matter. I also wish to join in the hope of the distinguished majority leader that hearings will be held very soon on this important matter.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 16915) was passed.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives 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. MONTOYA, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1007, H.R. 7618, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7618) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. 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. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 7618.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in its present form I am deeply concerned about H.R. 7618. This bill would convey, without any monetary consideration, 135 acres of land which now form an integral part of Eglin Air Force Base in Florida. The land, which has a present fair market value of $350,000, would be conveyed to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla., for the construction of two elementary schools.

Mr. President, ever since the passage of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Federal Government has been governed by the Morse formula in disposing of its real property. In general, that formula provides that surplus Federal land may be conveyed at a 50-percent discount. And ministration to a willing buyer, provided he pays fair market value for it. Where the conveyance is to a State, a county, or a municipality, however, and the land is to be used for parks or recreation purposes, the law permits the land to be conveyed at a 50-percent discount. And where the land is to be used by a public body for a school, hospital, or historical monument, the land may be conveyed at a discount up to 100 percent—free of monetary consideration.

But, Mr. President, there is an important proviso to this—one which I just alluded to. Before any conveyance of Federal land can take place under the law, the land must first be declared "excess" to the needs of the agency having jurisdiction over it, and it must then be declared "surplus" to the needs of the Federal Government as a whole.

The reason for this provision is fairly obvious. Without an independent determination that the land is surplus to the needs of the Government as a whole, the Federal taxpayer has no assurance that his interests will be protected—he has no assurance that land which should otherwise be available for the common good will not be conveyed away for the benefit of a lucky few who happen to reside in a given area.

Mr. President, that is precisely my concern with this bill. Here we have a very valuable piece of property, with a current fair market appraisal of $350,000. We are asked to approve a gratis conveyance of this property to Okaloosa County, Fla., with no assurance that the land is either excess to the needs of the Air Force or surplus to the needs of the Federal Government as a whole.

In fact, Mr. President, the inference is just the opposite. The report from the Armed Services Committee notes that "the land involved is not excess to the Air Force requirements"; that the land is "an integral part of Eglin Air Force Base"; and that the land covered by this bill "would not normally be declared surplus" to the needs of the Federal Government. In other words, the Air Force, and if not the Air Force, the Federal Government, can use this land, and there is no reason for conveying it away—particularly without receiving a dime for it. Mr. President, the Federal taxpayer is receiving the short end of the stick on this deal.

It is hardly a surprise that both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration oppose this bill. Even the Air Force, when asked for its views on H.R. 7618, refrained from supporting the bill, deferring instead to the views of HEW and GSA.

Mr. President, there is one particular question that concerns me about this matter, and that is, it is understandable why, in a body of this kind, or in the House, we would like to help our good friends and the States of our good friends whom we see every day and like very much, but once we start a precedent to give away property of the Federal Government not declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, we could create situations which are very hard to resist, involving in the future, not merely $350,000, which is a lot of money, but perhaps property involving hundreds of millions of dollars.

For that reason, I am concerned with the precedent involved. In the event the bill is passed, I want to make sure precedents are already established so that this will not involve a new precedent that will suggest to other Members of Congress that all they have to do is press hard enough and they will secure for their congressional districts or their States property from the Federal Government which is desirable and an integral part of a Federal station such as this.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Armed Services. The committee went very carefully into this matter and held the bill up for some time, on the very points that the Senator from Wisconsin appropriately mentions. We did not want to start a precedent that would plague us in the future, and we did not want to just give away a valuable piece of property for the benefit of a few people who happened to reside in that area.

First, Mr. President, we found here an unusual situation. This involves the Eglin Air Force Base, and that is a base that includes a large land area, much of which is used for very extensive testing of weapons, and I think some testing of vehicles and other kinds of testing that requires a great deal of space.

We found that 51 percent of all of the land in Okaloosa County is owned by the Federal Government and, therefore, is not on the tax rolls. We also found another special consideration here, in that 75 percent of the student load of the schools in the area at the present time are dependents of persons assigned to or working on the Eglin Air Force Base.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. I repeat: 75 percent of the student load in the area in question in this bill at the present time are dependents of persons assigned to or working on the Eglin Air Force Base.

As to the third question here, about the surplus status—and that is certainly a splendid point the Senator has brought up—this has not been declared surplus, and I do not think it would have been very soon, apart from this question. But at the same time, it is land in four different locations for which there is no present or foreseeable urgent use. That is, there is no demanding use for the land for military needs or for the operations that are carried on there. Even though it is not what one would call surplus, at the same time it is excess and it is not presently in an active use in connection with military operation.

That was a big factor with the committee. The last large, controlling factor is that after all, this land is going to be used for educational purposes, which is about the best reason one can have, if one is seeking to make some concession concerning any property the Federal Government owns.

Accordingly, on the basis of these main considerations, although there were others as well, this bill was finally approved by our committee, after examination and reexamination, by a unanimous vote.

Additional matters that do have a relationship——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point he has just made?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that is a significant point, and one that, of course, finds all of us sympathetic, because we all favor education. We recognize that at Eglin Air Force Base, as well as at many of our bases around this country, we have this problem of providing adequate education.

Congress has enacted a law, the impacted aid bill, which provides rather generous support to defray the costs of education for the children of parents who either work for the Government or live on a base. It would seem to me that in this case, those funds would be available for school purposes so there would not be any special hardship if this land is not made available. The Federal Government would still provide money in lieu of property taxes, which should make it possible for these students to be taken care of adequately with good educational facilities.

So, from an educational standpoint, while this is certainly, as the Senator properly says, one of the finest purposes for which we could provide Federal property, we have already passed legislation in that direction and, of course, here is another case where I just wonder where we draw the line. If we provide it for Okaloosa County, Fla., are we going to provide it for Missisippi, Wisconsin, New York, and all over the country?

Mr. STENNIS. I think here is the answer to the Senator's very pertinent question: In the first place, the impacted area money to which he refers could have been made available for these buildings, under certain circumstances. As I understand, though, most of the impacted area money that goes into buildings goes into buildings along with some State funds. That may not always be true, but that is the general pattern, as I understand it.

The State of Florida has a law that does not permit spending money for school buildings unless the State has title to the land. So, under this circumstance, the law would preclude the State of Florida from even making a contribution, because they would not have title to the land.

The way it is going to be paid for now, it is not going to cost the Federal Government any money. The State of Florida—or its subsidiaries—assumes full responsibility for the entire cost of the buildings. They will not be constructed at the expense of the Federal Government. That appealed to me, and to other members of our committee as well, that they were not asking for anything in the way of funds.

Second, as to the value of the land, it is hard to say what this land would be worth, but we know how much the Federal Government paid for it: $1 per acre, on the average. This is a part of the old national forest lands that were bought up by the Federal Government, I think some of it for as little as 50 cents an acre. Anyway, it averaged out, the best that we could find, not more than $1 an acre. I know some of this as bought up in my State during the depression, when some of that land could be bought for taxes.

But anyway, whatever value is placed on it, there is an accretion there for which the Federal Government has not paid any money. That is the story relative to the money itself.

Furthermore, we have made exceptions to the rule in other cases, much as we are in this one. The Senator from Wisconsin very properly asks about the precedents here.

In 1962, when the late Senator Engle represented the State of California in this body, he submitted a bill which conveyed certain rights in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California. That land had not been declared surplus, and would not have been for at least several years. It would have been at least 5 years before it could have been declared surplus. When all the facts were brought out, that bill was passed, on a record rollcall vote.

We have another example here, in the State of Maine. A measure providing for the conveyance to the State of Maine, without consideration certain lands for educational purposes. This was passed in 1957. I find from the report that this occurred at a time when I was handling that kind of legislation.

The report on that measure stated:

> The purpose of this bill is to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy to the State of Maine for vocational or other school purposes the property identified as Fort Gribble Military Reservation, South Portland, Maine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I ask the Senator a question in reference to that Maine precedent?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In that case, as I understand it, the property involved was property which was not surplus, it was on a military base, and it was made available for educational purposes, so that would be a precisely similar precedent, very similar to the bill now before us?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the way the Senator from Mississippi understands it, and I think I do fully understand it.

The two cases I have already referred to are almost exact precedents for the bill that is before us now. There is another precedent here that has to do with a similar amount of property—200 acres of land—where the Secretary of the Air Force, in connection with this same institution, was authorized to convey a tract of land for the location of the Okaloosa-Walton Junior College. That is a junior college, I believe, over on the other side of that military reservation.

Then there is a fourth precedent here, wherein land was conveyed to the State of Texas. It was different only in that it was not for educational purposes. But for roads. The principle is the same.

There is another one here, for a right-of-way, involving part of a street in Hawaii. That too was for a public use. but not for educational purposes.

There is one other point about the matter, and the Senator from Wisconsin has been very considerate of this. It has gotten to the point where they must have these buildings to serve them for a major part of the next school session. They are badly needed, and this bill will help it to move along.

I thank the Senator for his special consideration of this matter, and I hope that this evidence and these precedents are so clearly established that he can feel justified in recognizing those additional facts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand it, there is a reversionary clause in this bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So that in the event in time it ceases to be used for educational purposes, it would revert to the Federal Government ownership. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely. This is a conveyance to the State of Florida, for educational purposes only. Should they cease to use the property for educational purposes, the land will revert to the Federal Government.

I see the Senator from Florida in the Chamber. He is interested in this matter. Perhaps he has introduced a similar bill, although we have before us the House bill. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I believe that both Senators from Florida—I think I asked my junior colleague to join with me and he did—introduced similar legislation in the Senate. However, we have the House bill before us, because it passed the House a good long while ago.

Mr. President, I invite attention to several facts which I think make this situation unique. The Choctawhatchee National Forest was first located in this area, and it comprises 51 percent of the total area of Oscaloosa County. Later, when there became need for an air base for a particular specialized purpose, the Choctawhatchee National Forest was turned over to the Eglin Air Force Base.

The trouble is that the base and its people and the structures which house its people and the 300 additional residences which are about to be completed are all located in the southern end of this area, and the school population of the military dependents there vastly exceeds the population from ordinary civilian sources.

This is not just one tract but four tracts conveniently located so that it will not interfere with any present Air Force mission and so that it will serve the children conveniently—two of them to be elementary schools and one junior high school, one administrative unit, to be paid for entirely by local and State funds.

As soon as this bill is passed, I am advised that the contract is immediately available to be let for the construction of the first unit at the cost of $1.2 million, all to be spent out of local and State funds, for the junior high school.

I understand that the reason why it is impractical to go through the general surplus property rule is that, in the first place, some public agency might want it which would not be consistent with Air Force use; and, in the second place, it might be purchased, if sold on bids, by some kind of business that would not be consistent with the Air Force needs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would it or would it not be the case that once this land is conveyed to the State of Florida, once the school buildings are constructed, and so forth, the school district would receive impacted aid from the Federal Government?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would suppose they would, for the students who are from the Military Establishment. But I call attention to the fact that originally in this case, and in other cases I can cite, the other impacted school bill which provides help in constructing buildings would have been helpful in constructing buildings. This is out of the way now. The State and local communities have agreed to put up the entire cost of construction of these four buildings, and all with reversion clauses in them, so as to necessitate their continued uses for school purposes, or their reversion, with buildings on them, to the Federal Government.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Where do these children go to school now?

Mr. HOLLAND. Many of them are going to Niceville, which is a long distance away and which at the present time has over 1,600 children in a building which, according to the safety standards, can accommodate only 1,062, and others are going some distances away.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is there a school on the base?

Mr. HOLLAND. Furthermore, there will be 300 additional military housing units in this immediate vicinity, occupied in the immediate future, because they are now approaching completion. So that the Senator from Florida feels that not only is this proposal fair, but also, it indicates protection of the very objectives in which I am sure the Air Force people are interested—namely, in the convenient education of their children close to where they live and in, the assurance of early construction of modern buildings, and in the assurance of those buildings, along with the property, reverting in the event they are not continuously used for school purposes.

I do not see how the matter could be fairer to the protection of the Federal personnel than this matter would be.

I appreciate the willingness of the senior Senator from Wisconsin to understand the difficulties of this matter and to understand that the construction of these 300 new housing units will add to the congestion that already exists there.

I have this statement in a letter from the county superintendent. Incidentally, he came to see me about it and repeated these facts. He says:

> There are some 20,375 students enrolled in Okaloosa County schools constructed for a maximum of 15,970 students.

That is the present situation.

> And of this total, 11,052 are military dependents and 3,792 are dependents of civil service and contractor personnel working at Eglin Air Force Base. In addition, 300 new housing units located on the base are scheduled for completion shortly, which will further add to the overcrowding of the school facilities.

I think that the State and local school authorities are not only offering, with complete generosity, to do all the construction—because that is the only way they can get these desirable sites—but also, I think they are showing a good spirit, and I think the Air Force also is showing a good spirit.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that the acquisition of other sites anywhere close to where these military personnel live is impossible because of the great size of the former Choctawhatchee National Forest and the fact that it all belongs to the Eglin Air Force Base.

No Air Force base activity is going on or is planned on any of these four sites, or else, of course, we could not properly ask for the conveyance of the property.

I thank the Senator for his understanding. I especially thank the chairman of the committee. The State of Florida will be grateful for the favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I will be glad to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7618) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GOLDWATER TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that following the disposition of the reading of the Journal on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) be recognized for not to exceed 45 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) on tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements made therein.

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

POSTAL REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 17070.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER) 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. 17070) to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McGEE. 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. McGEE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BOGGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW TO NOON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon Wednesday next.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 1970, TO 11 A.M. THURSDAY, JULY 16, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Wednesday it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Thursday morning.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR RANDOLPH ON THURSDAY FOR FUELS AND ENERGY SPEECH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the approval of the Journal on next Thursday, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour. Our colleague will speak on our fuels and energy problems.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3215) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17619) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. MARSH, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MAHON, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. McDADE, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17711) to amend the District of Columbia Cooperative Association Act; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

HEALTH TRAINING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1006, S. 3586.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3586) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to establish eligibility of new schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, and podiatry for institutional grants under section 771 thereof, to extend and improve the program relating to training of personnel in the allied health professions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. 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. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill under consideration, S. 3586, is a bill called the Health Training Improvement Act of 1970. It is a bill to provide for the training of health professionals who require less training than medical doctors and dentists.

There are some 200 medical specialists who aid doctors and dentists, and they are in short supply throughout this country.

Section 101 of title I of this bill amends title VII of the Public Health Service Act to establish eligibility of new schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, and podiatry.

Title II of S. 3586, cosponsored by a number of Senators, would extend the training of more allied health professionals.

S. 3586 would extend the law for five years, from fiscal year 1971 through fiscal year 1975, and it would provide for the construction of teaching facilities for training centers for allied health professions, for basic improvement grants for training centers for allied health professions, for advanced traineeships for allied health personnel, and allied health developmental grants.

The bill is designed to improve medical care in America. We have shortages in these fields across the board. The Hill-Burton bill recently passed over the President's veto provided for approximately $2,176 million in loans, grants, and guaranteed loans to build hospitals and extended care facilities and emergency operating rooms, to remodel old hospitals, to build wings, to modernize them and to bring them up to date. This bill is to help deal with the shortage of the allied health professionals who will serve in many of the facilities authorized under the Hill-Burton legislation.

