

dices and idols, and rises little by little toward the light. He lacks any capacity for intrigue; he is innocent and straightforward.

He knows that no country has departed from its basic principles so much, in so short a time and without realizing it, as has the United States; that what we need is simplicity and what we can do without is romanticism.

He understands that if what is needful is to be done, we cannot depend on illusions, especially of an impossible good. A calamity can be brought about by persons of great good will. Too many such persons have set themselves up in the "grievance business." Their job is to find things that are wrong; then attempt to right them. If their efforts only make matters worse, they find something else wrong.

Mr. Rivers knows that the last war has been forgotten, erased from the collective American memory—the most devastating commentary history can render is to be forgotten because no one wants to remember.

He has named, numbered, and made perceptible, even to those who disagree with him, all the national verities that animate and sustain us, and that breathe in our blood.

He does his duty as if he were going to live forever, and casts his plans way ahead. He feels responsible without time limitation; the consideration whether he may or may not be around to see the results never enters his thoughts.

The day will come when this man, one of our great legislators and a prophetic thinker, will be recognized at his true value.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SENATE—Monday, December 7, 1970

The Senate met at 12 meridian and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

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

God of grace and God of glory, who long ago illumined the nightly sky with the promise of peace, prepare our hearts for the new advent of Him whose rule is the way to a man's freedom and enduring peace. Strengthen in mind and heart all who labor in this place. Amid the bewilderment and uncertainty about many things make us sure of Thee. May we be unafraid because we have heard the ancient message echoing down the years: "Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people." While we work may we also pray and make ready our hearts for the coming again of Him who brings redemption and peace.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 4, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar of unobjected to bills under rule VIII be dispensed with.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain bills on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1408.

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

TRANSFER OF PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The bill (S. 4561) to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions to make permanent certain provisions thereunder, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 4561

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 358a of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of

1938, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) thereof is amended by deleting "1969 and 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "and succeeding".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-1401) explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

EXPLANATION

This bill would make the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to permit transfers of peanut acreage allotments permanent. Section 358a was added to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by Public Law 90-211 on December 18, 1967, effective for the 1968 and 1969 crop years. It was extended to 1970 by Public Law 91-122 on November 21, 1969. It should now be made permanent in order to enable peanut farmers to acquire allotments of adequate size for efficient farming operations.

COST

Enactment of the bill will not require additional funds.

WATER BANK ACT

The bill (H.R. 15770) to provide for conserving surface waters; to preserve and improve habitat for migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources; to reduce runoff, soil and wind erosion, and contribute to flood control; and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-1393), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into 10 year renewable contracts with landowners and operators in important migratory waterfowl nesting and breeding areas for the conservation of water on specified wetlands.

NEED FOR THE BILL

Each year untold acres of valuable waterfowl habitat are lost forever. These lands are rapidly disappearing because of the accelerated pace in which marshes and swamps are being ditched, dredged, drained, filled, paved, and polluted in order to meet the demands of modern civilization. These encroachments are caused by the constant need for more agricultural lands, more industrial sites, more urban housing developments, more roads, and more airports.

H.R. 15770, would provide the owners and operators of these lands, which are so valuable to migratory waterfowl, an economic alternative to such uses.

BACKGROUND

In 1961, the Congress enacted the Wetlands Loan Act (Public Law 87-383). The act had, as its objective, the acquisition of 2.5 million acres of waterfowl habitat over a 7-year period. In 1967 the act was extended for an additional 8 years, until June 30, 1976.

Under the original goal, it was planned to purchase 750,000 acres of waterfowl refuges and 1,750,000 acres of waterfowl production areas of small wetlands. The latter figure includes fee purchase of 600,000 acres and purchase of perpetual easements on 1,150,000 acres. From 1961 to date, fee title has been acquired by the Secretary of the Interior on approximately 318,000 acres of refuges and 183,000 acres of waterfowl production areas. Easements have been purchased on approximately 700,000 additional acres of wetlands.

Unfortunately, the program has not proceeded at the pace anticipated. First there was considerable delay in getting the program started. Second, local opposition to the program developed in certain key States because of the impact of the program on county revenues. Third, some delay was, and still is caused by rising costs of land acquisitions. Fourth, the program never has been sufficiently founded. Fifth, the drainage of wetlands for agriculture, flood control, reclamation projects, and urban and industrial purposes has drastically reduced the number of acres that would be available for the program.

In fact, drainage of wetlands had been so extensive that by 1950, approximately half of the wetlands of the prairie pothole regions of the United States had been drained. This drainage has since continued and in North Dakota alone, approximately 45,000 acres of wetlands are being lost to drainage programs each year.

The objective of the waterfowl production area program carried out by the Secretary of the Interior is to preserve waterfowl breeding habitat by acquiring land, or interests in land, to prevent destruction of its wetlands character. The basic concept is to acquire the more permanent types of wetlands in fee as nucleus areas throughout the prairie pothole area. These are the deeper marshes which, barring drainage, can be expected to retain water throughout the farming season year after year. These permanent pothole areas generally include adjacent upland which increases the nesting potential of the pothole. Surrounding these nucleus areas are less permanent types of wetlands (including both shallow marshes and lands only intermittently under water) which afford additional breeding habitat during wet years, but may contain no water in drouth periods. These are the areas on which the Secretary acquires easements to prevent draining, filling, or burning of marsh vegetation. Both permanent potholes and temporary wetlands areas are necessary for maximum production.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 2335) for the relief of Enrico DeMonte was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BEASLEY ENGINEERING CO., INC.

The bill (H.R. 2876) for the relief of the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-1395), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc., of Emeryville, Calif., \$11,873.27 in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for losses sustained as a result of damage or destruction caused by floods to work already completed on The Dalles irrigation system.

STATEMENT

In its favorable report on this bill, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives said:

The bill, H.R. 2876, as amended by the committee, provides for a payment of \$11,873.27 in accordance with the recommendation of the Comptroller General, as set forth in his letter of June 5, 1968, which is set out following this report. This relief is also consistent with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget referred to in the report of the Department of the Interior dated May 21, 1968. In both instances it was the recommendation that the relief provided in the bill should be limited to 50 percent of the amount found by the Department of the Interior to be directly attributable to flood repair work performed by the Beasley Engineering Co. The Department of the Interior in its report stated that it had determined that the losses directly attributable to the flood equaled \$23,746.55. In providing for a payment of one-half of this figure, the committee is equating relief to that provided in the Federal Disaster Act (Public Law 89-769) concerning Federal assistance to States and local governments to alleviate suffering and damages resulting from major disasters. While the losses referred to in this bill were not of a type for which relief is provided under that act, for the reasons outlined in this report, the same scheme of compensation has been adopted by the committee as a basis for its recommendation in this instance.

The Beasley Engineering Co., Inc., was awarded a contract in the approximate amount of \$3,015,811 on October 3, 1963, by the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction of an irrigation system for The Dalles Irrigation District. The contract was to be completed by March 12, 1965. This irrigation system was located in Wasco County, Oreg., within the area of the Pacific Northwest hit by the unprecedented storms and floods in the latter part of December 1964, and was also within the major disaster area declared by the President. At the time of the floods, the construction project was ahead of schedule, with approximately 86 percent of the work completed, including 96 percent of the pipeline distribution system being in place. The completed portion of the work had been inspected and was ready for acceptance by the United States subject only to operational testing.