The bill would add new authorities for aid to allied health students through loans, scholarships, and work-study programs, advanced study, and licensure provisions.

The matter was gone into very thoroughly in the subcommittee and the full committee. It had the cooperation of the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), who made notable contributions to this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I support S. 3586, the Health Training Improvement Act of 1970, which incorporates moving features of the administration's Allied Health Professions Training Amendments of 1970 (S. 3718), which I introduced on behalf of myself and all the Republican members of the Health Subcommittee and Senator SCOTT, to extend and improve programs of assistance for training in the allied health professions, and the Veterans in Allied Health Professions and Occupations Act of 1969 (S. 2753), which I authored and introduced with Senator PROUTY last July.

As we aspire to bring the full potential of modern medicine to every American—whatever his economic status—we must overcome the grave deficiencies in health manpower and I consider this legislation very, very urgently needed. Mr. President, we are talking a great deal about the improving of health care for all Americans. Our ability to do it, Mr. President, depends on the facilities, which have now been to some extent dealt with by the enactment—over the President's veto, I regret to state—of H.R. 11102, the so-called Hill-Burton Act amendments. That dealt, as it were, with the health care facilities. Now we deal with the people who deliver the health care.

The health professions are woefully short in almost every field, and in addition to being woefully short, Mr. President—and I shall give the figures in a moment—the health professions are also in grave danger of losing very important elements of the places in which they study. Mr. President, while I am not at liberty, on the Senator floor, to disclose the names of the medical and dental schools which are affected, there is the gravest danger, Mr. President, that in addition to the closings which have already taken place, of more medical schools closing, and we have only 100 in the country, and three happen to be in the city of New York, which is the seat of greatest density for medical study. There is also the danger of several dental schools closing.

Mr. President, this would really be a national catastrophe of the first order. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that section 102 of this bill which relates to immediate relief for medical and dental schools in danger of closing is probably as critical an element as we have in the bill.

It just does not make sense to have the sources of the best, the newest and the safest in health care and treatment—the medical and dental schools and their teaching hospitals and dental clinics—institutions traditionally committed to standards of excellence in the care of the sick, in the training of new physicians, dentists and other health professionals, and in the expansion of medical knowledge on the brink of financial disaster.

To meet this crisis we have in the bill a special authorization of $100 million for one year for grants to medical and dental schools in dire financial straits as a result of their affirmative response to aspects of national health policy. I invite Senators to examine it very carefully, and that is the reason why I did not want the vote to take place immediately. I felt that Senators should have a very real opportunity to examine the condition with which we are faced—the reasons for this emergency provision, Mr. President.

In the first place, not only must the medical or dental school show real need, but they must show that, by maintaining their status—in other words, being rescued—they will contribute materially to the national effort to deal with the grave shortages in health personnel.

I ask unanimous consent that, as a part of my remarks, I be permitted to have printed in the RECORD the provisions of section 799(k)(2), which specifies exactly what schools we are trying to reach, and also that there be printed in the RECORD section 799(n), specifying the purposes for which we are saving, if we are able to save them, these institutions, and also showing the grave financial distress, which alone will qualify them in order to get this emergency relief.

There being no objection, the portions of the bill referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SEC. 799 k. (a) . . .

"(2) the financial straits of these institutions, placing many on the brink of disaster, are in substantial measure the result of their affirmative response to national health policy (as established or approved by the Congress) that such institutions (A) extend their enrollment through major expansion of training capacity to increase the supply of adequately trained health professions personnel or to improve facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health, (B) establish special facilities for, extend, or improve the quality and delivery of, health care and services to disadvantaged persons in urban or rural areas, (C) provide high quality health care and services to the massive number of individuals who are beneficiaries of programs established by or pursuant to titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, or (D) maintain present enrollments, and maintain or enhance the quality of training provided, despite costs that are increasing more rapidly than school income from all sources.

"(b) It is therefore the purpose of this part to provide these medical and dental schools with emergency financial assistance to enable them to continue and expand the services, programs, and activities which are in response to national health policy (as described in subsection (a)(2)).

"APPLICATION FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 799n. (a) The Secretary shall not approve any application for a grant unless the application is submitted by or on behalf of a public or nonprofit institution which is eligible (as prescribed by section 799m (b)) for a grant under this part, and the Secretary finds that—

"(1) such institution has made an affirmative response to one or more of the elements of national health policy (as described by section 799k(a)(2));

"(2) such institution is in financial distress;

"(3) the financial distress of such institution is attributable, in substantial degree, to such institution's having performed, engaged in, or undertaken, one or more of the functions, policies, programs, or activities referred to in paragraph (1);

"(4) the financial distress of such institution (if not relieved by a grant under this part) will oblige such institution either to discontinue or curtail its performance of, engagement in, or undertaking with respect to, one or more of the functions, policies, or activities referred to in paragraph (1); and

"(5) such institution has a plan (and submits such plan with or as a part of its application for grants) which provides a reasonable assurance that, if such grant is made, such institution will be able, during and after the period with respect to which the grant is made, to continue or expand its performance of, engagement in, or undertaking with respect to, any of the functions, policies, or activities (referred to in paragraph (1)) with respect to which a grant is sought in such application.

"(b) Grants under this part shall be in such amounts and subject to such limitations and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be proper to carry out the purposes of this part.

"(c) Amounts paid by the Secretary to an institution under this part shall be used for the purpose for which paid, may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

"(d) In the case of any medical school or dental school which owns or is affiliated with a hospital or dental clinic and such hospital or dental clinic is utilized by such school in connection with its major teaching programs, the facilities, activities, and programs of such hospital or dental clinic shall, insofar as they are a part of or are used in connection with such teaching programs, be deemed for purposes of this part to be facilities, activities, or programs of such school."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our shortages are very real—we are short over 50,000 doctors in the country—for even reasonable care of our population. We are short approximately 10,000 dentists and about 140,000 nurses. Everybody knows it. Every citizen who tries to make an appointment to see his doctor or his dentist, every family which cannot find a nurse, for love or money in a dire emergency, is very conscious of what we are up against and would be appalled by the prospect that the numbers of physicians and dentists would be even further diminished by virtue of the closing of any schools of medicine or dentistry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tables and commentary which show the number of physicians in practice and the amount of our shortages, the number studying, which does not approach the number we need, with relation to physicians, dentists, and nurses.

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

ESTIMATED SUPPLY OF PHYSICIANS: 1968-75

Year	Graduates of U.S. schools: Medicine	Graduates of U.S. schools: Osteopathy	Foreign medical graduates [1]	Deaths in year [2]	Physicians (M.D.+D.O.) Dec. 31: Total	Physicians (M.D.+D.O.) Dec. 31: Active	Population [3] Dec. 31 (thousands)	Physicians per 100,000 population: Total	Physicians per 100,000 population: Active
1968	7,973	427	5,000	4,360	331,080	311,000	205,791	161	151
1969	7,830	410	4,500	4,470	339,350	317,700	206,430	164	154
1970	8,040	430	4,000	4,580	347,240	325,100	209,077	166	155
1971	8,480	450	3,500	4,680	354,990	332,400	212,089	167	157
1972	8,680	470	3,000	4,770	362,370	339,300	215,753	168	157
1973	8,950	480	3,000	4,880	369,920	346,400	219,055	169	158
1974	9,320	500	3,000	4,970	377,770	353,800	222,492	170	159
1975	9,770	560	3,000	5,090	386,010	361,500	226,052	171	160

1 Includes Canadian and other foreign graduates newly licensed in the United States each year and other foreign graduates providing medical services in programs for which licensure is not required.
2 At 13 per 1,000 physicians annually.
3 Includes the Armed Forces in the United States and abroad and civilians in 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Source: Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training, Division of Physician Manpower.
U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population Estimates. Current Population Reports P-25, No. 381.

By 1975, we should have, according to this table, 361,000 active physicians, making a ratio of 160 active physicians per 100,000 population. Of these, however, at most only 225,000 will be in private practice. Conservative estimates indicate that this will be something between 50,000 and 60,000 physicians short.

ESTIMATED SUPPLY OF DENTISTS: 1969-75

Year	Graduates of U.S. dental schools [1]	Losses from the profession due to deaths [2]	Dentists as of July 1 [3]: Total	Dentists as of July 1 [3]: Active	Population July 1 [4] (thousands)	Dentists per 100,000 population: Total	Dentists per 100,000 population: Active
1969	3,470	2,280	114,860	101,100	204,470	56	49
1970	3,530	2,220	116,050	102,200	207,330	56	49
1971	3,710	2,280	117,360	103,400	210,350	56	49
1972	3,720	2,330	118,790	104,800	213,510	56	49
1973	3,970	2,360	120,180	106,000	216,800	55	49
1974	4,130	2,400	121,790	107,600	220,230	55	49
1975	4,330	2,440	123,520	109,200	223,790	55	49

1 Assuming that construction funds under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act will continue at a level of over $35,000,000 annually for dental schools.
2 Estimated by applying mortality rates for white males by single years to the 1968 dentist supply.
3 Excludes graduates of the year concerned.
4 Includes the Armed Forces in the United States and abroad and civilians in 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Source: Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training, Division of Dental Health.
U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population Estimates. Current Population Reports P-25, No. 381.
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Public Health Service; National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Statistics of the United States, 1966. Vol. II—sec. 5, Life Tables, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

This table shows that by 1975 the ratio of dentists per 100,000 population will remain roughly what it is today, even though there will be 8,000 additional dentists practicing in 1975. However, individual demands for dental care are expected to increase greatly in the next few years as a result of rising income and educational levels and of new methods of financing dental services. There is universal agreement that the nation's future supply of dentists will be grossly inadequate to meet both population increases and average individual care demands.

ESTIMATED SUPPLY OF ACTIVE NURSES: 1969-75

Year	Graduates	Net losses from profession [1]	Active nurses as of Jan. 1: Number	Active nurses as of Jan. 1: Rate per 100,000 population	Resident population [2] (thousands)
1969	40,000	20,400	680,000	340	199,861
1970	40,800	21,000	699,600	344	203,447
1971	41,000	21,600	719,400	349	206,307
1972	41,800	22,200	738,800	353	209,330
1973	42,300	22,800	758,400	357	212,490
1974	43,000	23,300	777,900	360	215,785
1975	43,400	23,900	797,600	364	219,211

1 Includes losses from deaths and retirements, less those returning from inactive status and foreign-trained nurses.
2 Includes Armed Forces and civilians in 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Source: Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training, Division of Nursing.

It is estimated that there will be 797,000 active nurses in 1975. Depending on varying estimates, the need is calculated to be between 895,000 and one million. It should be noted, however, that over one third of all professional nurses are not currently employed in nursing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in reviewing the pending legislation it is to be noted that one of our greatest concerns—in helping overcome the critical manpower shortages in the health field—is the need for conducting a comprehensive study of existing laws, regulations, customs, and practices governing the licensure, certification, or other means by which individuals are determined to be qualified to practice in the allied health professions. Every effort should be made to prevent artificial and unnecessary restrictions on the entry and advancement of skilled personnel. This Nation needs to make the best use of every available skill in the health field. Section 209 of the bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prepare and submit to the Congress, prior to July 1, 1971, a report identifying the major problems associated with licensure, certification, and other qualifications for practice or employment of health personnel, together with summaries of the activities—if any—of Federal agencies, professional organizations, or other instrumentalities directed toward the alleviation of such problems and toward maximizing the proper and efficient utilization of health personnel in meeting the health needs of the Nation.

Indeed, I would add it is hoped very much that this report may be made available long before July 1, 1971, as the information which is involved could be critically important to us all in dealing with the problems we have.

Mr. President, section 102 of the bill, the amendment for emergency aid to medical and dental schools is supported by the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Dental Association, and the American Association of Dental Schools. This is very important, because it demonstrates their deep concern and long awareness of the situation they face in their desire to get help from the Government with respect to it.

Finally, the veterans educational assistance amendment which it is expected will be stricken from the bill—and I have agreed with the chairman to its being stricken—is one which I would like to speak about. I think it is very important to know why we are striking it and to express our hope that when this bill goes to the other body, that amendment or some variant of it may be written into a bill by the appropriate committee.

It is a fact that there may be a problem of jurisdiction, for in the Senate the jurisdiction over certain veterans' affairs is in our committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is well known that many of us, including myself, have for years tried to get a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate. Many of our Members favor it, but it has never been successful.

But there is a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House and, quite properly, it desires to deal with all veterans' matters. I hope very much that Representative TEAGUE's committee—he is its long-standing, very distinguished and very able chairman—will give sympathetic attention to what we are striking out here. It is not lost, by any means; but I agree that it would create difficulties if it went to the House in this form.

My reason for offering the amendment in committee is as follows:

There are approximately 30,000 medical corpsmen in the various armed services who leave those services every year. This is an absolutely irretrievable and indispensable source of effective manpower in the health field. Surely a medical corpsman who was qualified to treat the wounded on the field of battle can be quickly qualified to assist, in a very high level way, in the treatment of patients in hospital wards and emergency rooms.

The amendment we shall strike seeks to provide a special incentive for veterans undertaking allied health training. It would provide that educational allowances for veterans pursuing a course of study in one of the allied health professions are to be paid without charge to any period of entitlement the veteran may have earned by virtue of his service.

Our colleagues in the other body may feel that some other incentive may be better; but I would hope very much that they would see the force of the argument of trying very hard—and on incentive is a very good way to do it—to reclaim, as it were, for the allied health profession, a large part of the personnel which is now lost to us because it finds its way into other fields very often completely unrelated to the specialty which it has developed in the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, while I join with the chairman and agree with him that this particular provision be stricken—because we feel this bill is so important that we do not want it held up in any way and have people feel that they have to make a fight on it for reasons which have nothing to do with its substance or merits—I hope very much that the Members of the House will give it their sympathetic consideration and that some way may be found to reclaim for the allied health professions this indispensable and irreplaceable corps of medical corpsmen and veterans with experience in a health field who leave the armed services, to attract them into the profession which they have learned in the Armed Forces.

Other than that, I commend the bill most highly to my colleagues. I think it is a real tribute to the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) and the Health Subcommittee that the bill seems to have no real opposition in the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, before proceeding further in explanation of the bill, in order to get the bill in the form in which we hope it will pass the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments, except the language on page 38, be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, after line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

GRANTS TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DISTRESS

SEC. 102. Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after section 799a thereof (as added by section 209 of this Act) the following new part:

"PART H—GRANTS TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DISTRESS

"FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 799k. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(1) the Nation's economy, welfare, and security are adversely affected by the acute financial crisis which threatens the survival of medical and dental schools which provide the highest quality of teaching, medical and dental research and the delivery of health care for the Nation; and

"(2) the financial straits of these institutions, placing many on the brink of disaster, are in substantial measure the result of their affirmative response to national health policy (as established or approved by the Congress) that such institutions (A) extend their enrollment through major expansion of training capacity to increase the supply of adequately trained health professions personnel or to improve facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health, (B) establish special facilities for, extend, or improve the quality and delivery of, health care and services to disadvantaged persons in urban or rural areas, (C) provide high quality health care and services to the massive number of individuals who are beneficiaries of programs established by or pursuant to titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, or (4) maintain present enrollments, and maintain or enhance the quality of training provided, despite costs that are increasing more rapidly than school income from all sources.