The severe flooding caused by the 1964 storm damaged the irrigation system. The Dalles Irrigation District asked that the system be restored, and the Office of Emergency Planning requested the Bureau of Rec-

lamation to perform disaster assistance for the Dalles irrigation system. Because of the conflict raised by the request of the Office of Emergency Planning and the responsibility of the contractor under the terms of his contract, the Comptroller General was asked for his opinion as to whether the restoration work performed by Beasley Engineering Co., Inc., was eligible for payment under the provisions of Public Law 875, 81st Congress. The Comptroller General informed the Interior Department on May 2, 1965 (see B-152747) that in his opinion the restoration work was not eligible for payment because the United States had not accepted the work from the contractor, and under the terms of the contract the builder had an obligation to make needed repairs on the work prior to acceptance by the United States. It appears that if the work had been accepted prior to the floods, the restoration work would have been eligible for payment under the provisions of Public Law 875, 81st Congress.

The ruling of the Comptroller General prevents the Department of the Interior from making any payment to Beasley Engineering Co., Inc., under either the provisions of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, or Public Law 89-769. The latter act was passed by the Congress shortly after the disastrous floods of the winter of 1964 to help relieve the damage and suffering in that area.

Section 9 of Public Law 89-769 authorizes an appropriation to reimburse up to 50 percent of "eligible costs incurred to repair, restore, or reconstruct any project * * * for * * * irrigation, * * * which was damaged or destroyed as a result of a major disaster, and of the resulting additional eligible costs incurred to complete any facility which was in the process of construction." The committee has concluded that the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 89-769 would not have any application to this case because this facility had not been turned over to the local governmental agency that would have responsibility for it.

A similar bill in the 90th Congress, H.R. 8588, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on May 22, 1968. Representatives of the Beasley Engineering Co. appeared at the hearing and testified concerning the facts outlined above. The result has been that the company suffered a private loss under circumstances where had the work been accepted by the Government there would have been a basis for relief to the irrigation district had the project been turned over to the irrigation district. The extensive flooding so changed water courses and areas traversed by the pipeline constructed by the company that numerous change orders were necessary to permit a relocation of the pipeline. The report submitted to the committee by the Department of the Interior refers to these change orders and notes that \$27,705.21 was paid the company in connection with those changes. That report states that the Government contracting officer found that the total direct cost of repairing flood damage was \$51,451.76. At the hearing it was noted that this figure does not cover the indirect cost suffered by the company involved in the delays resulting from the flood and the necessity to retain personnel on the payroll and keep equipment and material on the job for an extended period of time. However, in seeking to make an equitable adjustment of the matter the committee concluded that the figure ascertained by the Interior Department should be taken as the basis for the loss, that is, \$51,451.76. The amount paid for change orders under the contract, \$27,705.21, is deducted from this figure to leave the amount directly attributable to the flood which has not been covered by other payments. This is the \$23,746.55, the amount stated in the bill, H.R. 2876, as originally

introduced in the present Congress. The Department of the Interior has stated that it is opposed to payment in excess of \$23,746.55 and has recommended that the claimant be limited to that amount. The bill, H.R. 8588, was favorably reported and passed the House in the 90th Congress, and provided for payment of that amount. (H. Rept. 1693, 90th Cong., 2d sess.)

The report of the Department of the Interior indicated that the ruling of the Comptroller General prevents any payment to the Beasley Engineering Co. under Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress or Public Law 89-769. The 89th Congress law was passed shortly after the floods of the winter of 1964 for the express purpose of helping to relieve the damage and suffering caused in the area in which the company was performing the contract. The Bureau of the Budget referred to Public Law 89-769, however, it is apparent to the committee that the law does not apply for the stage of work was such that the company would not have qualified under that law. While this is true, the committee has concluded that it is inequitable to impose this loss on the company. As suggested in the report of the Department of the Interior, the committee has contacted the General Accounting Office and confirmed the fact that Public Law 89-769 would not apply in this instance. It is therefore clear that the company had no alternative but to appeal to the Congress for relief. In this connection, this reference to the law enacted on November 9, 1966, and to the recovery available under that law is apparently intended to call the attention of the committee to the fact that benefits payable to the local agency are limited to 50 percent of the loss. As has been noted, the committee has accepted the payment under that law as a guide to relief in this case. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be amended to provide for the payment of \$11,873.27 and that the amended bill be considered favorably.

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

MRS. MARGARET M. McNELLIS

The bill (H.R. 8573) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-1396), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the amount which would have been payable under the public health service program for civilian medical care in behalf of Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis of Waterbury, Conn., had she been an eligible beneficiary for care in civilian facilities under that act. The bill further authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the amount certified to him by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

STATEMENT

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has no objection to favorable consideration of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

On September 24, 1966, Mrs. McNellis suffered severe burns over her body and was hospitalized in a civilian hospital. The personnel office of the PHS hospital in San Francisco determined Mrs. McNellis to be a dependent parent of Public Health Service Officer Margaret M. McNellis, her daughter,

and issued her an identification card which showed her as being eligible for medical care in both uniformed services medical facilities and in civilian medical facilities. Mrs. McNellis and her daughter, now Mrs. Glen Martin, were lead to believe by the assertion of personnel in the PHS hospital in San Francisco and by the ID card, that Mrs. McNellis' care in a civilian hospital would be covered by the PHS. In accordance with regulations, however, a dependent parent is not eligible for care except in a PHS hospital, or in a uniformed services medical facility, on a space-available basis. The ID card showing eligibility was in error. Thus, Mrs. McNellis is not entitled to be reimbursed by the Public Health Service for expenses resulting from services received at a civilian hospital. A private relief bill is the only method available for Mrs. McNellis to recover her expenses.

In view of the error made by the PHS personnel in issuing an ID card stating that Mrs. McNellis was entitled to care in a civilian hospital, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare states that it has no objection to favorable consideration of a private relief bill.

The House-passed bill embodies the recommendation from HEW and deletes any reference to a specific amount of money and authorizes the Secretary of HEW to determine the amount representing the charges for services rendered Mrs. McNellis that would otherwise be payable under the Public Health Service program for civilian medical care, had she been an eligible beneficiary. This means that the care would have to be of a type authorized and, as an example, stated that private duty nursing care is allowable only on the attending physician's certification of need. The bill also embodies the Department's recommendation that any recovery would be limited to costs incurred during the period between September 1966 when Mrs. McNellis was hospitalized, and April 1967 when Mrs. McNellis' daughter was advised of the error in the issue of the ID card.

The bill authorizes HEW to adjudicate the exact amount of the claim under the program based on evidence presented to it by Mrs. McNellis within 6 months after enactment.

The committee is in agreement with the conclusions arrived at by the House committee and accordingly recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 8573 without amendment.

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 13, H.R. 12128, for the relief of William Heideman, Jr., and Calendar No. 1414, H.R. 12173, for the relief of Mrs. Francine M. Welch be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be passed over.