"(b) It is therefore the purpose of this part to provide these medical and dental schools with emergency financial assistance to enable them to continue and expand the services, programs, and activities which are in response to national health policy (as described in subsection (a)(2)).

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 7991. For the purpose of enabling the Secretary to make grants under this part, there is authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"GRANTS BY SECRETARY

"SEC. 799m. (a) Fom the sums appropriated pursuant to section 7991, the Secretary is authorized to make grants, in accordance with the provisions of this part.

"(b) In order to be eligible for a grant under this part, an institution must be a public or nonprofit school of medicine or dentistry (as defined in section 724(4) and which is accredited as provided in section 721(b)(1)(B) or section 773(b)(2)).

"(c) No grant shall be made to any institution under this part except pursuant to application therefor which is approved by the Secretary.

"APPLICATION FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 799n. (a) The Secretary shall not approve any application for a grant unless the application is submitted by or on behalf of a public or nonprofit institution which is eligible (as prescribed by section 799m(b)) for a grant under this part, and the Secretary finds that—

"(1) such institution has made an affirmative response to one or more of the elements of national health policy (as described by section 799k(a)(2));

"(2) such institution is in financial distress;

"(3) the financial distress of such institution is attributable, in substantial degree, to such institution's having performed, engaged in, or undertaken, one or more of the functions, policies, programs, or activities referred to in pargagraph (1):

"(4) the financial distress of such institution (if not relieved by a grant under this part) will oblige such institution either to discontinue or curtail its performance of, engagement in, or undertaking with respect to, one or more of the functions, policies, or activities referred to in paragraph (1); and

"(5) such institution has a plan (and submits such plan with or as a part of its application for grants) which provides a reasonable assurance that, if such grant is made, such institution will be able, during and after the period with respect to which the grant is made, to continue or expand its performance of, engagement in, or undertaking with respect to, any of the functions, policies, or activities (referred to in paragraph (1)) with respect to which a grant is sought in such application.

"(b) Grants under this part shall be in such amounts and subject to such limitations and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be proper to carry out the purposes of this part.

"(c) Amounts paid by the Secretary to an institution under this part shall be used only for the purpose for which paid, may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

"(d) In the case of any medical school or dental school which owns or is affiliated with a hospital or dental clinic and such hospital or dental clinic is utilized by such school in connection with its major teaching programs, the facilities, activities, and programs of such hospital or dental clinic shall, insofar as they are a part of or are used in connection with such teaching programs, be deemed for purposes of this part to be facilities, activities, or programs of such school."

On page 8, line 1, after the word "Training", strike out "Centers"; in line 9, after the word "for", strike out "grants for basic improvements", and insert "basic improvement grants"; on page 12, after line 3, strike out:

REDESIGNATION OF SECTIONS

SEC. 205. Sections 795, 796, 797, and 798 of such Act are hereby redesignated as sections 799, 799a, 799b, and 799c, respectively.

At the beginning of line 10, change the section number from "206" to "205"; at the beginning of line 16, change the section number from "795" to "794a"; in line 22, after "41 U.S.C." strike out "(5))" and insert "(5)),"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 20, strike out "796" and insert "794b."; on page 14, line 5, after the word "determines", insert the word "that"; on page 15, at the beginning of line 11, change the section number from "797" to "794c."; on page 18, line 13, after the word "therein", insert "an opportunity"; on page 20, at the beginning of line 19, change the section number from "798" to "794d"; at the beginning of line 20, insert "(in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe)"; on page 21, line 10, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, strike out "school" and insert "agency, institution, or organization"; in line 15, after the word "to", strike out the word "section" and insert "subsection"; on page 22, at the beginning of line 3, insert "program of such"; in line 21, after the word "the" strike out "school" and insert "agency, institution, or organization"; on page 24, line 5, after the word "practitioner", insert "of medicine or dentistry"; in line 12, after the word "nonprofit", strike out "hospital or other" and insert "hospital, other"; in line 13, after the word "agency", strike out "in any area"; in line 15, after the word "to", strike out "be an area which has" and insert "have" on page 27, line 19, after the figure "1972,", strike out "and such sums as are necessary for the next three fiscal years," and insert "$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975,"; on page 28, line 15, after the word "program", insert "or programs"; in line 19, after the word "such", insert "program or programs in such"; at the beginning of line 20, strike out "agencies, institutions, or organizations", and insert "agency, institution, or organization"; in line 22, after the word "in", insert "such programs in"; on page 35, after line 2, strike out:

EVALUATION

SEC. 207. (a) That section of the Public Health Service designated as section 799b by section 205 of this Act is amended (1) by striking out "or 794," and inserting in lieu thereof "794, 795, 796, 797, or 798".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be effective only with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970.

At the beginning of line 13, change the section number from "208" to "206"; after the amendment just above stated, strike out "That section" and insert "Section 795"; in line 14, after the word "Act", strike out "which is redesignated as section 799 by section 205 of this Act"; after line 17, strike out:

STUDY

SEC. 209. That section of the Public Health Service Act redesignated as section 799c by section 205 of this Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition to the report provided for by the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall prepare, and submit to the President and the Congress prior to January 1, 1972, a report on the administration of this part, an appraisal of the programs under this part in light of their adequacy to meet the needs for allied health professions personnel, and his recommendations as a result thereof."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

SEC. 207. Section 798 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

STUDY

"SEC. 798. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a study of the administration of—

"(1) the provisions of this part,

"(2) other provisions of this Act which relate to the allied health professions or the training of individuals to prepare them to engage in any of such professions; and

"(3) provisions of law which are administered by the Commissioner of Education and which relate to the allied health professions or the training of individuals to prepare them to engage in any of such professions;

with a view to determining the adequacy of such provisions and the programs established pursuant thereto to meet the needs of the Nation for allied health professions personnel."

On page 36, at the beginning of line 23, change the section number from "210" to "208"; in line 24, after the word "after", strike out "the section redesignated as section 799c by section 205 of this act" and insert "section 798 thereof"; on page 37, at the beginning of line 2, change the section number from "799d." to "799."; after line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

LICENSURE REPORT

SEC. 209. Part G of title VII of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding after section 799 (as added by section 208 of this Act) the following new section:

"LICENSURE REPORT

"SEC. 799a. The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress, prior to July 1, 1971, a report identifying the major problems associated with licensure, certification, and other qualifications for practice or employment of health personnel (including group practice of health personnel), together with summaries of the activities (if any) of Federal agencies, professional organizations, or other instrumentalities directed toward the alleviation of such problems and toward maximizing the proper and efficient utilization of health personnel in meeting the health needs of the Nation. Such report shall include specific recommendations by the Secretary for steps to be taken toward the solution of the problems so identified in such report."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 38.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move now that title III on page 38, lines 1 through 20, be stricken from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the adoption of the proposed committee amendment. That question will have to be voted down for the Senator to accomplish his end.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Texas still has the floor. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. We cannot vote until he has yielded the floor. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would have to yield the floor in order to have a vote.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. I am not ready for a vote yet, so I would like the Senator to hold the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is satisfactory to the Senator from Texas, but I desire to have before the Senate the matter which will be offered after a brief explanation of the bill by me. At that time I will yield the floor.

Mr. President, S. 3586 provides for a 5-year extension and improvement of the Allied Health Professions Act. For the fiscal year 1971 the total amount would be $79,250,000; $97 million in 1972; $118,250,000 in 1973; $138.5 million in 1974; and $158,750,000 in 1975.

This is divided between construction grants, basic improvement grants, special project improvement grants, advanced traineeships of people in these categories, the development of new methods of training, the utilization of educational talents, scholarship grants, work-study programs, and student loans.

All across the board, we are attempting to enlarge this number of trained professionals, but who can take a lot of the load off the doctors and dentists.

The testimony before us developed that there are some 200 categories of medical specialists who help in some branch of medicine and dentistry. Their training, which is less time consuming than that of physicians or dentists, is nevertheless essential if we are to deal with this country's health care crisis. It is hoped that, with this stimulation of training in these medical specialties and the recruitment of more personnel, we will greatly alleviate some of the vast health shortages we have in this country.

Mr. President, people who need health care and services today are suffering unnecessarily and, in many cases, longer than they should, because there are not enough people trained to provide the health services that are needed. At this very moment, one of the major reasons that many citizens of the wealthiest Nation in the world are not receiving adequate health care is due to critical shortages of workers in all the health fields.

During the past several years, many of the needs for allied health manpower have been identified. The report submitted to the Congress last year by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act documented these needs, as have a number of other public reports.

In 1966, the Congress enacted the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act. This was the first Federal legislation specifically designed to increase the number of allied health personnel to provide essential health services and to improve and expand programs for the education and training of such personnel. In 1968, that legislation was extended. We are now considering a further extension, which will substantially expand and improve this program.

Since the very beginning of this program, the funds appropriated for the allied health training programs have been only about one-third of the amounts the Congress authorized—authorizations that we knew even then were modest, especially in view of the magnitude of the job to be done. Unfortunately, appropriated funds have been so limited that only a small, initial effort has been possible.

I have a table which graphically documents the very real gap between what has been authorized and what has been appropriated for these programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. However, in the face of these limited appropriations, substantial accomplishments have been made. In that regard I would like to bring to your attention the progress which has been made in the five main elements which comprise the existing legislation.

First. Construction. Although construction moneys were appropriated in only 2 years of the program, six projects have been funded for the construction of teaching facilities with new spaces for nearly 1,000 students in more than 10 different allied health disciplines.

Second. Basic improvement—formula—grants. The largest proportion of total moneys available for the allied health programs was spent on the formula grants for basic improvement of allied health curricula in baccalaureate and associate degree programs in junior colleges, colleges, and universities. In fiscal year 1969, 577 allied health training programs in 258 institutions received formula grant assistance.

Third. Special improvement—formula—grants. Special improvement grants are presently authorized to be made to training centers having approved applications for basic improvement grants from sums remaining available after full funding of the formula grants. Because of this statutory interrelationship between the basic improvement and the special improvement grant authorities, it has never been possible to award a single special improvement grant.

Fourth. Advanced traineeships. In fiscal year 1969 awards were made to 77 programs for advanced traineeships for about 400 trainees preparing to be teachers, administrators, supervisors or specialists in the allied health professions. With the rapid increase in numbers of training programs, it is essential that faculty be prepared and that administrators and supervisory personnel be trained to make the optimum use of significantly expanding numbers of trained personnel.

Fifth. Developmental grants. Under the authority for development and evaluation of new types of health personnel, a beginning has been made in spite of the modest funds available. Under this authority 18 projects have been supported for the development of such new types of personnel as orthopedic assistant, child health associate, physical therapy assistant, and hospital pharmacy technician.

S. 3586, the bill that we are reporting to you today will provide the legislative framework which can build on the limited progress that has been made to date toward increasing the pool of qualified allied health workers.

We must begin at once to move rapidly to produce the numbers and kinds of allied health personnel this country needs. A 5-year program, with realistic funding, would provide a significant incentive to training institutions to accelerate their production and to make the changes that are needed in their training programs, so that qualified, trained allied health personnel will be available as rapidly as possible to provide health services.

If progress is to be made, continuity of this program is essential. Commitments must be planned for, and made, well in advance of actual training. It is our conviction that shorter extensions of this legislative authority, such as the administration's 1-year proposal, will seriously dilute the potential accomplishments of these training efforts.

The institutions need time to acquaint themselves with new programs and authorities, time to marshal local resources, and time to institute training efforts. There should be a reasonable period of certainty about the signals under which they can expect to operate. The 5-year extension in the bill we are reporting provides for an initial year for tooling up and one academic generation for many of the programs.

The bill will continue the program of grants for the construction of teaching facilities; this is absolutely essential if the allied health schools are going to be able to expand their student enrollments. The time required to develop plans, present proposals, award funds and, finally, build buildings is such that any delay will indeed be a contributing factor to the continuation of manpower shortages. Provisions of this new bill authorize $20 million in fiscal year 1971 for construction of teaching facilities for allied health professions personnel; over the next 5 fiscal years this sum will increase to $40 million.

The bill would authorize $15 million for each year through 1975 for the continuation of the basic improvement—formula—grant program. Through this program, junior colleges, colleges, and universities qualifying as training centers for allied health professions have been assisted in expanding and improving their allied health curriculums.

The bill also makes a provision for special project grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations for new training programs, improvement of curriculums, expansion of existing training programs, and the establishment of special training programs to meet the needs of special groups—for example, the disadvantaged and veterans who have had previous training and experience in health.

The original act authorized special improvement grants that are dependent on overflow funds from the basic improvement grant, and limits eligibility to schools that have been awarded a basic improvement grant. Accordingly, the special project program has never been implemented, because there have never been overflow funds from the basic grants. Provisions of S. 3586, by establishing a separate appropriation authorization and broadening the eligibility, will enable many training resources—training centers, agencies, organizations, and other institutions not previously eligible to apply for allied health training funds—to use their capabilities to plan and develop new programs and to expand their on-going efforts that meet special training and retraining needs. Such a project grant authority is needed to encourage a wide variety of activities directed toward high priority problems in the allied health field. Over the next 5 years this program would authorize appropriations beginning with $20 million in fiscal year 1971 and increasing at a rate of $5 million a year to $40 million in 1975.

S. 3586 would authorize a program of traineeships for advanced training and allied health personnel to prepare them to teach or to serve as administrators, supervisors, or specialists in the allied health field. In fiscal year 1967, this program provided traineeship support for only 64 students. However, in 1969, awards were made to support nearly 400 students preparing to become leaders in their fields. The shortages of competent faculty and other allied health leaders are great and probably constitute the greatest obstacle to the rapid expansion of allied health manpower. As educational programs enlarge and new programs are started, the present shortage of qualified teachers will become increasingly critical.

For advanced traineeships grants, this bill would authorize $8 million in fiscal year 1971 and increments of $1 million for each year thereafter to $12 million in fiscal year 1975.

This bill would also authorize grants and contracts for developmental projects. It would extend and broaden the developmental grants program authorized under the original law, which provides for grants to develop, demonstrate, or evaluate new types of health technologists and new methods and curriculums for training allied health personnel.

Under the authority for development and evaluation of new types of health personnel, a dramatic beginning has been made in spite of modest funding. Projects have supported the development of such new types of personnel as orthopedic assistant, child health associate, physical therapy assistant, and hospital pharmacy technician. These projects have a significant potential for alleviating manpower shortages and contributing to the improvement of health services.

The bill would provide new authority for support of projects to study and develop mechanisms for determining the equivalency and proficiency of previously acquired knowledge and skills in the allied health field and to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate new means of recruitment, retraining, or retention of allied health personnel. These new efforts are essential in order to remove conditions that now exist in the educational and employment sectors of the health field that are constricting the production and utilization of competent allied health manpower.

The bill would authorize for the developmental projects program $6 million in fiscal year 1971, increasing by $2 million each year to an authorization of $14 million in fiscal year 1975.

The proposed bill, S. 3586, would provide an authority for grants and contracts for the encouragement of educational talent in the allied health professions including returning veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States. This program would encourage and assist individuals of financial, educational, or cultural need with potential capacity for education or training in the allied health professions. This would, for example, provide opportunities to encourage and assist returning veterans who wish to qualify for civilian employment in the allied health professions. Proposed authorizations for these educational talent encouragement grants and contracts are $750,000 in fiscal year 1971 and $250,000 increments each year until fiscal year 1975 when $1.75 million would be authorized.