CENTRAL GULF STEAMSHIP CORP.

The bill (H.R. 12958) for the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corp., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-1399), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay \$50,055.95 to the Central Gulf Steamship Corp. in full settlement of all its claims against the United

States for reimbursement of customs duties paid by the corporation on certain steel which arrived at the Port of New Orleans during 1968 and 1969.

STATEMENT

In its favorable report to the committee dated November 13, 1970, the General Counsel of the Treasury said:

Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on S. 4468, "For the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corp."

The proposed legislation would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Central Gulf Steamship Corp. the sum of \$50,055.95 in full settlement of all its claims against the United States for reimbursement of customs duties paid by the corporation on certain steel which arrived at the Port of New Orleans during 1968 and 1969.

The bill concerns merchandise that was entered for use in a foreign-trade subzone to be established in New Orleans. The background and history of the subzone are set forth in the decision of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, in the case of *Armco Steel Corporation v. Maurice H. Stans, et al.*, 68 Civ. 4416, decided June 19, 1969, as follows:

"The saga of the subzone commenced in October 1967 when the New Orleans board (Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans) was approached by representatives of Equitable-Higgins Shipyard, Inc. (Equitable) to explore the possibility of establishing a subzone in the Equitable shipyard for the specialized purpose of manufacturing barges to be used aboard LASH vessels. After receiving bids from Equitable and other domestic and foreign shipbuilders, Central Gulf Steamship Corp. (Central Gulf) entered into a contract with Equitable on January 17, 1968, under which Equitable was to build 233 barges to be manufactured out of steel plates imported from Japan. Equitable to use its 'best efforts' to insure that a subzone would be established in New Orleans for the construction of the barges. The contract prices assumed that the steel plates from Japan would be brought into the subzone without payment of customs duties, and that the completed barges, as 'vessels,' would enter the customs territory of the United States duty free.

"On March 18, 1968, the New Orleans board applied to the Zones Board for the establishment of the subzone in a 3.64 acre area within the Equitable shipyard. In the application, the New Orleans board stated that the existing zone in New Orleans was operating at near maximum capacity and was not able to accommodate the equipment or facilities needed to manufacture the barges.

"Hearings on the application were conducted by the Examiners' Committee of the Zones Board in New Orleans on May 22 and 23, 1968. Testimony was taken from representatives of the New Orleans board, Equitable, and Central Gulf and others in favor of the application, and from representatives of Armco, Bethlehem Steel Corp., and the Shipbuilders Council of America in opposition. On June 5, 1968, the Examiners' Committee issued its report recommending that the zones board grant the subzone application.

"On November 16, 1968, the zones board issued the order authorizing the establishment of the subzone in New Orleans, and made findings of fact in support of its orders. * * *

The subzone became operational as of May 16, 1969.

In reporting to the House Committee on the Judiciary on February 9, 1970, with respect to a substantially similar bill introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 12958, the Treasury Department stated:

"The Department will * * * interpose no objection to legislation authorizing the reimbursement of the Central Gulf Steamship Corp. in an amount equal to the duty paid on that portion of the steel imported prior

to the establishment of the subzone, which was not used in the manufacture of barges in the subzone as of November 19, 1968, the date of the approval of the establishment of the subzone."

This amount was subsequently estimated to be \$50,055.95.

In view of the above, the Department would have no objection to the proposed legislation.

The Department has been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report to your committee.

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the report from the General Counsel of the Treasury.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, D.C., November 13, 1970.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,

Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on S. 4468, "For the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corporation."

The proposed legislation would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Central Gulf Steamship Corp. the sum of \$50,055.95 in full settlement of all its claims against the United States for reimbursement of customs duties paid by the corporation on certain steel which arrived at the Port of New Orleans during 1968 and 1969.

The bill concerns merchandise that was entered for use in a foreign-trade subzone to be established in New Orleans. The background and history of the subzone are set forth in the decision of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, in the case of *Armco Steel Corporation v. Maurice H. Stans, et al.*, 68 Civ. 4416, decided June 19, 1969, as follows:

"The saga of the subzone commenced in October 1967 when the New Orleans board (Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans) was approached by representatives of Equitable-Higgins Shipyard, Inc. (Equitable) to explore the possibility of establishing a subzone in the Equitable shipyard for the specialized purpose of manufacturing barges to be used aboard LASH vessels. After receiving bids from Equitable and other domestic and foreign shipbuilders, Central Gulf Steamship Corp. (Central Gulf) entered into a contract with Equitable on January 17, 1968, under which Equitable was to build 233 barges to be manufactured out of steel plates imported from Japan, Equitable to use its 'best efforts' to insure that a subzone would be established in New Orleans for the construction of the barges. The contract price assumed that the steel plates from Japan would be brought into the subzone without payment of customs duties, and that the completed barges, as 'vessels' would enter the customs territory of the United States duty free.

"On March 18, 1968, the New Orleans board applied to the Zones Board for the establishment of the subzone in a 3.64-acre area within the Equitable shipyard. In the application, the New Orleans board stated that the existing zone in New Orleans was operating at near maximum capacity and was not able to accommodate the equipment or facilities needed to manufacture the barges.

"Hearings on the application were conducted by the Examiners' Committee of the Zones Board in New Orleans on May 22 and 23, 1968. Testimony was taken from representatives of the New Orleans board, Equitable, and Central Gulf, and others in favor of the application, and from representatives of Armco, Bethlehem Steel Corp., and the Shipbuilders Council of America in opposi-

tion. On June 5, 1968, the examiners' committee issued its report recommending that the Zones Board grant the subzone application.

"On November 19, 1968, the Zones Board issued the Order authorizing the establishment of the subzone in New Orleans, and made findings of fact in support of its order. * * *

The subzone became operational as of May 16, 1969.

In reporting to the House Committee on the Judiciary on February 9, 1970, with respect to a substantially similar bill introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 12958, the Treasury Department stated:

"The Department will * * * interpose no objection to legislation authorizing the reimbursement of the Central Gulf Steamship Corp. in an amount equal to the duty paid on that portion of the steel imported prior to the establishment of the subzone, which was not used in the manufacture of barges in the subzone as of November 19, 1968, the date of the approval of the establishment of the subzone."

This amount was subsequently estimated to be \$50,055.95.

In view of the above, the Department would have no objection to the proposed legislation.

The Department has been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL R. PIERCE, Jr.,
General Counsel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. Would the Senator have any objection to taking up Calendar No. 1396, Senate Resolution 486, relating to prisoners of war?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not an item to be called up by unanimous consent. I should prefer that some other Senators who are interested in the subject be on the floor of the Senate at the time it is taken up. Personally, I would have no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. I have no objection; I should like to make that clear.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT NIXON TO
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MANUFACTURERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the address by President Nixon to the National Association of Manufacturers in New York City on Friday, December 4, 1970.

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

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

I would like to take this occasion to report to the nation on this Administration's economic strategy—what we found when we took office, what we did about it, what the results of our moves were, and what we are doing now.