The bill also would authorize scholarships, loans, and a work-study program to assist students who are preparing for employment in the allied health professions. At the present time, undergraduate students preparing for allied health careers must compete for student aid through the general student assistance programs. Special financial aid resources are needed to attract able students to allied health training opportunities. It is especially important to have scholarship aid for needy students who could not otherwise consider undertaking such training, and for persons already working in allied health occupations in which retraining is necessary to keep pace with changing practices of technology. For these three student-aid programs—scholarships, work study, and student loans—the bill would authorize appropriations beginning in fiscal year 1971 of $9.5 million and increasing to $36 million in fiscal year 1975.

In addition to the grants and contracts provision of title II of S. 3586 there are two special provisions proposed. One is a requirement that the Secretary submit a report identifying the major problems associated with licensure, certification, and other qualifications for practice or employment of health personnel—including group practice of health personnel—together with summaries of the activities—if any—of Federal agencies, professional organizations, or other instrumentalities directed toward the alleviation of such problems and toward maximizing the proper and efficient utilization of health personnel in meeting the health needs of the Nation.

The second special provision relates to advance funding. The authority would permit grantee institutions to plan more effectively by providing the appropriation of funds in the fiscal year during which the funds may be awarded to the institutions. If we continue the 1-year rule, we will be getting the money appropriated for the past year about the time we are holding hearings for the next year's appropriations. This is disastrous to the training we are supporting. If schools are to get and retain competent faculty and qualified students, they must know at least a year in advance whether or not there will be available funds that they can commit.

Finally, Mr. President, the bill in title I includes two additional provisions which would—

First. Amend section 771 of the PHS Act so as to authorize special assistance to new schools of medicine and the like such that they could qualify for the institutional — formula — grant support under which existing medical schools now receive support. There is no reason why we should continue to discriminate against new medical schools, especially when the Nation is faced with an acute shortage of health professionals.

Second. Authorize the appropriation of $100 million to assist medical and dental schools—and their affiliated teaching institutions—which are in financial distress. As each of us knows, the medical and dental schools of this Nation are in serious financial difficulty. Several are on the brink of financial catastrophe. Others are now surviving only by expending their endowments. Mr. President, the committee's action in this regard, which will be described in greater detail by other Senators who will speak today, is essentially intended to deal with the paradox which is created by this Nation's great need for additional medical schools while at the same time being faced with the imminent closing of existing high quality institutions of medical education.

EXHIBIT 1, 1970

TABLE I.—AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS GRANTS PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEARS 1967 THROUGH 1970

Year	Total grant program	Construction grants	Educational improvement grants	Advanced training grants	Development of new methods grants
Fiscal year 1967:					
Authorization	$14,250,000	$3,000,000	$9,000,000	$1,500,000	$750,000
Appropriation	3,735,000		3,285,000	250,000	200,000
Fiscal year 1968:					
Authorization	26,750,000	9,000,000	13,000,000	2,500,000	2,250,000
Appropriation	15,250,000	[1] 3,000 000	9,750,000	[2] 1,500,000	[3] 1,000,000
Fiscal year 1969:					
Authorization	37,000,000	13,500,000	17,000,000	3,500,000	3,000,000
Appropriation	14,325,000	1,800,000	9,750,000	1,550,000	1,225,000
Fiscal year 1970:					
Authorization	39,500,000	10,000,000	20,000,000	5,000,000	4,500,000
Appropriation	13,137,000		9,750,000	1,550,000	[4] 1,837,000
Total authorization, 1967–70	117,500,000	35,500,000	59,000,000	12,500,000	10,500,000
Total appropriation, 1967–70	46,447,000	4,800,000	32,535,000	4,850,000	4,262,000

[1] $1,000,000 was placed in reserve and carried over to 1969. This reduced the money available for construction grants in fisca year 1968 to $2,000,000 and increased the amount available in fiscal year 1969 to $2,800,000.
[2] Reserves necessitated by the cost-reduction program reduced the funds available for obligation to $1,204,000.
[3] Reserves necessitated by the cost-reduction program reduced the funds available for obligation to $800,000.
[4] Reserves necessitated by the cost-reduction program reduced the funds available for obligation to $1,238,000.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief, but I wish to inform the chairman of the committee and the manager of the bill that I would hope that when I am through, which will be in a very few minutes, we can then vote on the amendments en bloc, and then deal with that part of the bill which it is proposed to strike separately. I agree with the chairman that that should be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The Chair would apprise the Senator from New York that we have already voted on the other amendments, except for page 38.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I did not hear the Chair put the question, and it was understood they would not be voted on until Senator YARBOROUGH had finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair answered the Senator's question on the basis of the committee amendment on page 38.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Was not the unanimous-consent request that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, except for one amendment, as original text?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would state, to clear up the situation, that prior to the Senator from New York's raising his objection, the Senate had already agreed to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas to approve all committee amendments except as to page 38, and Senator YARBOROUGH had been recognized.

Then, when the Senator from New York raised his objection, the only point at issue was as to page 38 of the committee amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York was not aware of that. As a matter of fact, he was not aware that that was the unanimous-consent request at all. He understood the Chair's ruling to be that no vote could be taken until such time as the Senator from Texas surrendered the floor, on any of the amendments, as the Senator from New York stated that he was not prepared to vote as yet on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did hear the Senator from New York say that he was not prepared to vote, but the chair assumed it was as to page 38, since that was the only committee amendment in dispute, the other having previously been agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not wish to move to reconsider, which I could do, because I did not accord with the request, but I shall not, because I do not think it matters.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his great contribution to this bill. His amendments are written into it. We have collaborated on it.

The $100 million emergency fund for medical schools we have agreed on thoroughly. We were looking for a vehicle, and he has added his proposal to this bill. I hope the House will accept the amendment.

As the Senator from New York has pointed out, we have medical schools which are in danger of closing. Sixty cents out of every dollar that goes to support the medical schools in this country comes from the Federal Government under the National Institutes of Health and other programs for research. Due to budget stringencies and the reduced purchasing power of the dollar, many medical schools which have received the same grants as in the past can no longer go on.

A few weeks ago, in a Dallas veterans' hospital, I held an informal conference with the director and the staff; and they told me of the many economies they are having to practice, especially cutting down on their staff. They could not cut down on money for supplies, because the price of an item such as blood plasma, for example, had gone up 100 percent over 12 months. So they had to cut their personnel so as not to cut on food, blood, and medicines for the veterans. That is what happened in 1 year.

We had testimony in the committee this week, while we were having hearings on other bills, to the effect that, in Russia, they have a medical assistant for every medical doctor—280 medical assistants per 100,000 personnel, where we have 160 medical doctors to every 100,000 personnel. We have the greatest medicine in the world. We have the greatest medical science in the world but we do not have enough personnel to get this medical science and knowledge out to the people of this land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report entitled "Grants to Medical and Dental Schools in Financial Distress," which is printed on page 5 of the committee report on S. 3586.

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

GRANTS TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DISTRESS

The committee finds that the urgent need for emergency relief to our Nation's medical and dental schools has continued to grow. The committee believes that American medical and dental schools which provide the highest quality of teaching, medical and dental research and the delivery of health care for the Nation are in serious financial difficulties as a result, in substantial measure, of their affirmative response to national health policy established or approved by the Congress and that the situation is so critical that one must be concerned about their maintenance of quality and even about their ability to survive.

Accordingly, the committee has authorized the appropriation of $100 million for grants to assist those medical and dental schools which are in acute financial distress and which without such assistance will be forced to curtail their services.

Section 102 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue grants to medical and dental schools in dire financial straits as a result of their affirmative response to one or more of the following aspects of national health policy: (a) increasing enrollment of students for the purpose of augmenting the supply of trained health professions personnel; (b) improving the quality or delivery of health care and services to disadvantaged persons in urban or rural areas; (c) providing health care and services to a substantial number of patients who are beneficiaries of programs established by or pursuant to Titles XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act; (d) maintaining present enrollments and maintaining or enhancing the quality of training, despite costs that increase more rapidly than school income from all sources.

In order to be eligible for a grant, an institution would be required to establish: (1) that its financial distress is attributable, in substantial degree, to seeking to fulfill any one of the stated national health policies; (2) that without the benefit of the financial assistance provided, the institution would be forced either to discontinue or curtail its performance in meeting this national health policy; (3) that the institution has submitted a plan providing reasonable assurance that if it receive the grant, it will continue or expand its fulfillment of the national health policies; (4) that any grant will be utilized in performing the stated national health policies pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. When a medical or dental school owns or is affiliated with a hospital or dental clinic, which the school utilizes for its teaching program, the hospital's or dental clinic's activities shall be considered the same as the school's program in determining the school's participation in meeting the specified national health policies.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this excerpt explains the need for this, and the rules and criteria under which aid will be granted to medical schools.

The amendment is a great amendment and I agree with much that the distinguished Senator from New York has said about it.

As to page 38, the amendment on page 38 of the reported bill, we have a communication from the chairman of the Veteran's Committee in the House pointing out that, if that part is put in the bill, there will be a jurisdictional problem involved.

However, we do not want to run any risk of endangering this emergency measure, which is a necessary measure to aid the schools, and the other to train the allied health professions, on my motion to strike that out, which is based not upon the intrinsic merits but because many of the people coming out of the armed services today who have had special medical training will be of great value if they can be merged into the civilian medical system.

There was a program on CBS last night called MEDEX regarding a medical school in the State of Washington, which the University of Washington was sponsoring, to train personnel for the medical beyond what is in the bill here—that is, a special assistant to every medical doctor, especially in the rural areas—CBS had a 30-minute program on national TV on the subject.

The names of many categories were brought out in the hearings. Let me cite just a few of them. Dieticians, medical technologists, medical record librarians, occupational therapists, optometric technologists, physical therapists, radiological technologists, sanitation technicians, and so forth.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) has written to me, raising the question with regard to the eligibility of teaching hospitals for grants under title VII of the Public Health Service Act. I include the letter in the RECORD at this point:

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has narrowed its interpretation of the term, "teaching facility," in Title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to exclude teaching hospitals from receiving construction grants as teaching facilities for medical, dental and other health personnel.

The University of Wisconsin Medical School has been caught in a very serious financing squeeze due to this revised interpretation as have schools in other states. My staff is presently surveying the states to determine the extent of this problem.

In view of the fact that the Labor Committee has recently ordered reported the Health Training Improvement Act of 1970, I would appreciate it if you could explore the desirability of placing language in the Committee Report on this bill to indicate that Congress intended that these grants should be available for teaching hospitals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator.

I understand that the Association of American Medical Colleges has also expressed a similar concern about the Department's interpretation in this matter. I might point out that the committee has specifically designated teaching hospitals as eligible for aid under the section of this bill covering medical and dental schools in financial distress. It is my clear understanding from the legislative history and congressional intent of this statute that the teaching hospitals of all medical and dental schools should certainly be eligible to receive construction grants under section 720, title VII of the Public Health Service Act.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 3586, as reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by the great chairman of that committee (Mr. YARBOROUGH) who also so ably chairs the Health Subcommittee. Both Senator YARBOROUGH and Senator JAVITS, the distinguished ranking minority member of the full committee, deserve great praise for the constructive changes they have made in the Allied Health Personnel Professions Training Act. It has been a great privilege for me to work under their leadership on the Health Subcommittee for the last 18 months. The legislative authorities contained in that act have been expanded in this bipartisan bill to make the program a much more effective mechanism for filling the health manpower needs of the Nation.

Among the new provisions this bill would add are those expanding the eligibility of recipients of grants under the programs—now limited to junior colleges, colleges, and universities—to public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations. This provision alone should increase considerably the Nation's resources for the training of allied health professionals. It is particularly noteworthy that this expanded eligibility will include approved training programs conducted by hospitals. Many hospitals are currently developing allied health training programs which are operated independent of academic institutions. For example, Marshfield Clinic in Wisconsin has a training program for specialized physician's assistants. The Washington Hospital Center in the District of Columbia is training the cardiovascular technician. The certified laboratory assistant recieves his entire training in a hospital. The contributions which such training programs can make in alleviating the shortage of health manpower are substantial.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I would in particular like to emphasize that this eligibility for support of hospital-based training programs would apply as well to the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration. These hospitals have long been recognized as a source of health manpower. Their potential for providing leadership in the development of new types of allied health personnel as well, was singled out by the 1969 report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Allied Health Personnel, sponsored by the Division of Medical Sciences of the National Academy of Sciences, which stated:

The Committee recommends that experiments be conducted in the training of new categories of supporting health personnel and their integration into health care teams, and in desirable changes in the skills of presently recognized personnel categories to meet changing requirements. The Veterans' Administration is suggested as a logical system in which such experiments might be tried.

The provisions of S. 3586 would make it possible for the Veterans' Administration to increase its activities in this area and to implement further this recommendation. And I am very pleased that the committee adopted language in its report—91-1002, pages 11-12—specifically spelling out this possibility. The report states:

BROADENED APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

Applicant eligibility for grants, excluding formula grants and construction grants, has been broadened under the bill to include public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations. This expanded eligibility includes among others, approved allied health training programs operated by public and nonprofit private hospitals. This broader eligibility applies to grants: To improve, plan, develop or establish new programs for training of allied health personnel; for traineeships for advanced training of allied health professions personnel; to encourage the full utilization of educational talent for the allied health professions, including outreach programs, scholarship grants, work-study programs, and loans.

The committee is impressed with the effectiveness of allied health training programs developed in many hospitals where the entire training is provided by the hospital. Among these are programs for specialized physicians assistants, cardiovascular technicians, and certified laboratory assistants. The contributions these hospital-based programs can make in alleviating the shortages of health manpower and in developing new types of allied health professions are substantial.

Included as eligible public hospitals under the bill are the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration and certain other Federal agencies. This eligibility results from section 507 of the Public Health Service Act which authorizes that "appropriations to the Public Health Service available for research, training, or demonstration project grants shall also be available, on the same terms and conditions as apply to non-Federal institutions, for grants for the same purpose to hospitals of the service, of the Veterans' Administration or of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, and to Saint Elizabeths Hospital. Thus, the Veterans Administration hospitals could receive grants under sections 792(a)(2), 793, 794, 794(a), or 794(b).

The Veterans' Administration hospitals have long been recognized as a source of health manpower. Generally, most students in Veterans' Administration hospitals are associated with an academic institution and are eligible for scholarships and loans through that institution. However, the Veterans' Administration also has provided allied health training which is not academically affiliated. Thus, students in Veterans' Administration hospital-based approved programs could benefit from this new eligibility for allied health scholarships. It should be noted that because of the bill's requirement of non-Federal contributions to work-study programs, and because of its requirement that a training institution or agency provide no less than one-ninth of the capital contributions to a loan fund, these two programs would not be applicable to students receiving their total training in a Veterans' Administration or other Federal medical facility.