When we came into office 22 months ago, this was the situation:

532,000 Americans were fighting in Vietnam, with no diplomatic or military plan to bring them home, and no economic plan to provide civilian futures for them when they did get home;

Prices were rising, interest rates were rising, and monetary and budget policies had produced a serious inflationary crisis.

The challenge was clear: Never before had this nation been able to end a war without severe economic hardship and never before had we been able to curb a major inflation without a recession. We accepted that challenge.

We acted immediately on both the war front and the home front.

Abroad, we implemented a plan that will bring 265,000 men home by next May. We brought casualties down to the lowest point in over four years. We presented a fair and honest plan for peace. We re-ordered our national priorities: More than a million men were released from armed forces and from defense plants, and for the first time in twenty years the Federal government spent more money to meet human needs than on defense.

At home, we took the action needed to combat inflation. We held down Federal spending and balanced the budget; at the same time, the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve was restrictive. By doing what we said we would do, we effectively countered much of the inflationary pressure that had been feeding on itself and endangering the dollar.

In essence, then, we found a war that was surely not ending and an inflation that was surely accelerating, and we moved quickly to set a new course that would end the war and curb inflation—both at the same time.

Let me focus now on our economic plan and its results. Keep in mind its two basic elements.

First, we were determined to slow down a runaway inflation in a way that would not bring about a serious recession.

Next, even before the results of our anti-inflationary action became fully apparent, our plan called for moving the economy up toward its full growth potential, in a way that would not bring about a new round of inflation.

That was the plan and that is the plan. It was, and is, a bold and ambitious plan—to slow down the cost of living as we end the cost of war, to hold down the pain of transition as we build strong and stable foundations for a new prosperity, with new confidence in the purchasing power of the dollar.

I want to speak with complete candor about the progress we have made and the problems we will confront.

The inflation psychology was more powerful than anyone knew. But the dangerously rising momentum of inflation was arrested by late 1969, and the rate of inflation has been moving gradually downward in 1970.

The progress is not as fast as we want, and we can expect some reverses along the way. But the worst of inflation is over. The lowered rise in the consumer price index, and the much lower rise in wholesale prices and lower interest rates indicate that there will be a further decline of the rate of inflation during the year ahead.

Have we slowed inflation without a serious decline, as our plan called for? We have—but the nation has paid a price for slowing down the rise in prices. The unemployment figures issued today, while they reflect in part the temporary effects of the auto strike, underscore that fact.

Unemployment is at the level of the first half of the Sixties, before the Vietnam war buildup began. I believe we can and must do better.

Businessmen and investors, large and small, have felt a profit squeeze, with corporate profits down 8% from 1969. Many working people and investors have been hurt, and it offers them little solace to know that this has been the least painful transition from war to peace, from inflation toward stability, in our recent history.

These are not small problems, and people are not statistics. The man looking for a job, the businessman suffering from disap-

pointing sales, the investor who has seen his savings and investments erode—all are Americans with important human concerns.

The pain of transition from war to peace, from inflation to stability, is real, and it is the business of government, business and labor to help ease that pain as we move ahead.

Having paid the cost of slowing the rise in prices, the workingman and the businessman have earned a new right—the right to reasonable stability and a new steadiness of growth in our economic life.

Let me turn now to the prospects for the next phase of our economic plan. Our objective is to help move our economy up to its full potential of growth and employment while continuing to reduce inflation.

The basic questions are these: What have we been doing to restimulate the economy? What do we intend to do to step up the pace of growth? And what are we all prepared to do to hold down the cost of living as we quicken our economic pulse?

This is what has already been done to help the economy resume its growth:

First, early in 1970, budget policy turned in a more expansionist direction. It was an orderly and well-timed change. Some of the present deficit is government's way of picking up the check for a slowdown of inflation; much of it is a force working toward orderly stimulation and expansion of the economy.

Second, monetary policy has changed over the period of this year. From mid-1969 to February of this year, the money supply grew by only 1% a year; since February, the Federal Reserve has permitted the supply of money to grow at an annual rate of 6%.

Third, as a result of easier credit policies and curbing of inflationary psychology, interest rates are coming down substantially. This sets the stage for new expansion of housing, of State and local government construction, of private capital formation needed for productivity.

The effects of these basic changes in economic policy can already be seen in the strong upsurge in housing starts, the rapid expansion of State and local bond financing, and the strong market for corporate debt financing. Along with unusually large spending potential by consumers, these signs all point to the expansion ahead.

But the government has a responsibility to do more: this is what we are doing to help the economy along the path that will get us back to full employment as rapidly as possible, while continuing to make progress against inflation.

First, we plan our budget on the basis that it would be balanced if we were at full employment and the economy were producing full revenues, not when the economy is below that point. Our budget policy will be responsible in holding down inflation and responsive in encouraging expansion.

Second, as the economy rises toward full employment, more money will be required to do the nation's business. The amount of business to be done will rise steadily, and we shall need a rate of expansion of the supply of money and credit to do the job properly. I have been assured by Dr. Arthur Burns that the independent Federal Reserve System will provide fully for the increasing monetary needs of the economy. I am confident that this commitment will be kept.

Third, we look to a continuation of the strong revival of housing construction to be a leading force in the upward movement of the economy. Housing starts have been rising strongly this year and surged ahead almost 20% in the last quarter. The programs of government, which profoundly affect the rate of housing construction, will continue to be directed to assure that the pent-up demand for housing in America is met.

As we take these actions to produce a vigorous and orderly expansion, this is what we are doing to strengthen resistance to inflation:

We have arranged for a series of Inflation Alerts and established the National Commission on Productivity to enable labor, business and the public to cooperate in improving efficiency and cutting costs.

We have also set up procedures to change some government regulations that contribute to higher prices. These are not moves toward controls; on the contrary, these are moves away from the kind of government controls that cause artificial market shortages.

Take, for example, the recent increase of 25¢ per barrel in the price of crude oil, accompanied by increases in prices of gasoline and, later, jet fuel.

Up to now, State restrictions on production on Federal offshore leases have held down the supply of crude oil.

I have been informed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness that these restrictions are not necessary for national security; moreover, they actually interfere with the freedom of our domestic market system.

I have today directed the Interior Department to assume complete regulating responsibility for conservation and production of oil and gas on all Federal offshore lands. This means that more oil will be produced on those lands, while maintaining strict environmental standards.

I have also directed that companies importing Canadian oil be permitted to use their overseas allocation for the purchase of more crude oil from Canada.

Taken together, these actions will increase the supply of oil and can be expected to help restrain the increase of oil and gasoline prices.

Let us look at the other side of the coin—at the wage side—to see where government leadership can help hold down costs and prices.

The problem in the construction industry, for example, illustrates the need for that leadership. When you have an industry in which one out of three negotiations has led to a strike; when construction wage settlements are more than double the national average for all manufacturing, at a time when many construction workers are out of work, then something is basically wrong with that industry's bargaining process.

What can be done about it?

For one thing, the structure of bargaining must be changed. As it is now, the craft-by-craft, city-by-city pattern only guarantees instability. What is called for is more consolidated bargaining, on an area or regional scope. What is needed is a bargaining process that will preserve the integrity of each bargaining unit while it provides a new base for stability and fairness.

I have directed the Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Commission to take the initiative in working out these changes with leaders of management and labor. If the Commission determines that legislation is required, it will be proposed.

In today's economy, about the only thing greater than the problem of the construction industry is the potential of the construction industry. The men who are building this nation work in a field with a great future, and one in which the Federal government—with its expanded housing programs and its highway programs—will be a driving force for growth.

The time is now for the construction trades and the construction industry to face up to reality—a reality where strikes and costs are limiting its own future. The Federal stake in the construction industry is enormous. Unless the industry wants government to intervene in wage negotiations on Federal projects to protect the public inter-

est, the moment is here for labor and management to make their own reforms.

If business and labor expect the public to help stimulate real expansion, then business and labor should be prepared to offer the public some real help in curbing inflation.

In discussing this problem, however, let us recognize that no one industry and no one side of the bargaining table can be made the scapegoat for rising prices. There is blame enough to go around, and the past policies of government bear their full share of that blame. But recriminations and buck-passing will not help; what is needed now is the firm acceptance of the fact that fighting inflation is everybody's business.

The decisions of business and labor about prices and wages must be formed by the economic facts of life. The most basic of these facts is that we cannot receive more real income than we turn out in real goods and services. When profits and wages are rising faster than productivity, prices will also be rising.

Because of our campaign against inflation, we now have an opportunity to break the vicious circle of wage-price escalation. As you know, productivity is once again on the rise. As a result, production costs are rising less rapidly.

Government has done its part to hold the line. This is the critical moment, then, for business and labor to make a special effort to exercise restraint in price and wage decisions.

This is the moment for labor and management to stop freezing into wage settlement and price actions any expectation that inflation will continue in the future at its peak rate of the past. Any wage or price decision that makes that flat and irreversible assumption of a high rate of inflation ahead is against the public interest and against the real interest of the workingman.

This is also the moment, with productivity newly on the rise, for business to take a hard new look at its pricing policies, and to pass along to the consumer its savings in production costs.

Let us look beyond our immediate concerns to the deeper strengths and longer-range goals of the American economy.

Many people see full employment and a stable cost of living as a kind of trade-off; they say we can have one or the other, but never both at the same time. The best we can hope for, they say, is a "balance of error"—not too much unemployment at a time when there is not too much inflation.

That may be a stage on the way to our goal, but it is by no means the goal itself.

The American people have a right to expect more than that.

Our goal is to achieve a combination of full employment and reasonable price stability. I am confident we can and will achieve that goal.

This is why I am confident:

I have an abiding faith in the power and genius of the American economic system. No businessman can intelligently plan ahead without figuring in the capacity of that economic system to meet the demands made upon it by the American people.

Taking the record of American free enterprise as a guide, the most realistic, business-like view of the future is this: Our system can deliver full employment, a stable dollar and truly equal opportunity—all at the same time.

I know that many businessmen are concerned when young people, including their own children, come to them and say: "Business is not for me. I don't want to get in the rat race; I want to help other people."

The paradox is this: Nothing has done more to help people in this country and people throughout the world than the American private economic system. Not organized charity, not the most active voluntary organization, not government itself can begin to com-

pare with the benefits to people that flow from our unique combination of management, capital and labor.

Here is a system that has reduced the percentage of poor in this nation by almost half in the past decade alone; a system in which even those on welfare receive more real income than 75% of the people of the world will see in their lifetime.

Here is a system that provides the working man with more opportunity, more real income, more leisure time, more personal freedom than any system in the history of man—and provides this all at the same time.

Here is a system that has made it possible for the United States to distribute 140 billion dollars in aid to the rest of the world since the end of World War II—that makes it possible for us to respond generously to human needs created by an earthquake in Peru, a flood in Romania or to a cyclone and tidal wave in East Pakistan.

And here is a system that makes possible massive aid to education, vital new programs to improve the health of our people, and a wide range of efforts to protect and restore our environment. A strong economy makes us strong enough to better our lives; a strong economy makes us strong enough to defend our freedom.

Our system produces wealth. I realize that "wealth" is a word that is scorned by a lot of people today.

But how could we afford our massive educational system without the wealth produced by the people who make our economy move? Where would we get the resources to care for the poor, to look after the sick, to clean up our air and water—if it were not for the wealth generated by our free economy?

Too many people make the mistake of thinking that because government is the distributor of so much wealth, government must be the source of that wealth. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

You cannot pass a law raising a nation's standard of living. You cannot legislate into being the resources to solve our problems.

On the contrary, the only place you can turn to for the ability to help other people is that place that is so often denounced as the citadel of self-interest—the private enterprise system.

The next time you hear someone running that system down, the next time you hear the product of that system derided as "material" or unworthy of man's highest ideals—remember this:

A nation with the greatest social goals, with the most perfect political system, but without a strong and free economy is like a magnificent automobile without an engine.

We in America have that engine; it is something to be proud of, not ashamed of; it gives power to our purpose.

Surely there are many ways for that engine, that system, to be improved. But let us never forget that what is right about our system enables us to correct what is wrong. The wealth produced by labor, management and capital gives all of us the power to ennoble our aims, to enrich our own lives and the lives of our fellow men.

We are not the only nation to dream of opportunity with security, growth with stability, freedom with justice. That "American dream" is not limited to Americans.

But we stand first in the world on the road to achieving that dream, because we have created the system that can take us there.

Without a strong economy, dreams will always remain impossible dreams; but with the wealth that workingmen and businessmen produce, we can and we will turn our dreams into reality.

To the young person thinking of entering business tomorrow, as well as to those already managing and working in our free economic system today, may I point out that a credo for a new prosperity is emerging:

I believe the American economy is strong and growing stronger, capable of more than doubling the real income of each succeeding generation of Americans.

I believe American business will respond to the social as well as the economic demands of the consumer, adding to the dignity and security of work as well as the quality of life.

I believe the greatness of America's economic system will be judged by future generations not by how big it gets but how good it is; not only in the increased value of its investments, but in its increased investment in human values.

I believe that we will build a new prosperity that will last; not a period of good times between periods of hard times, but a steady prosperity that people can count on and plan for.

I believe that the new prosperity can never be gained at the expense of one group or another, but must be newly shared at every level of our society and among all our people.

And this above all: I believe that only if our economic system remains free can we achieve that combination of full employment with price stability—something Americans have never enjoyed in this century—a new prosperity in a full generation of peace.

THE PROWESS OF SENATOR MILTON R. YOUNG OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to note that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young), with a single, mighty whack of his bare right hand, split a 1-inch panel board in half on December 5, thus becoming the first president of the United States Tae Kwon Do Association.

I cite this as a tribute to the distinguished Senator today, his birthday, and express the hope that just as Senator Young crashed through this obstacle, the Senate may crash through its impediments toward adjournment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join in the commendation and congratulations to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, not only because he won the title in this exotic sounding outfit to which the distinguished minority leader has referred, but also because, in my opinion, Senator Young is one of the finest Members of this body. He is my close personal friend. He is a man to whom farmers can look with respect and for consideration. He has done much to raise the level of integrity in this body down through the years in which he has served.

I am extremely proud to be considered a friend of Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota. I look on him with affection and respect, and I honor him for the many good things he has done in behalf of the agricultural sector of our economy.