I also wish to emphasize that the outreach programs established by S. 3586 should increase substantially the numbers of veterans entering the health professions, and particularly those veterans who have received specialized training in health care during their military career. It has been estimated that approximately 30,000 veterans having some training in health fields, leave the Armed Forces annually. S. 3586 will authorize the establishment of programs which will encourage such veterans to seek advanced training in the allied health professions. The bill will also encourage studies to develop equivalency testing. Establishment of such systems will mean that the training veterans have already received in military medical facilities could be credited toward educational requirements for certification or licensure in an allied health profession. This provision should enable many veterans to enter certain of the allied health professions without undergoing lengthy periods of training duplicating that they received in military service.

When one considers the tremendous shortages of health manpower existing throughout the medical system and which have been graphically portrayed in the case of VA hospitals by witnesses before the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, the provisions of S. 3586 take on a special meaning and importance to all citizens. A big step toward alleviating this problem will be taken through enactment of this important legislation.

Finally, I wish to comment on one specific committee amendment to S. 3586. Section 301 of the reported bill contains an amendment to title 38 of the United States Code, which contains veterans legislation. That provision is explained on page 11 of the committee report 91–1002 as follows:

VETERANS EDUCATIONAL ALLOWANCE FOR STUDENTS OF ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Section 4 of S. 3586 would add a new section 1679 to title 38 of the U.S. Code which would require the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to pay educational assistance allowances to eligible veterans pursuing a course of study in one of the allied health professions (as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for purposes of part G of title VII of the Public Health Service Act). Present law provides that veterans are eligible for educational allowances for a period of time varying with their length of service on active duty, but, with certain exceptions in the case of the educationally disadvantaged, for no period in excess of 36 months. The bill would afford a special incentive for veterans undertaking allied health training. It would provide that educational allowances for veterans pursuing a course of study in one of the allied health professions are to be paid without charge to any period of entitlement the veteran may have earned.

I very recently received a letter from my good friend, the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, voicing strong jurisdictional and substantive objections to this proposed amendment. Similar objections were raised by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans in recent communications. These communications were received after the bill had been reported to the Senate. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the communications from the three Veterans organizations be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am very pleased that Chairman YARBOROUGH and Senator JAVITS have agreed to deletion of the provision in question from the bill, and I endorse their action.

I would also like to draw attention to one vital aspect of the performance of duties by a paramedical professional. An important element of any training program in allied health where the trainee's duties will involve direct patient care is the inclusion in the training curriculum of special emphasis on the psychology of the patient and the importance to his recovery of individualized and compassionate care. This subject was covered in our committee discussions, and I am pleased that the committee report—page 11—affirms the committee's strong feeling that such training is essential in providing complete care to a patient.

A most vital and urgently needed provision contained in section 102 of the reported bill is the provision for emergency grants to medical and dental schools in financial distress. There are a number of medical schools in California who would be rescued from disaster by this new authorization of the appropriation of $100 million. This new provision is described in the committee report—page 5—as follows:

Section 102 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue grants to medical and dental schools in dire financial straits as a result of their affirmative response to one or more of the following aspects of national health policy: (a) increasing enrollment of students for the purpose of augmenting the supply of trained health professions personnel; (b) improving the quality or delivery of health care and services to disadvantaged persons in urban or rural areas; (c) providing health care and services to a substantial number of patients who are beneficiaries of programs established by or pursuant to Titles XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act; (d) maintaining present enrollments and maintaining or enhancing the quality of training, despite costs that increase more rapidly than school income from all sources.

In order to be eligible for a grant an institution would be required to establish: (1) that its financial distress is attributable, in substantial degree, to seeking to fulfill any one of the stated national health policies; (2) that without the benefit of the financial assistance provided, the institution would be forced either to discontinue or curtail its performance in meeting this national health policy; (3) that the institution has submitted a plan providing reasonable assurance that if it receive the grant, it will continue or expand its fulfillment of the national health policies; (4) that any grant will be utilized in performing the stated national health policies pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. When a medical or dental school owns or is affiliated with a hospital or dental clinic, which the school utilizes for its teaching program, the hospital's or dental clinic's activities shall be considered the same as the school's program in determining the school's participation in meeting the specified national health policies.

Mr. President, the bill under consideration today is another example of the constructive, innovative and far-reaching legislation produced by the dedicated bipartisan teamwork which has characterized so much of the outstanding work of our Health Subcommittee under the leadership of Senators YARBOROUGH and JAVITS and their excellent staff counsels. If any significant immediate improvements are to be made in the quality and reach of health care in this country, they will be made, I am convinced, by greater and more effective utilization of the allied health and paraprofessional personnel who will be trained under the provisions of this important bill.

EXHIBIT 1

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1970.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YARBOROUGH: Title III of S. 3586, the Health Training Improvement Act of 1970, would amend 38 U.S.C., chapter 34, by adding a new section 1679 to provide that the Administrator of Veterans Affairs shall pay to an eligible veteran pursuing a course of study in one of the allied health professions, as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, an educational assistance allowance as provided in sections 1681 and 1682, and that the educational assistance allowance authorized and paid shall be without charge to the veteran's earned period of entitlement.

As a matter of policy The American Legion resists those legislative and executive measures which tend to dilute the centralization of authority in administration of the veterans benefits programs. Since the language of this Act would grant certain responsibility to the Secretary of HEW, we oppose the present provisions of Title III of this Act.

Recognizing the merits of the purpose of Title III, as an alternative we recommend a clean bill to encourage veteran training in those scarce category allied health professions as determined by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, without charge to any period of entitlement earned by virtue of active duty in the Armed Forces, with the provision that the cost of such training be amortized by a period of obligated employment with the Veterans Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery. Considering the magnitude of the VA hospital and medical care program, there appears to be no justification to seek determinations from the Secretary of HEW as to shortages in allied health manpower. A clean bill in accordance with these precepts would assure study and discussion by both the administration and interested groups such as The American Legion.

Sincerely yours,

HERALD E. STRINGER,
Director.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 7, 1970.

Hon. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars vehemently opposes the transfer of veterans programs to other departments or agencies. Section 4 of Health Training Improvement Act of 1970, scheduled for consideration this week, would give jurisdiction of a veteran's educational program, to the Secretary of H.E.W.

Accordingly, it is strongly recommended that section 4 of S. 3586 be deleted.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service VFW.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 7, 1970.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans opposes the amendment to S. 3586 giving discretionary power to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to utilize veterans administration funds to an eligible veteran pursuing a course of study in one of the allied health professions. We believe programs affecting veterans or use of Veteran Administration funds should be administered by the Administrator of the Veterans Administration.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The Chair would state that the question now recurs on agreeing to the proposed committee amendment on page 38.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3586) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3586

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Health Training Improvement Act of 1970".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress to advance the public welfare by promoting the expansion and improvement of the health professions in order to meet the growing and critical health needs of our expanding population.

TITLE I—SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, DENTISTRY, OSTEOPATHY, PHARMACY, OPTOMETRY, VETERINARY MEDICINE, AND PODIATRY

INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 771 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295f–1) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In the case of an application for a grant under this section for a new school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, or podiatry, the provisions of subsection (b)(1) and subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1) of this section shall not apply. In lieu of such provisions, the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe criteria (1) for enrollment increases to be met by the applicants for such grants, and (2) for determining the amounts of each such grant in excess of the $25,000 authorized by subsection (a)(1) of this section."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be effective only with respect to sums available for grants under section 771 of the Public Health Service Act from appropriations under section 770 of such Act for the fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970.

GRANTS TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DISTRESS

SEC. 102. Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after section 799a thereof (as added by section 209 of this Act) the following new part:

"PART II—GRANTS TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DISTRESS

"FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 799k. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(1) the Nation's economy, welfare, and security are adversely affected by the acute financial crisis which threatens the survival of medical and dental schools which provide the highest quality of teaching, medical and dental research and the delivery of health care for the Nation; and

"(2) the financial straits of these institutions, placing many on the brink of disaster, are in substantial measure the result of their affirmative response to national health policy (as established or approved by the Congress) that such institutions (A) extend their enrollment through major expansion of training capacity to increase the supply of adequately trained health professions personnel or to improve facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health, (B) establish special facilities for, extend, or improve the quality and delivery of, health care and services to disadvantaged persons in urban or rural areas, (C) provide high quality health care and services to the massive number of individuals who are beneficiaries of programs established by or pursuant to titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, or (D) maintain present enrollments, and maintain or enhance the quality of training provided, despite costs that are increasing more rapidly than school income from all sources.

"(b) It is therefore the purpose of this part to provide these medical and dental schools with emergency financial assistance to enable them to continue and expand the services, programs, and activities which are in response to national health policy (as described in subsection (a)(2)).

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 799l. For the purpose of enabling the Secretary to make grants under this part, there is authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"GRANTS BY SECRETARY

"SEC. 799m. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 799l, the Secretary is authorized to make grants, in accordance with the provisions of this part.

"(b) In order to be eligible for a grant under this part, an institution must be a public or nonprofit school of medicine or dentistry (as defined in section 724(4) and which is accredited as provided in section 721(b)(1)(B) or section 773(b)(2)).

"(c) No grant shall be made to any institution under this part except pursuant to application therefor which is approved by the Secretary.

"APPLICATION FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 799n. (a) The Secretary shall not approve any application for a grant unless the application is submitted by or on behalf of a public or nonprofit institution which is eligible (as provided by section 799m (b)) for a grant under this part, and the Secretary finds that—

"(1) such institution has made an affirmative response to one or more of the elements of national health policy (as described by section 799k(a)(2));

"(2) such institution is in financial distress;

"(3) the financial distress of such institution is attributable, in substantial degree, to such institution's having performed, engaged in, or undertaken, one or more of the functions, policies, programs, or activities referred to in paragraph (1);

"(4) the financial distress of such institution (if not relieved by a grant under this part) will oblige such institution either to discontinue or curtail its performance of, engagement in, or undertaking with respect to, one or more of the functions, policies, or activities referred to in paragraph (1); and

"(5) such institution has a plan (and submits such plan with or as a part of its application for grants) which provides a reasonable assurance that, if such grant is made, such institution will be able, during and after the period with respect to which the grant is made, to continue or expand its performance of, engagement in, or undertaking with respect to, any of the functions, policies, or activities (referred to in paragraph (1)) with respect to which a grant is sought in such application.

"(b) Grants under this part shall be in such amounts and subject to such limitations and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be proper to carry out the purposes of this part.

"(c) Amounts paid by the Secretary to an institution under this part shall be used only for the purpose for which paid, may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

"(d) In the case of any medical school or dental school which owns or is affiliated with a hospital or dental clinic and such hospital or dental clinic is utilized by such school in connection with its major teching programs, the facilities, activities, and programs of such hospital or dental clinic shall, insofar as they are a part of or are used in connection with such teaching programs, be deemed for purposes of this part to be facilities, activities, or programs of such school."

TITLE II—ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHING FACILITIES FOR ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL

SEC. 201. (a) Section 791(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295h(a)(1)) is amended (1) by striking out the "and", and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $35,000,000 for the fical year ending June 30, 1974; and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

(b) Section 791(b)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 295h(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TRAINING FOR ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

SEC. 202. (a) Section 792(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295h-1(a)) is amended by striking out "and $20,000,000" and all that follows down to but not including the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; and $15,000,000 for each of the next five fiscal years; for basic improvement grants under this section to assist training centers for the allied health professions to improve the quality of their educational programs".

(b) Section 792(a) of such Act is further amended (1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; for special project grants under this section to assist public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations in providing or maintaining existing programs or planning or establishing new programs for training or retraining of allied health personnel."

(c) Section 792(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 295h-1(b)) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1975".

(d)(1) Section 792(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 295h-1(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a)(2) of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to make special project grants under this section to public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations to (A) plan, develop, or establish new programs for the training or retraining of allied health personnel, (B) effect significant improvements in the curriculums of programs for the training or retraining of such personnel, (C) expand training capacity in programs for the training or retraining of such personnel, or (D) establish special curriculums, in programs for the training or retraining of allied health personnel, designed to meet the needs of, and encourage and facilitate participation in such programs by individuals who are economically or culturally deprived, are returning veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States with training or experience in or related to the allied health fields, or are reentering or interested in reentering the allied health fields."

(2) The heading to such section 792(c) is amended by striking out "IMPROVEMENT" and inserting in lieu thereof "PROJECT".

(e) Section 792(d)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 295-1(d)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting "in the case of an application for a basic improvement grant," immediately after "(A)".

(f) The amendments made by this section shall be effective only with respect to grants made under section 792 of the Public Health Service Act from sums appropriated under such section for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970.

TRAINEESHIPS FOR ADVANCED TRAINING OF ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL

SEC. 203. (a) Section 793(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295h-2(a)) is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1969" and (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1970;" the following: "$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975;".

(b) Section 793(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 295h-2(b)) is amended by striking out "training centers for allied health professions" and inserting in lieu thereof "agencies, institutions, and organizations".

(c) Section 793(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 285h-2(c)) is amended by striking out "centers" and inserting in lieu thereof "public and nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations".

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW METHODS

SEC. 204. (a) Section 794 of the Public Health Service (42 U.S.C. 295h-3) is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1969;", (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1970;" the following: "$6,000,000 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1971; $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975;" and (3) by inserting "or contracts with" immediately after "grants to".

(b) Such section 794 is further amended (1) by inserting "(1)" after "projects", and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", (2) to study and develop mechanisms for determining the equivalency and proficiency of previously acquired knowledge and skills related to the allied health professions, (3) to develop, experiment with, and demonstrate new teaching methods and curriculums relating to the allied health professions, and (4) to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate new means of recruitment, retraining, or retention of allied health personnel".

ENCOURAGEMENT OF FULL UTILIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL TALENT FOR THE ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

SEC. 205. Part G of title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding immediately after section 794 thereof the following new sections:

"GRANTS AND CONTRACTS TO ENCOURAGE FULL UTILIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL TALENT FOR ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

"SEC. 794a. (a) To assist in meeting the need for additional trained personnel in the allied health professions, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to State or local educational agencies or other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, or enter into contracts without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. (5)), for the purpose of—

"(1) identifying individuals of financial, educational, or cultural need with a potential for education or training in the allied health professions, including returning veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States with training or experience in the health field, and encouraging and assisting them, whenever appropriate, to (A) complete secondary school, (B) undertake such postsecondary training as may be required to qualify them for training in the allied health professions, and (C) undertake postsecondary educational training in the allied health professions, or

"(2) publicizing existing sources of financial aid available to persons undertaking training or education in the allied health professions.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $1,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"SCHOLARSHIP GRANTS

"SEC. 794b. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make (in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe) grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations with an established program for training or retraining of personnel in the allied health professions or occupations for (1) scholarships to be awarded by such agency, institution, or organization to students thereof, and (2) scholarships in retraining programs of such agency, institution, or organization to be awarded to allied health professions personnel in occupations for which such agency, institution, or organization determines that there is a need for the development of, or the expansion of, training.

"(b) Scholarships awarded by any agency, institution, or organization from grants under subsection (a) shall be awarded for any year only to individuals of exceptional financial need who require such assistance for such year in order to pursue a course of study offered by such agency, institution, or organization.

"(c) Grants under subsection (a) may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and at such intervals as the Secretary may deem appropriate and with appropriate adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(d) Any scholarship awarded from grants under subsection (a) to any individual for any year shall cover such portion of the individual's tuition, fees, books, equipment, and living expenses as the agency, institution, or organization awarding the scholarship may determine to be needed by such individual for such year on the basis of his requirements and financial resources; except that the amount of any such scholarship shall not exceed $2,000, plus $600 for each dependent (not in excess of three) in the case of any individual who is awarded such a scholarship.