Mr. SCOTT. All of us, indeed, on both sides of the aisle, are proud of Senator Young and his accomplishments and expertise. We look to him for guidance and advice in many matters, including farm matters. I should like to express, on behalf of all of us, our best wishes for a happy birthday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, we do not yet know what will be the result of the Montana State-North Dakota game to be held in the Camellia Bowl later this month. The bet is a jackrabbit; and the

one who loses has to go out and catch that animal. Personally, I do not intend to lose that bet, because I do not think I would have the endurance.

Mr. SCOTT. If the jackrabbit is hiding under a thick pine board, it might give the Senator from North Dakota some advantage.

THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AND THE RAILROAD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senators may recall that in the past year I have become increasingly concerned about the attitude of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its ineffectiveness in protecting the interests of the shippers, the consumers and the traveling public. In my estimation, the Interstate Commerce Commission has almost given in to the industry and has done little to help formulate an improved transportation system. As a Senator from the State of Montana, I am primarily concerned about the effect that this situation is having on my constituents. There is every indication that there will be further reductions in passenger train service in Montana. The Burlington-Northern has reduced service to more of the small communities in my State with the acquiescence of the Commission. It has only been a few days since the Commission agreed to permit the Burlington-Northern to discontinue its service between Sappington and Norris, a matter which our State regulatory agency, the Montana Board of Railroad Commissioners, intends to appeal.

The three freight rate increases approved this year by the Commission have placed the agriculture and lumber segments of my State's economy and, I believe, the Nation's economy in a very precarious position.

In all fairness to the Interstate Commerce Commission, I will say that the boxcar shortage in Montana is less serious than it has been in the past, but it has taken considerable time to convince the Commission of the seriousness of this matter so that they would take the necessary initiative through their own personnel and regulations. I am including a copy of a report I have just received which gives the Commission's position on this area in considerable detail.

Until such time as the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission will take the time to assume the independent role of the Commission and, in effect, lecture and suggest to the transportation industry how their services and management might be improved to meet the demands of this country in the early 1970's, I believe that the Commission has little value. I am not the only Member of this body who has expressed concern. I have been joined by 30 of my colleagues in expressing our reservations to the Chairman of the Commission. This is indicative of what I feel will be one of the major issues to be discussed in the 92d Congress—the future of the Interstate Commerce Commission and other regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint communication to the Chairman be printed at

this point in my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent to have a recent news story appearing in the Independent Record, Helena, Mont., daily newspaper, printed in the RECORD, which indicates in more detail the effect and scope of the recent approval of freight rate increases. Freight rate increases over the past 12 months will cost the grain industry in Montana some \$7.5 million a year.

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1970.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: This is in reply to your telegram of November 18, 1970, addressed to Chairman George M. Stafford, with reference to the effective date of the eight-percent freight rate increase.

I am particularly interested in that part of your telegram wherein you state that the railroads are not furnishing enough grain cars prior to the effective date of the increase. Due to my close association with the total car supply of all the railroads and the responsibility for same delegated to me by the Commission, I have been requested by Chairman Stafford to reply to that portion of your telegram.

We have practically completed the movement of the recent grain harvest in the western and midwestern states, including Montana. I am happy to report that this year we have had very few complaints from shippers unable to obtain cars to transport their grain. Presently the bulk of Montana grain is being loaded on the lines of the former Great Northern Railway in the area bounded by Great Falls on the south, Shelby on the northwest, and Havre on the northeast. The other lines of the Burlington Northern and the Milwaukee railroads have made only minor demands for grain cars at this time.

I am quoting below statistics for the Billings region of the Burlington Northern, which takes care of practically the entire State of Montana, for November 18, 19, 20, and 23:

	11/18	11/19	11/20	11/23
Boxcars:				
Cumulative orders.....	411	423	435	416
Available cars.....	970	832	990	977
Surplus cars.....	559	409	555	561
Covered hoppers:				
Cumulative orders.....	904	913	857	824
Available cars.....	118	114	118	109
Short.....	786	799	739	715

The car supply of the Burlington Northern today is such that it is able to fill all orders for boxcars. The information obtained from our field personnel indicates that hundreds of cars of grain are being held at hold points in Montana and Washington awaiting billing instructions from the shippers. In fact, the flow of grain for Montana and contiguous states has been so heavy that it will probably be necessary to embargo the largest elevator complex in the Pacific Northwest because of its inability to handle cars currently. This facility on November 19 had nearly 500 cars of grain, largely from Montana, on hand for unloading.

On the Milwaukee Railroad there are no shortages of cars for grain loading at this time. The Union Pacific, the other Class I railroad operating in Montana, has no grain traffic originating in that State at this time.

On Friday, November 20, the Milwaukee Railroad requested that the Commission discontinue its assistance in furnishing it with boxcars because of substantial reductions in the demand for boxcars from shippers on its

lines. We received a similar request from the Burlington Northern on November 23.

It is pointed out that, as indicated in the above tabulations, there remain substantial shortages of covered hopper cars. This is true wherever grain is being shipped today. Shippers desire covered hoppers because of their economy in loading and unloading. There is no rate difference in the use of covered hopper cars over boxcars; but, as you are aware, the covered hopper is a specialized car, very desirable for grain shippers. The demand for covered hoppers has far exceeded the carriers' ability to furnish them. However, all grain carrying roads have been making a vigorous effort to augment their covered hopper fleets.

From the above information I am sure you will recognize that, while the railroads are not furnishing sufficient covered hopper cars to meet the demands of shippers served by them, it is quite evident that they are furnishing sufficient equipment to transport the grain being offered.

As previously stated, we in the Commission feel that the efforts of our Washington staff, along with the close checking of our agents in the field, have resulted in much-improved service and a minimum of complaints. We have monitored the car demands consonant with the grain movements and have amended and modified our orders to effect the greatest utilization of equipment and to have the greatest number of cars available where they are needed.

We have endeavored to perform a service to all; and where our efforts would best be served by focusing our attention on seasonal movements, we have done this. I can say without reservations that most grain shippers will agree that the carriers have met the demands made upon them in a reasonable manner. To support this, I am enclosing copies of correspondence which I believe indicate the results of our handling of car supply and service complaints. While I am somewhat hesitant to expound on the work accomplished by our Commission, I do believe in all fairness that you should be given the benefit of the enclosed.

While I have dealt primarily with present conditions in Montana, I do believe that a similar situation has prevailed for quite some time; and while the farmers' elevators might be in a position to produce contrary statistics, we feel that a general statement to the effect that railroads were not furnishing grain cars prior to that date is a debatable question.

In any event, I am happy to bring you up to date on the present picture.

Sincerely yours,

RUPERT L. MURPHY,
Commissioner.

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., November 30, 1970.
HON. GEORGE M. STAFFORD,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAFFORD: The gravity of the present surface transportation situation in the United States cannot be overstated. It is past time for the Interstate Commerce Commission to review its decisions with respect to transportation matters under its jurisdiction and to assess its position. We ask that you consider the long list of decisions which have reduced service, increased costs and permitted the draining of assets so seriously as to imperil the future of rail transportation in the United States.