"(e) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

"SEC. 794c. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations with established programs for the training or retraining of personnel in the allied health professions under which the Secretary will make grants to such agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in the operation of work-study programs for individuals undergoing training or retraining provided by such programs.

"(b) Any agreement entered into pursuant to this section with a public or nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization shall—

"(1) provide that such agency, institution, or organization, will operate a work-study program for the part-time employment of its students or trainees either (A) in work for such agency, institution, or organization or (B) pursuant to arrangements between such agency, institution, or organization and another public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization, in work which is in the public interest for such other agency, institution, or organization;

"(2) provide that any such work-study program shall be operated in such manner that its operation will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for employment:

"(3) provide that any such work-study program will provide conditions of employment, for the students or trainees participating therein, which are appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as type of work performed, prevailing wages in the area for similar work, and proficiency of the individual in the performance of the work involved;

"(4) provide that no Federal funds made available to such agency, institution, or organization pursuant to such agreement shall be used for the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility or part thereof which is used or is to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(5) provide that Federal funds made available to such agency, institution, or organization pursuant to such agreement shall be used only to make payments to its students or trainees performing work in the work-study program operated by such agency, institution, or organization; except that such agency, institution, or organization may use a portion of such funds to meet administrative expenses connected with the operation of such program, but the portion which may be so used shall not exceed 5 per centum of that part of such funds which is used for the puropse of making payments, to such students or trainees, for work performed for a public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization other than the agency, institution, or organization receiving such Federal funds pursuant to such agreement;

"(6) provide that such agency, institution, or organization, in selecting students or trainees for employment in such work-study program, will give preference to individuals from low-income families, and that no individual will be selected for employment in such program unless he (A) is in need of the earnings from such employment in order to pursue a course of study (whether on a full-time or part-time basis) for training or retraining of personnel in the allied health professions provided by such agency, institution, or organization, (B) is capable, in the opinion of such agency, institution, or organization, of maintaining good standing in such course of study while employed under such work-study program, and (C) in the case of any individual who at the time he applies for such employment is a new student or trainee, has been accepted for enrollment in such course of in the case of any other individual, is enrolled in such course of study on such a basis and is maintaining good standing in such course of study.

"(7) provide that such agency, institution, or organization shall, in the operation of such work-study program, provide all individuals desiring employment therein an opportunity to make application for such employment and that, to the extent that necessary funds are available, all eligible applicants will be employed in such program; and

"(8) include such other provisions as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall not approve any grant under this section unless the applicant therefor provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that funds made available through such grant will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of non-Federal funds which would, in the absence of such grant, be made available for the purpose for which such grant is requested.

"(d)(1) Funds provided through any grant made under this section shall not be used to pay more than—

"(A) 90 per centum, in the case of the three-year period commencing on the date of the enactment of this section,

"(B) 85 per centum, in the case of the one-year period which immediately succeeds the period referred to in clause (A),

"(C) 80 per centum, in the case of the one-year period which immediately succeeds the period referred to in clause (B), nor

"(D) 75 per centum, in the case of any period after the period referred to in clause (C),

of the costs attributable to the payment of compensation to students or trainees for employment in the work-study program with respect to which such grant is made.

"(2)(A) In determining (for purposes of paragraph (1)) the amounts attributable to the payment of compensation to students or trainees for employment in any work-study program, there shall be disregarded any Federal funds (other than such funds derived from a grant under this section) used for the payment of such compensation.

"(B) In determining (for purposes of paragraph (1)) the total amounts expended for the payment of compensation to students or trainees for employment in any work-study program operated by any agency, institution, or organization receiving a grant under this section, there shall be included the reasonable value of compensation provided by such agency, institution, or organization to such students or trainees in the form of services and supplies (including tuition, board, and books).

"(e) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"LOANS FOR STUDENTS OF THE ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

"SEC. 794d. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized (in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe) to enter into an agreement for the establishment and operation of a student loan fund in accordance with this section with any public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization which has an established program for the training or retraining of personnel in the allied health professions.

"(2) Each agreement entered into under this subsection shall—

"(A) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by such agency, institution, or organization for students or trainees enrolled in such program;

"(B) provide for deposit in the fund of (i) the Federal capital contributions paid under this section to the agency, institution, or organization by the Secretary, (ii) an additional amount from other sources equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal capital contributions, (iii) collections of principal and interest on loans made from the fund, (iv) collections pursuant to subsection (b)(6), and (v) any other earnings of the fund;

"(C) provide that the fund shall be used only for loans to students or trainees enrolled in such program of the agency, institution, or organization in accordance with the agreement and for costs of collection of such loans and interest thereon;

"(D) provide that loans may be made from such fund to students pursuing a course of study (whether full time or part time) in such program of such agency, institution, or organization and that while the agreement remains in effect no such student who has attended such program of such agency, institution, or organization before July 1, 1971, shall receive a loan from a loan fund established under section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and

"(E) contain such other provisions as are necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States.

"(b)(1) The total of the loans for any academic year (or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Secretary) made by agencies, institutions or organizations from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this section may not exceed $1,500 in the case of any student. The aggregate of the loans for all years from such funds may not exceed $6,000 in the case of any student.

"(2) Loans from any such student loan fund by any agency, institution or organization shall be made on such terms and conditions as it may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Secretary may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the agency, institution, or organization) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of such fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

"(A) such loan may be made only to a student who (i) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a part-time course of study at the agency, institution, or organization, and (ii) is capable, in the opinion of the agency, institution, or organization, of maintaining good standing in such course of study;

"(B) such loan shall be repayable in equal or graduated periodic installments (with the right of the borrower to accelerate repayment) over the ten-year period which begins nine months after the student ceases to pursue a part-time or full-time course of study in a program for the training or retraining of personnel in the allied health professions at an agency, institution, or organization approved by the Secretary, excluding from such ten-year period all (i) periods (up to three years) of (I) active duty performed by the borrower as a member of a uniformed service, or (II) service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, and (ii) periods (up to five years) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at a school leading to a baccalaureate or associate degree or the equivalent of either or to a higher degree in one of the allied health professions;

"(C) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for full-time employment in any of the allied health professions (including teaching any such profession or service as an administrator, supervisor, or specialist in any such profession) in any public or private nonprofit health professions (including teaching any agency, institution, or organization, or in a rural area with an individual practitioner of medicine or dentistry if such service is approved by a local county health department or its equivalent at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete year of such service, except that such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete year of service in such a profession in a public or other nonprofit hospital, other health service facility or health agency which is determined, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, to have a substantial shortage of persons rendering service in such profession, and for purposes of any cancellation at such higher rate, an amount equal to an additional 50 per centum of the total amount of such loans plus interest may be canceled;

"(D) the liability to repay the unpaid balance of such loan and accrued interest thereon shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if the Secretary determines that he has become permanently and totally disabled;

"(E) such a loan shall bear interest on the unpaid balance of the loan, computed only for periods during which the loan is repayable, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum;

"(F) such a loan shall be made without security or endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required; and

"(G) no note or other evidence of any such loan may be transferred or assigned by the agency, institution, or organization making the loan except that, if the borrower transfers to another agency, institution, or organization participating in the program under this section, such note or other evidence of a loan may be transferred to such other agency, institution, or organization.

"(3) When all or any part of a loan, or interest, is canceled under this subsection, the Secretary shall pay to the agency, institution, or organization an amount equal to its proportionate share of the canceled portion, as determined by the Secretary.

"(4) Any loan for any year by an agency, institution, or organization from a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Secretary or such agreement and, upon notice to the Secretary by the agency, institution, or organization that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate.

"(5) An agreement under this section with any agency, institution, or organization shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established thereunder reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in the agency, institution, or organization in need thereof.

"(6) Subject to regulations of the Secretary, an agency, institution, or organization may assess a charge with respect to a loan from the loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this section for failure of the borrower to pay all or any part of an installment when it is due and, in the case of a borrower who is entitled to deferment of the loan under paragraph (2)(B) or cancellation of part or all of the loan under paragraph (2)(C), for any failure to file timely and satisfactory evidence of such entitlement. The amount of any such charge may not exceed $1 for the first month or part of a month by which such installment or evidence is late and $2 for each such month or part of a month thereafter. The agency, institution, or organization may elect to add the amount of any such charge to the principal amount of the loan as of the first day after the day on which such installment or evidence was due, or to make the amount of the charge payable to the agency, institution, or organization not later than the due date of the next installment after receipt by the borrower of notice of the assessment of the charge.

"(7) An agency, institution, or organization may provide, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, that during the repayment period of a loan from a loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this section payments of principal and interest by the borrower with respect to all the outstanding loans made to him from loan funds so established shall be at a rate equal to not less than $15 per month.

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for Federal capital contributions to student loan funds pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(B)(i) $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and there are also authorized to be appropriated such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan from any academic year ending before July 1, 1975, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary (1) for payments into the funds established by subsection (f)(4), and (2) in accordance with agreements under this section, for Federal capital contributions to schools with which such agreements have been made, to be used together with deposits in such funds pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii), for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

"(d)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (c) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each agency, institution, or organization, which has an established program or programs for the training or retraining of personnel in the allied health professions approved by the Secretary, an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in such program or programs in such agency, institution, or organization approved by the Secretary bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in such programs in all such agencies, institutions, or organizations in all the States. The number of persons enrolled, in such a program, on a full-time basis in such agencies, institutions, or organizations for purposes of the subsection shall be determined by the Secretary for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him. Funds available in any fiscal year for payment to agencies, institutions, or organizations under this section (whether as Federal capital contributions or as loans under subsection (f)) which are in excess of the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (c) for that year shall be allotted among agencies, institutions, or organizations approved by the Secretary in such manner as the Secretary determines will best carry out the purposes of this section.

"(2) The Secretary shall from time to time set dates by which agencies, institutions, or organizations must file applications for Federal capital contributions and for loans pursuant to subsection (f).

"(3) The Federal capital contributions to a loan fund of an agency, institution, or organization approved by the Secretary under this section shall be paid from time to time in such installments as the Secretary determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in its loan fund.

"(e)(1) After June 30, 1979, and not later than September 30, 1979, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the loan fund established under an agreement pursuant to subsection (a)(2) by each agency, institution or organization approved by the Secretary as follows:

"(A) The Secretary shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to such balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1979, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(B)(i) bears to the total amount in such fund derived from such Federal capital contributions from funds deposited therein pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii).

"(B) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the agency, institution, or organization approved by the Secretary.

"(2) After September 30, 1970, each agency, institution or organization approved by the Secretary with which the Secretary has made an agreement under this section shall pay to the Secretary, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by it after June 30, 1979, in payment of principal and interest on loans made from the loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (other than so much of such fund as relates to payments from the revolving fund established by subsection (f)(4)) as was determined for the Secretary under paragraph (1).

"(f)(1)(A) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the next four fiscal years, the Secretary may make loans, from the revolving fund established by paragraph (4), to any public or private nonprofit agency, institution or organization approved by him, to provide all or part of the capital needed by any such agency, institution or organization for making loans to students under this subsection (other than capital needed to make the institutional contributions required of agencies, institutions or organizations by subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)). Loans to students from such borrowed sums shall be subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations set forth in subsection (b). The requirement in subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii) with respect to institutional contributions by agencies, institutions, or organizations to student loan funds shall not apply to loans made to agencies, institutions, or organizations under this subsection.

"(B) A loan to an agency, institution, or organization approved by the Secretary under this subsection may be made upon such terms and conditions, consistent with applicable provisions of subsection (a), as the Secretary deems appropriate. If the Secretary deems it to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this subsection will be achieved, these terms and conditions may include provisions making the obligation of the agency, institution, or organization to the Secretary on such a loan payable solely from such revenues or other assets or security (including collections on loans to students) as the Secretary may approve. Such a loan shall bear interest at a rate which the Secretary determines to be adequate to cover (i) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Secretary under subsection, and (ii) probable losses.

"(2) If an agency, institution, or organization approved by the Secretary borrows any sums under this subsection, the Secretary shall agree to pay to it (A) an amount equal to 90 per centum of the loss to it from defaults on student loans made from such sums, (B) the amount by which the interest payable by it on such sums exceeds the interest received by it on student loans made from such sums, (C) an amount equal to the amount of collection expenses authorized by subsection (a) (2) (C) to be paid out of a student loan fund with respect to such sums, and (D) the amount of the principal which is canceled pursuant to subsection (b) (2) (C) or (D) with respect to student loans made from such sums. There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this paragraph.

"(3) The total of the loans made in any fiscal year under this subsection shall not exceed the lesser of (1) such limitations as may be specified in appropriation Acts, and the difference between $35,000,000 and the amount of Federal capital contributions paid under this section for that year.

"(4) (A) There is hereby created within the Treasury an allied professions training fund (hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as the 'fund') which shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation as a revolving fund for the purposes of this subsection. A business-type budget for the fund shall be prepared, transmitted to the Congress, considered, and enacted in the manner prescribed by law (sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, 31 U.S.C. 847–849) for wholly owned Government corporations.

"(B) The fund shall consist of appropriations paid into the fund pursuant to subsection (c), appropriations made pursuant to this paragraph, all amounts received by the Secretary as interest payments or repayment of principal on loans under this subsection, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by him from his operations in connection with this subsection (other than paragraph (2)), including any moneys derived directly or indirectly from the sale of assets, or beneficial interest or participation in assets, of the fund.

"(C) All loans, expenses (other than normal administrative expenses), and payments pursuant to operations of the Secretary under this subsection other than paragraph (s)) shall be paid from the fund, including (but not limited to) expenses and payments of the Secretary in connection with the sale, under section 302 (c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, of participation in obligations acquired under this subsection. From time to time, and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay from the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations paid out for loans under this subsection, less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield during the months preceding each fiscal year on outstanding Treasury obligations of maturity comparable to the average maturity of loans made from the fund. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. If at any time the Secretary determines that moneys in the fund exceed the present and any reasonable prospective future requirements of the fund, such excess may be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(g) The Secretary may agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this section, and may compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand of the United States arising or acquired under this section."

DEFINITION OF NONPROFIT AGENCY, INSTITUTION, OR ORGANIZATION

SEC. 206. Section 795 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after "professions", in paragraph (3) thereof, the following: ", or any agency, institution, or organization,".

SEC. 207. Section 798 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"STUDY

"SEC. 798. (a) The Secretary shall conduct a study of the administration of—

"(1) the provisions of this part,

"(2) other provisions of this Act which relate to the allied health professions or the training of individuals to prepare them to engage in any of such professions; and

"(3) provisions of law which are administered by the Commissioner of Education and which relate to the allied health professions or the training of individuals to prepare them to engage in any of such professions;

with a view to determining the adequacy of such provisions and the programs established pursuant thereto to meet the needs of the Nation for allied health professions personnel."

ADVANCE FUNDING

SEC. 208. Part G of title VII of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding after section 798 thereof the following new section:

"ADVANCE FUNDING

"SEC. 799. Sums authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for grants, contracts, or other payments, under this part are hereby authorized to be included in the appropration Act for the fiscal year preceding such fiscal year."

LICENSURE REPORT

SEC. 209. Part G of title VII of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding after section 799 (as added by section 208 of this Act) the following new section:

"LICENSURE REPORT

"SEC. 799a. The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress, prior to July 1, 1971, a report identifying the major problems associated with licensure, certification, and other qualifications for practice or employment of health personnel (including group practice of health personnel), together with summaries of the activities (if any) of Federal agencies, professional organizations, or other instrumentalities directed toward the alleviation of such problems and toward maximizing the proper and efficient utilization of health personnel in meeting the health needs of the Nation. Such report shall include specific recommendations by the Secretary for steps to be taken toward the solution of the problems so identified in such report."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I again thank the Senator from New York and express my appreciation to him for his great contributions to the bill and for aiding in the expedition of the hearings and for making valuable contributions to the bill in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and on the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the leadership of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) in health matters has been most enviable and a great credit to the people of Texas who sent him here. It is an indication of his high character and dedication. He needs no greater compliment than to say it was a splendid exercise of leadership in the finest traditions of our former committee chairman, former Senator Hill, of Alabama, who was probably the leading Senator in our history in terms of advances in the field of health care and research.

I am very honored and privileged to have been associated with the Senator from Texas in this endeavor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I again express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New York for his great contributions over the years in the field of health and health care.

SENATOR HATFIELD COMMENTS ON FUTURE FOREST NEEDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recently, our distinguished colleague from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) showed his concern for future generations of Americans in a speech before the East Portland Rotary in Portland, Oreg.

His speech dealt with how we will utilize our forests to meet the needs of our growing population for recreation and for lumber. Senator HATFIELD's remarks show an insight into the problems we will face, and evidence a fresh approach to the solutions.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) also has prepared a first draft of a bill to implement his ideas. He plans to introduce the bill early in the 1971 session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the Senator from Oregon and his draft bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREST ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT

(Remarks by Senator MARK O. HATFIELD, before the East Portland Rotary Club, Portland, Oreg., July 2, 1970)

Our timber, the backbone of Oregon's economy and Oregon's forest environment, is on the threshold of growth and use never before known to us.

In order to stimulate this growth and to provide one answer to the challenges which face us all, I wish to announce today the details of legislation which I will introduce and which will, I believe, stimulate that growth—growth in vitally needed recreational opportunities for our people, growth in timber supply and growth in work opportunities.

Legislation which I have been considering for some time would have as its primary thrust the intensive and improved management of our national forestlands while at the same time providing incentives to the small, private landowners of this country to put their fallow or uneconomic acreage into the production of trees.

I will go into more detail later, but as these remarks will demonstrate we are falling far short of the production of timber which we must have for our future population growth and the crying need for housing. We are not meeting the recreation demands of our citizens close to their homes; we are not adequately protecting our natural environment and we are allowing private land to sit idle when it could be put into productive use by planting trees we must have to provide for these housing and recreation demands.

My legislation is in harmony with that of the President who, on June 19th, directed the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to improve the quality of the federal forestlands in order to increase timber yield in a manner consistent with restoration, maintenance, preservation and enchancement of the environment.

The Presidential order to increase timber was predicated on the findings of a 15-month study conducted by the White House Cabinet Committee Task Force on Softwood Lumber and Plywood after the 1968–69 boom and bust of lumber and plywood prices.

Mr. Robert P. Mayo, then Director of the all-powerful Bureau of the Budget in the Executive Office of the President, was named Chairman of that Task Force.

On June 19th, almost simultaneously with the White House release, Mr. Mayo addressed the Forest Industries Marketing Conference in Eugene, at which he commented on the findings of the Task Force report. The following are excerpts from Mr. Mayo's remarks which deal directly with the forest economy and our environment:

"The Task Force, of which I am Chairman, has been studying the supply-demand situation in softwood lumber and plywood in terms of both the short and longer term implications.

"From 1972 to 1976, short supplies of softwood timber and/or substitutes could restrain housing construction unless effective programs are developed to expand timber availability. Our latest estimates indicate that softwood requirements in the period 1974 to 1976 may increase about 11 billion board feet over 1968 consumption.

"For purposes of estimating, we are projecting:

"A U.S. population of 300 million people by the year 2000, an increase of almost 50 percent over the present population.

"Residential construction—the nation's largest market for softwood timber products—rising from 1.8 million units in 1968 to about 3 million units by the mid-1970's, and 3.5 million units by the year 2000.

"We project roundwood demand to rise up to 95 billion board feet in the year 2000—nearly double the 48 billion board feet consumed in both 1968 and 1969. This is clearly a major national challenge—to government, to the forest products industry, and to small owners of commercial woodland."

In the quote which follows, Mr. Mayo pinpoints not only the interests of Oregonians, but the interest of all who are concerned with our environment in the following terms:

"We estimate that, with prudent and intensive management, the allowable cut in the national forests can be increased by 7 to 8 billion board feet over the next decade. I believe this can be done in ways fully consistent with environment considerations and with sustained yield and multiple use objectives."

The report of the White House's Timber Task Force makes it clear that the United States faces a serious timber shortage once home building resumes.

This means we have moved into the era where we must now secure full development and properly balanced use of Oregon's forest resources.

During the past two years, the Forest Service has gone on record on several occasions stating that substantial increases could be made in allowable cuts.

The Bureau of the Budget is now on record acknowledging the potential of the public forestlands, and the President of the United States has directed that timber production from federal lands be increased, and asks that ways be found to increase the production of softwood timber by small, non-industrial forestland owners.

On June 22, the Chief of the Forest Service said that the President approved the basic idea of a direct subsidy to aid small, non-industrial forestland owners.

On June 23, the long-awaited Public Land Law Review Commission report was issued. This year-long study of public land policy, costing over 7 million dollars, concluded, in part, as follows:

1. Federally owned timber is vital to the wood economy of the country;

2. Federally owned timber is vital to the economics of many communities;

3. Federal policies with respect to the sale of this timber can result in the life or death of firms that use it;

4. The federal government's dominance as a supplier of timber will continue in the future.

5. Lands should be classified for commercial timber production where that is the dominant use and federal programs on these lands be financed by appropriations from a "Revolving Fund," made up of receipts from timber sales from these lands.

The goals for the forestlands for this country have been established.

The American people are calling in a loud, clear and unmistakable voice for conservation leadership which will result in this nation's forestlands, both public and private, providing beauty and prosperity in increasing amounts which will be of benefit to present and future generations of Americans.

I have strong feelings about forestland conservation and an equally strong desire to get things moving. We need a way to get the job done.

I have drafted legislation which contains provisions necessary to implement President Nixon's call for environmental enhancement and increased production.

The American Forestry Act of 1971 is designed to do just this. It will achieve the following major objectives:

1. Increase productivity by:

A. Intensive management of publicly owned commercial forestlands.

B. Providing matching grants to state and private owners to rehabilitate and reforest presently non-productive lands.

2. Enhance the environment by:

A. Developing forestlands which will serve as recreational areas during growth periods.

B. Re-establishing the ecological balance through the improvement of the quality of the air, water and soil.

3. Improve awareness of forest values by:

A. Accelerated educational programs.

B. Accelerated research programs.

4. Provide a flexible program for log exports.

INCREASING FOREST PRODUCTIVITY

The White House Timber Task Force projections on timber supplies shows shortages requiring that mandatory action be taken now to provide the increased timber growth. Reforesting and rehabilitating the forestlands of the United States can be one of the quickest and most tangible ways to enhance this country's environment while at the same time growing timber for the future needs.

The forestlands of the United States, both public and private, are one of this nation's most extensive and valuable renewable natural resources. They must be managed to make the full contributions to the nation's welfare now and in the future.

THE NATURE OF THE NEED

With American people demanding more from their country's resources, the forestland is one which can, within limits, respond to increases in the public's needs and desires.

There can, and there must, be an accommodation for all uses of forest resources.

The lack of decent housing is one of the most serious sociological problems facing the United States today, and much of the unrest in this country can be tied directly to this problem.

Congress recognized housing as a top national priority in 1968 when it reaffirmed the national goal set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

In the 1968 Housing Act, Congress set a national goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated units by 1978, an average of 2.6 million units a year.

Unfortunately, however, the construction of housing for our people is staggering along at the undistinguished rate of about 1.2 million starts for the current year.

We won't reach the nation's housing goals until there is a substantial infusion of funds into the conventional mortgage market, a lowering and stabilization of interest rates and some brakes applied to the zooming cost of construction.

The Congress has passed the Emergency Housing Act of 1970 which provides a 250 million-dollar subsidy to the Federal Home Loan Bank. This should provide the stimulus to add approximately 300,000 new housing starts.

The failure of homebuilding to keep pace with demand forewarns that when home construction does resume, there will be an unprecedented demand for timber, and such demand may again skyrocket prices as it did two years ago. Loggers and lumbermen are tired of riding the boom and bust roller coaster.

THE KEY TO MEETING THE NEEDS

Our timber needs can be met by improving our management of public forest lands and by providing a means to stimulate private landowners to reforest their lands.

My American Forestry Act of 1971 will establish a "Forestland Management Fund" to deposit receipts from the sale of public timber. This will make available the funding necessary for intensive management of public forestlands to increase productivity, while insuring that funds to develop and protect the other uses of the forest resources, at the same time restoring, maintaining and enhancing the quality of the public forestland environment.

The proposed "Forestland Management Fund" is similar to the "revolving fund" recommended by the Public Land Law Review Commission just nine days ago.

This bill establishes an "American Advisory Board" appointed by the President which will counsel and assist the federal agencies in determining the allocation of uses of the nation's forestland resources.

Public timber sales generate $350 million annually. Funds are appropriated by Congress to manage and protect the national forest including timber, water, recreation, range, wildlife, and the building of roads.

My legislation anticipates that funds will continue to be used for these purposes.

Increased receipts will be generated by intensive management techniques.

These funds should continue to be applied for the enhancement of our public forestlands and to stimulate development of reforestation on privately owned lands.

The key to meeting the nation's long-term needs for wood is in developing the private forestlands.

Approximately one-third of the surface area of the United States is in forest cover, and over one-half of this area is in privately held small ownerships.

The June issue of *American Forests* indicates there are some 4 million private owners who own and control some 200 million acres of these small non-industrial tracts. I believe a way can be found to require a tree planted for every tree cut.

The cost of rehabilitating and reforesting this nation's non-producing forestland and its environment is going to be high. However, I have little doubt that the direct and indirect public benefits will far exceed the costs.

The principal single purpose of my "American Forestry Act of 1971" is to make it possible to grow as much wood on every acre of suitable forestland as each acre is capable of producing. In a single word, the purpose of this Act is Growth.

ENHANCING THE ENVIRONMENT

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 declares a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere, and stimulate the health and welfare of man, and enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the nation.

Our public lands must receive a better quality of management to enhance the environment in terms of scenery, improved air and water quality, soil stabilization, outdoor recreational opportunities and spritual enrichment.

The "American Forestry Act of 1971" meets this challenge.

Not only will the public forests be managed with strong environmental consideration, my proposal calls for the development of a large number of small tracts of privately held land that will be made available for recreation purposes during the growth period of the forest.

This can be done through a leasing program administered at the state level which will provide sufficient inducement to the owner to permit public recreational use.

Funds for the administration of this program can come from several sources. Legislative deliberation should determine that which is most appropriate.

A national policy which permits vast expenditures of public funds to keep crops out of production should not preclude the use of those funds for forest development. No longer can we enjoy this luxury.

The most appropriate application of this program would be to develop forested tracts near our urban centers for the enjoyment of families who do not have the inclination, the time, or the money to backpack into the more remote areas.

IMPROVE OUR KNOWLEDGE OF FOREST VALUES

In consonance with other on-going educational programs, this proposal calls for expansion of our environmental educational effort.

Our programs recognize the role of enlightened forest management and the relationship and value of well-managed forests to our total environmental needs.

Strong emphasis on forestry research should continue at the state level. Land grant institutions have a far-reaching role to exert in the development of improved forestry techniques, genetics and practices.

Environmental implications of technical changes must be fully evaluated. We must apply the knowledge learned and make sure that it is taught in our elementary and secondary schools so that our younger citizens can become more intelligently aware of the reasons why the forests are managed as they are.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. The proposed legislation provides for a flexible log export policy. It will authorize our forest management agencies to reduce or halt altogether log exports as determined by our ability to meet domestic needs.

2. The "American Forestry Act of 1971" provides specifically for no alteration, amendment, repeal, modification or conflict with the O & C Act of 1937. The recent Public Land Law Review Commission report relating to payments in lieu of taxes on federal lands could have serious impact in Oregon. This should prompt each county to make an early in-depth analysis of its present receipts from timberlands administered by federal agencies compared to the receipts recommended or implied in the Public Land Law Review Commission report.

CONFLICTS

For some time I have been deeply troubled over what appears to be a steady drift into deadlock. The national efforts in forest conservation have been nullified by powerful groups of strongly spirited and highly motivated people. This has had a profound influence on forestry in Oregon.

The strong, united conservation surge which marked the first 50 years of this century has fractured and split. During the past decade conservation positions have increasingly become polarized and hardened. "Amenity conservation" is in a contest with "Wise Use Conservation." Yet in between the two there seems to be a large area of middle ground where both may attain some of their announced objectives, but perhaps not to the degree and magnitude which they might otherwise have hoped as the sole dominating force.

But we cannot permit this growing polarization to stop progress.

CONCLUSION

My bill is proposed legislation. I do not intend to introduce it for legislative action until I have had an opportunity to hear from all interested parties.

The bill which finally emerges should represent that which is needed to get forest conservation moving in a direction that best meets the needs of present and future generations of Americans.

My concern is that each state be in a position to play a dominant role in the management of its own resources and environment with the federal role being limited to technical and financial assistance.

Yes, this is a new approach. It is the type of program that can do much for Oregonians.

We have a great potential for adding to our nation's total timber supply, exceeded only by our potential to demonstrate our ability to merge these goals with our environmental needs.

I have faith in America and in the ability of all Americans, working together to solve these problems.

I believe that our people will respond favorably to this type of challenging program which should help lead the way to better housing, more and better recreational opportunities; and purer air and water.

But most important of all, it will provide a measure of hope for the future and restored faith in our ability to provide for not only the immediate housing and recreation needs but for the future of our children and our children's children.

[July 1, 1970, first working draft of bill to be introduced by Senator MARK O. HATFIELD, of Oregon.]

S. —

A bill to provide for the reforestration and rehabilitation of forestlands throughout the nation in order to improve forestland productivity and the environment; to provide for balanced management, development, protection and preservation of forestlands on public lands of the United States by the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior in order to meet the increasing national demand for timber, recreation, including wilderness, water of high quality, pure air, minerals, forage, and fish and wildlife habitat; and educational program in forest environment, technical guidance and assistance, and forestland research; establishment of suitable and special funding; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "American Forestry Act of 1971."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds—

(a) that fulfillment of the Nation's increasing need for forest products, recreational opportunities, water of high quality, pure air, minerals, forage, and fish and wildlife habitat, plus restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the forestland environment, are a shared responsibility of forestland owners and reponsive balanced forestland management is needed which promotes the national welfare by creating and maintaining harmonious conditions in terms of both beauty and prosperity in a manner which best fulfills the social, economic and other requirements for present and future generations of Americans.