Two once great railroads, after merger, are bankrupt; another newly merged giant is short of cash; passenger trains have been discontinued, one after the other, in little more than three years, there have been freight rate increases totaling 30 percent, with another increment of 7 percent threatened. Only lately and only partially has the

ICC demonstrated its concern with carrier diversification and the consequences of it for rail service. In addition, the box-car shortages on the Western lines are not sporadic anymore; it appears to be a permanent liability.

It would be curious, indeed, if the agency that was established to regulate surface transportation were to be the instrument for the collapse of a vital sector of that industry. The most recent order to permit an 8 percent increase of rail freight rates suggests to us that, despite clear warnings, the Commission remains unaware that to all appearances it has ceased to be a regulatory agency.

Indications at this time lead us to believe that merger considerations, diversifications and increasing labor demands may well result in a transportation crisis of unprecedented magnitude within the next two years. The related effect of this crisis is presently measurable in its effects upon both the rural and urban economic base, regionally and nationally.

Repeated Congressional expressions of concern, not only for rail transportation but for other facets of the economy dependent upon rails, have gone virtually unheeded by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A review of hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Surface Transportation clearly indicates by the Commission's own figures that the railroads have been given "substantially everything they have asked for." The Commission's granting of rail requests has had virtually no effect on the decline of rail service.

The Nation is falling into a transportation morass from which certain segments of the economy may never recover. The time has come for a facing of the realities of this situation and for the concerted action necessary to reverse the present course of events.

Sincerely yours,

Senator Mike Mansfield, Senator Lee Metcalf, Senator Stuart Symington, Senator John Sparkman, Senator Len B. Jordan, Senator Jennings Randolph, Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Senator George D. Aiken, Senator Stephen M. Young, Senator Quentin N. Burdick, Senator Harold E. Hughes, Senator Abraham Ribicoff.

Senator William Proxmire, Senator Albert Gore, Senator Clifford P. Hansen, Senator Frank Church, Senator Alan Bible, Senator Edward J. Gurney, Senator B. Everett Jordan, Senator Strom Thurmond, Senator Birch Bayh, Senator John Sherman Cooper.

Senator Thomas F. Eagleton, Senator Howard W. Cannon, Senator Barry Goldwater, Senator Mike Gravel, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Senator Gaylord Nelson, Senator Spessard L. Holland, Senator Gale W. McGee, Senator Edmund S. Muskie.

[From the Helena (Mont.) Independent Record, Nov. 8, 1970]

FREIGHT RATE MEANS \$15 MILLION LOSS
(By Arthur Hutchinson)

Freight rate increases granted railroads in the past 12 months will cost the grain sector alone of the Montana economy \$7.56 million a year, the State Agriculture Department said Friday.

That figure is the direct annual loss in value of Montana wheat and barley production which is exported. It is due to rate increases authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission since last November which now amount to 21.2 percent compounded over the period.

The loss in purchasing power to grain farmers will cost the state economy more than \$15 million, based on research by Montana State University showing every \$1 of

grain production has a \$2 effect on the total state economy.

The loss does not include higher freight rates for imported goods including automobiles, machinery, manufactured goods and liquor which move by rail.

Nor does it include the loss to the state government of income taxes paid by farmers.

The farmer must bear the entire cost of the freight increases because he paid the port terminal price less the shipping cost from his home elevator.

DETAIL STATISTICS

Detailed statistics were submitted by Agriculture Commissioner George Lackman to the ICC in behalf of his department and its ad-hoc committee composed of virtually every farm organization in the state in an effort to block the latest 15 per cent boost asked by the railroads.

The ICC Thursday gave railroads authority to raise rates 8 per cent. This came atop a 5 per cent increase granted in November 1969 and another 5 per cent effective last June and raised another 1 per cent this month.

Had the railroads been given the full 15 per cent the loss to the grain sector would have been \$10.9 million a year and the loss to the total state economy in the neighborhood of \$2 million.

Montana wheat production in recent years has been 100 million bushels annually. About 80 million bushels is exported, of which 82 per cent moves by rail, said Eldon Fastrup, marketing coordinator for the department.

He said prior increases amounting to 11 per cent cost wheat farmers \$3.7 million a year and the latest 8 per cent hike will cost them another \$2.6 million.

Montana barley production averages about 65 million bushels a year of which 25 million bushels are shipped out, 59 per cent of this by rail, Fastrup said.

The earlier increases cost barley producers \$750,000 a year and the latest 8 per cent hike will cost them another \$510,000 a year for an annual loss in barley value alone of \$1.26 million.

NO ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION

Fastrup, who prepared the detailed analysis Lackman presented to the ICC, said there was no economic justification for the increased rates.

"The railroads were already making substantial profits from grain hauls in Montana," he said. Fastrup said railroad revenue from Montana grain hauls ranged from 153 per cent to 217 per cent of the road's fully distributed costs "and this includes a fair return on their capital investment."

He said railroads justified their requests by claiming grain growers in the West could afford to bear their fair share of the railroads' increased operating costs.

The railroads, he said, argue the grain farmer has improved his income through higher yields per acre.

"This is not true in Montana," Fastrup said. "The railroads fail to recognize the cost of production and inflation have eaten up the profits from increased yields."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I gladly yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that my senior colleague, the majority leader, called attention to this important matter involving the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A former member of a regulatory commission suggested that the membership of the regulatory Commission should be renewed every 10 years. Another former

member of the regulatory Commission has suggested that the regulatory Commission passes through the same stages of life as men. They start out to be aggressive in the juvenile stage, then go into middle age, and finally go into senility.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. METCALF. The Interstate Commerce Commission is an example of the truth of this statement. It is the grandfather of all commissions. I believe that it has gone into the stage of senility. It is a Commission that has now been captured by the very industries whom it is supposed to regulate—the railroads.

Every time that a railroad matter appears before the Commission, whether it involves rates, the discontinuation of a route, or some other matter, the decision is inevitably made in favor of the railroads rather than in favor of the public concerned.

I completely agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana that the regulatory Commission should be very carefully examined in the next Congress. We should have hearings on whether we should continue the Interstate Commerce Commission, have a new commission, or abolish it entirely.

The whole concept of a regulatory agency has been destroyed by decision after decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It has been my obligation as a Senator from Montana, and also on behalf of other Senators and Representatives from the Northwest, to appear several times before the Interstate Commerce Commission to protest the discontinuation of such trains as the Main Streeter, the Great Northern's Empire Builder, and also the service from the Northern Pacific's North Coast Limited.

Now that we have a consolidation of the Burlington-Northern, we have an automatic discontinuation of service insofar as these great railroads are concerned. We find that gradually they are automatically discontinuing service in the State of Montana and probably in other States.

I know that we will have a petition for discontinuation of service of the Main Streeter, the Great Empire Builder, or the Northern Pacific's North Coast Limited.

We will have a gradual destruction of all of the main routes in Montana.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, as the oldest regulatory commission concerned, should certainly be subjected to a congressional or a senatorial investigation as to its effectiveness and functions.

(At this point, Mr. METCALF, the Acting President pro tempore, took the chair.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I could not agree more with my distinguished colleague.

I point out that in little more than 3 years, freight rate increases totaling 30 percent have been granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, with another increment of 7 percent threatened.

This is a problem which not only affects Montana, with its small population and tremendous area, but is a problem which affects the urban areas as well.

I would point out that two once-great railroads, after merger, are bankrupt; another newly merged giant is short of cash; passenger trains have been discontinued one after the other.

This is a most serious situation.

I think that we in the Congress are to blame for allowing the ICC to get away with its increases. They are almost automatic and have been down through the years. As I have said, there has been a 30 percent increase in freight rates over the past 3 years alone and another 7 percent increase is in the offing.

This is something which will be looked into by the next Congress.

May I point out that the letter sent to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission has also been signed by my distinguished colleague who has just spoken, and is now presiding over the Senate, Senator METCALF, and Senators SYMINGTON, AIKEN, SPARKMAN, YOUNG of Ohio, JORDAN of North Carolina, BURDICK, RANDOLPH, HUGHES, ANDERSON, RIBICOFF, PROXMIRE, EAGLETON, GORE, CANNON, HANSEN, GOLDWATER, CHURCH, GRAVEL, BIBLE, KENNEDY, GURNEY, NELSON, JORDAN of Idaho, HOLLAND, THURMOND, BAYH, MCGEE, COOPER, and MUSKIE.

That roster covers the entire philosophical spectrum of the Senate.

EAST PAKISTAN RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in what was probably the greatest natural disaster of the century, a massive cyclone and tidal bore struck the southeastern coastal areas of East Pakistan on November 13 with winds in some areas up to 150 miles per hour, followed by tidal waves 20 to 30 feet high. Many families were completely wiped out. Almost all seasonal workers, who were harvesting rice in low-lying fields close to the Bay of Bengal, were drowned. Coastal embankments provided some protection for those living behind them. Despite such protective embankments in many areas, the official death toll of those buried or reported dead is currently 200,000 and unofficial estimates are as high as 750,000 to 1 million. According to preliminary estimates, the lives of about an additional 2 million people have been severely disrupted by the disaster. About 250,000 houses were completely demolished and another 110,000 were partially damaged. Crops, including over 600,000 megatons of rice nearing harvest, were destroyed. Total crop and property loss has been initially estimated at about \$150 million.

IMMEDIATE NEED

The immediate need in the affected area is for clothes, blankets, food, and potable water. Shortly after the disaster, the U.S. Ambassador made an emergency donation of PRs 250,000—\$52,000—and

on November 17, President Nixon announced an initial commitment of \$10 million to assist in the worldwide relief effort.

Commercially chartered planes departed the United States between November 19 and 25 on a daily basis carrying blankets, tents, packaged foods—including 250 tons of survival biscuits donated by the Office of Civil Defense—and 45 tons of packaged meat, chicken, and applesauce—donated by CARE—fifty 16-foot boats with motors purchased by AID, and 21,000 immunizations of typhoid vaccine donated by Church World Services. Also on November 17, 50,000 metric tons of wheat—valued to \$6 million, including freight—under Public Law 480 title II—Emergency Relief—were authorized for early shipment to East Pakistan to replenish stocks now in East Pakistan which are being drawn down for emergency distribution.

But the relief effort is further complicated by the fact that the worst part of the disaster occurred in remote coastal areas where transportation facilities are extremely limited. For that reason, the United States has already sent eight UH-1—Huey—helicopters and two Bell helicopters under contract to AID in Nepal.

RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

It is clear that an extensive reconstruction program will be needed for the area. The rice crop in the affected areas has been virtually wiped out and in certain hard-hit regions, 90 percent of the bullocks used by farmers to till their fields have been killed. Coastal embankments, roads, dwellings, schools, markets, dispensaries, grain storage facilities, and other public buildings are gone and must be replaced. A broad scale reconstruction program must be placed in operation as soon as possible in order to take advantage of the dry weather construction season which is now just beginning. More important is the fact that the reconstruction projects would have a high employment impact and provide jobs and income for thousands of destitute villagers. Significant delays in starting reconstruction could mean the loss of an entire year before the productive output of the region is restored.

AID has already used or earmarked \$11.5 million of the contingency fund for various purposes, including about \$5 million of contingency funds to meet immediate emergency disaster relief needs in East Pakistan. Assuming full appropriation of the fiscal year 1971 request of \$15 million, prior year carryovers, and possible deobligations of prior year funds, total contingency fund availabilities for fiscal year 1971 will be about \$20 million. It is clear that the unallocated contingency fund balance of \$8.5 million will not be adequate to meet the longer term reconstruction requirements in East Pakistan. Moreover, the use of these funds would totally deplete the contingency fund and, thus, make it impossible to meet other similar emergency and humanitarian needs which will likely arise during the remainder of fiscal year 1971.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS

It is critical, therefore, that additional funds be made available by increasing the current authorization for the contingency fund to provide the necessary support to East Pakistan for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction programs.

A portion of the funds to be made available will finance imports to underwrite local costs related to such needs as rebuilding farm dwellings; restoration of fisheries; road reconstruction; construction of additional community cyclone shelters; and improvement of public health facilities. In addition, agricultural inputs, such as seeds, fertilizer and low-lift pumps are urgently needed as is replacement of grain storage and marketing facilities; irrigation systems and rehabilitation of fresh water supplies.

Rapid and constructive U.S. action would have a strong positive public impact in Pakistan and would encourage other donors to participate in the longer term rehabilitation effort. The assistance also would permit the Government of Pakistan to maintain its allocation of funds for overall development directed toward support of such critical programs as population control, agricultural development, education, and public health throughout the province of East Pakistan and at the same time permit them to mount a program to meet urgent reconstruction needs in the cyclone-affected districts. Significant slippage in the government's ongoing development programs for East Pakistan would only force a greater concentration of people in areas of marginal economic potential and increase the numbers of poverty-stricken human beings subjected to the natural calamities and ravages of nature in East Pakistan.

Mr. President, on December 3, the House Foreign Affairs Committee recognized the severe need for increased financial assistance to Pakistan, during markup of the supplemental foreign aid authorization bill, the committee acted favorably on a proposal by Congressman WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, authorizing the appropriation of an additional \$15 million of contingency funds for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction in East Pakistan. An amendment authorizing the appropriation of excess foreign currencies held in Pakistan was also accepted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I strongly urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to authorize additional funds to support East Pakistan relief.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

ADMINISTRATION MISLEADS ON SST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, over the weekend the administration unfortunately made remarks which I can only consider to be grossly misleading with respect to the SST. They made those remarks after the Senate voted last week on the SST.

They seem to be trying to pump new life into the SST albatross.

Congress cannot make an intelligent decision about the SST unless it has the correct information about the program. The administration remarks are confusing on the issue.

A prime example is the claim that it would cost as much to terminate this program as it would to complete it. We are told that termination costs will run to \$277 million and that it would cost \$290 million to go ahead with the program.

The fact is that actual termination costs under the SST contracts would run about \$85 to \$90 million. This is the penalty that the Federal Government must pay for failing to go ahead with the program. The \$85