(b) that there is a pressing and growing need for massive new efforts to reforest and rehabilitate deforested and partially stocked Federal and private forestlands which are not contributing to the national wood needs nor to a quality environment and often represent degradation of both;

(c) that there is a need to strengthen and broaden the base in forest environment education, and technical guidance and research which have fallen far behind national needs, and are responsible, in part, for this Nation's projected deficiency in timber supply and deterioration of the forestland environment;

(d) that except for Federal forestlands, the expenditure of funds authorized under the terms of this Act shall be directed through State Governments, due to the rural nature of the forestland resource and the predominance of small private non-industrial forestland ownerships;

(e) that nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, interpret, modify or be in conflict with the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 215); O&C Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 874); Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 986); Wilderness Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 891) and the National Environment Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852), unless specifically provided under the provisions of this Act.

TITLE I. GENERAL FORESTLAND CONSERVATION MEASURES

NON-FEDERAL FORESTLANDS: REFORESTATION AND REHABILITATION

SEC. 101. (a) With general funding by the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, under conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in each State, to cooperate with the States and through them with private organizations or individuals therein, in the rehabilitation and reforestation of suitable State and small private non-industrial forestland ownerships, provided, however, such grants will be limited to that acreage currently in a non-stocked or poorly stocked condition at the time of enactment of this legislation, including the following:

(1) To provide matching grants to States for reforestation and rehabilitation of suitable State-owned forestlands;

(2) To provide matching grants to States for the leasing or purchase of suitable lands from private owners for rehabilitation or development of forestlands which can serve as recreational areas during timber growth;

(3) To provide grants through the States for matching private investments in the reforestation and rehabilitation of suitable small private nonindustrial forestland ownerships. In any one year the reforestation and rehabilitation provisions shall not apply to any tract or tracts of land which, when combined, are in excess of 1,000 acres, under the sole ownership of an individual, corporation, partnership, trust, association, or any other business unit, device or arrangement;

(4) To establish or expand and operate forest tree nurseries where private sources of forest trees are inadequate;

(5) To provide assistance for State developed and controlled expanded programs in forest environment education, technical forestland management guidance and forestland research.

(b) In no case other than for preliminary investigations, shall the amount expended by the Federal government in any State during any fiscal year, under this section, exceed the amount expended by the State and others for the same purpose during the same fiscal year, including the expenditures of forest owners or operators which are required by State law.

(c) As a condition for the expenditure of directly appropriated Federal funds for the reforestation and rehabilitation of forestlands upon private property, the fee owner will be required to sign a lien agreement, management contract, or similar device, with the State for a period of time determined and specified by the State, or until the State certifies the first cut of timber suitable for industrial use. This lien, contract or device is intended to assure restoration of timber productivity and its environment or obtain repayment of the grant, plus interest, if such lands are not maintained and protected for the purposes for which funds were granted, and in addition, to assure that timber harvest will be promptly matched by reforestation. For State and local government-owned lands, evidence of laws, ordinances, or public resolutions acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture will be deemed necessary to satisfy this requirement. In either case, priority in treatment will be given to those lands yielding the greatest public benefits.

(d) Funds are authorized for use to aid in the establishment, development, and expansion of State and private forest tree nurseries; provided that only tree seed which is certified as to source and quality is used.

(e) On an availability basis, tree seedlings may be sold at cost from forest nurseries for private use in reforesting small privately owned tracts or non-industrial forestlands.

(f) Funds are authorized to accelerate and expand forest environment education, technical forestland guidance, and forestland research under direction of the appropriate officials in each State. An expansion in environmental studies, particularly those dealing with forestland resources and its associated environment, is needed at the lower grade levels throughout school systems; technical assistance through strengthened and expanded cooperative extension forestry is needed to provide the means of securing environmental improvements as well as increased production of forest products, particularly from small forestland ownerships; and, special forestland research grants are needed to accelerate studies in new ways and methods of improving environmental management, intensive forest production, and wood utilization.

(g) Each State receiving Federal funds for the purposes of this Act shall prepare a State reforestation and rehabilitation plan in cooperation with the Federal agencies administering Federal lands within the State which shall be approved by the American Forestry Board, hereinafter provided, prior to the expenditure or allocation of Federal funds for development of State or private forestlands.

TITLE II. FEDERAL FORESTLANDS

FORESTLAND MANAGEMENT FUND

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a "Forestland Management Fund." Except as hereinafter provided, beginning —— there shall be credited to the fund all receipts from (1) the sale of timber and from any other source of revenue from the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service and (2) the sale of timber from public domain lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) The provision of Section 3 of the Materials Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 681) as amended, which authorizes or directs deposits in connection with, or receipts from, the sale of timber from public domain lands, is hereby amended to direct that such deposits or receipts from the sale of timber from public domain lands will be deposited into the "Forestland Management Fund."

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 202. (a) Moneys credited to the "Forestland Management Fund" by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management shall be available in like amounts for expenditure, for the purposes of this Act only when appropriated therefor. Such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available until expended. Any money credited to the fund and not subsequently authorized for expenditure by Congress within two fiscal years following the fiscal years in which such money was credited to the fund, shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipt of the United States Treasury.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 203. (a) Moneys appropriated from the fund shall be allocated in each fiscal year for expenditure as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior or the appropriation Acts making them available. Moneys allocated to any unit of the national forest system administered by the Forest Service or to the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, shall be used for the following purposes:

(1) Timber resource management including reforestation and development

(2) Environment management including restoration, maintenance and enhancement of its quality.

(3) Recreation management.

(4) Fish and wildlife habitat management.

(5) Range resource management.

(6) Soil, water and pure air management.

(7) Administration of mineral claims, leases, special uses, and research for the purposes enumerated in this subsection.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ON FEDERAL FORESTLANDS

SEC. 204. (a) In connection with the sale of timber and other forest products, or the use of public lands of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are authorized and directed to require contractors and permittees to install or take such measures as deemed desirable to minimize adverse environmental impacts that might result from the authorized activity. The costs of such measures shall be recognized in determining the appraised value of the product to be sold or the amount of the permit fee.

REPEAL

SEC. 205. (a) The Act of March 13, 1913 (37 Stat. 843. 843:16 USC 501) is hereby repealed.

TITLE III. GENERAL PROVISIONS

FORESTLAND MANAGEMENT PLAN

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress within one year from the date of enactment, a national plan including national forest and goals for the balanced development, management, preservation, and protection of all the Nation's forestlands for high resource yields and environmental restoration, maintenance and enhancement.

AMERICAN FORESTRY BOARD

SEC. 302. (a) The President shall appoint an advisory board known as the American Forestry Board consisting of not less than seven or more than eleven members, and name a chairman thereof, to serve at his pleasure, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to counsel and assist the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior in determining the allocation between uses of the resources of the Federal forestlands and to direct a balanced expenditure program which will provide for the maximum and properly balanced use of the resources of the Federal forestlands. The Board will also advise on reforestation and rehabilitation of the non-federal forestlands, technical forestland assistance, environmental education and forestland research and other matters directly or indirectly related thereto.

(b) Members of the American Forestry Board shall, while serving in the business of the Board, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, including travel time; and while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allotted travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by Sec. 5703 of Title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government Service intermittently.

(c) Funds are authorized for appropriation from the Federal Forestland Fund for the purposes of this Section.

EXPORT OF UNPROCESSED TIMBER

SEC. 303. (a) Effective January 1, 1972, the volume of unprocessed timber originating on Federal lands of the United States west of the 100th meridian to be sold annually into foreign export will be jointly determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior after public hearings and consultation with the American Forestry Board.

(b) The Secretaries of the Departments administering public forestlands shall issue rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including the prevention of direct substitution of non-Federal timber restricted from export by this section.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 304. (a) In carrying out the provisions of this Act and those Acts cited herein, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior:

(1) Shall as soon as practicable, but not later than three years after the passage of this Act, and not later than every ten years thereafter, hold a public hearing or hearings at a suitable location on the prescribed Federal or State forestland plans. Hearings will be held by appropriate Federal agencies having 10 per centum or more of the public forestland in the State, or, by the State where Federal matching funds are used in a State in which less than 10 per centum of the public forestland in the State is in Federal ownership. Notice of such hearings shall be given through such means as the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior or State officials deem appropriate, including publication in a newspaper or newspapers of general circulation in the area. Such notice shall include statements as to the time and place of the hearing and the place where the plan may be examined. In reaffirming or approving such plans, the Secretary or State official shall consider the views and comments presented by interested individuals, groups, and agencies. A summary and discussion of views and comments shall be included as a part of the record of plans. Such record and the reaffirmed or approved plan shall be available to the public in the office of the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, or appropriate State office in the area. Such plan will apply to each appropriate administrative unit. The appropriate Secretary or State official is authorized and directed to manage the area covered by the plan in conformity with such plan or any revisions thereof adopted in accordance with this subsection. Until such plans have been reviewed or developed and reaffirmed or approved in accordance with this subsection, a public hearing at a location convenient to the area involved shall be announced through such means as the Secretary or State official deems appropriate including publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the area, and shall be held before any sale of timber is made in any unroaded area which is a regionally significant geographical or physical entity;

(2) Shall from time to time consult with the Environmental Quality Council concern-

ing the establishment and administration of balanced forestland use and in carrying out the functions of this Act;

(3) Shall report annually to the Congress on the operation and effectiveness of this Act.

SEC. 305. Definition.

(a) As used in the Act, the term "forestland" means land which is producing, or is capable of producing, crops of industrial wood and not withdrawn from timber utilization by statute or administrative regulation.

SEC. 306. Authorization.

(a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, but for fiscal year 1971 appropriations shall not exceed $—— from the Forestland Management Fund and $—— through general funding by the Congress. Such sums shall be in addition to allotments of grants that may be made available under other authorizations.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1010, S. 2455. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 2455) to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. Subsection (a) of section 103 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 635; 42 U.S.C. 1975b(a)), as amended, is further amended as follows: Strike "$75" and insert in lieu thereof "$100".

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 636; 42 U.S.C. 1975d(a)), as amended, is further amended as follows: Strike "$75" and insert in lieu thereof "$100".

SEC. 3. Section 106 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 636; 42 U.S.C. 1975e), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 106. For the purposes of carrying out this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of $3,400,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter until January 31, 1973, the sum of $3,400,000."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request, which has to the best of my knowledge been cleared all around. It has to do with this bill, which will not be considered before tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The unanimous-consent request will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday July 14, 1970, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill S. 2455, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission and for other purposes, debate on the McClellan amendment No. 770 be limited to one hour and debate on any other amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: Provided, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: Provided further, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: Provided, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the debate on S. 2455 and the final vote thereon, the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 926, S. 1830, an act to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes.

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

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES AMENDMENTS OF 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3215) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the conferees appointed by the Senate and the House met in committee of conference on S. 3215, to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes, and have resolved all differences between the two versions of the bill. Of the 12 differences, two were of major import while the other—though substantive—were resolved without difficulty. I shall confine my remarks to the two major areas of importance and submit for the RECORD a statement pertaining to the other points.

The House amendments amended section 5(h)(3) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 to provide that no State should receive less than $75,000 for any fiscal year from funds allocated to carry out the purposes of that subsection. The Senate bill in authorizing separate appropriations for the purpose of paragraph (3) of subsection (h) of section 5 provided that $50,000 should be allotted to each State and that any funds remaining after such an allotment would be distributed among the States in equal amounts except that for the purpose of the additional allocation Guam and American Samoa would not be considered as States. The conference report provides that from the sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of section 5(h)(3) for any fiscal year not less than $65,000 shall be allotted to each State and adopts the remaining text of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill contains for fiscal year 1971 separate authorizations of appropriations to each endowment for the various activities under the act totaling $40,000,000. The House amendment consolidated the authorization of appropriations into a single sum of $40,000,000 to be appropriated to the Foundation for fiscal year 1971. In addition, the House amendment placed no limit on appropriations for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. The Senate bill placed overall limitations on appropriations of $60 million for fiscal year 1972 and $80 million for fiscal year 1973. The conference report adopts the provisions of the Senate bill.

Except for minor clarifying, conforming provisions this supplemental material reflects the resolution of the minor differences between the Senate- and House-passed bill.

First. The Senate bill provided that this act may be cited as "The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Amendments of 1970." The House amendment contained no short title. The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

Two. The House amendment added additional language to clause 2 of the declaration of purpose contained in section 2 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. The Senate bill had no comparable provision. The conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

Three. The House amendment amended the definition of the humanities to include "comparative religion" and "ethics" and by requiring that particular attention be paid to the relevance of the humanities to current conditions of national life. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

Fourth. The Senate bill incorporated the substantive provisions of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act into section 6 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 deleting the independent study authority of the National Council on the Arts. The House amendment contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts in substance the provisions of the Senate bill.

Fifth. The House amendment authorized the establishment of an Executive Committee of the National Council on the Arts. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report does not contain such new authority.

Sixth. The Senate bill contained a technical amendment providing for a successor to the Recreation Board of the District of Columbia to carry out the functions of a State arts council under section 5(h) of the act. The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision. The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

Seventh. The House amendment but not the Senate bill authorized the National Council on the Humanities to initiate and support research and programs to strengthen teaching potential in the humanities. The conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

Eighth. The House amendment authorized the National Council on the Humanities to foster education in the humanities. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

Ninth. The House amendment authorized the establishment of an Executive Committee of the National Council on the Humanities. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report does not contain such new authority.

Tenth. The Senate bill, unlike the House amendment, amended section 9 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 to include the Archivist of the United States as a member of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities. The conference report contains the provision of the Senate bill.

Mr. President, as chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, I am satisfied that the bill is the best that could be brought out of conference. It was an amicable session, with agreement being easily reached. I move that the Senate adopt the report of the committee of conferees on S. 3215.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 14, 1970, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 13, 1970:

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Saul Haas, of Washington, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring March 26, 1976, vice Roscoe C. Carroll, term expired.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Charles R. Harley, of Maryland, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years, vice John S. Hooker.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Juan C. San Agustin, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Guam for the term of 4 years, vice Francisco R. Santos, resigning.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John MacNair Wright, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Edward Leon Rowny, [redacted] U.S. Army.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be major

Basom, Darrel W., [redacted].
Floyd, John D., [redacted].
Hatch, Richard A., [redacted].
Lovett, John A., [redacted].
Saltee, Lawrence T., [redacted].
Strum, Major, [redacted].
Walker, Wiley W., [redacted].

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, July 13, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou art my rock and my fortress: Therefore for Thy name's sake lead me and guide me. (Psalm 31: 3.)

Almighty and everlasting God, who art the Father of all mankind, we turn from the activities of the day to lift our spirits unto Thee from whom all blessings flow. Keep us ever mindful of Thy presence for without Thee all our labor is in vain.

We pray for guidance as we face the duties of these hours, as we make our decisions, and as we plan for the welfare of our beloved America. For courage and faith we pray that through these difficult days we may do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee.

Bless those who serve under the flag of our country, these Members of Congress, the men and women in our Armed Forces, our prisoners of war, and those in civilian offices. Keep us all united in the common cause of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all men.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 9, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

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

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3430. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1456. An act to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested: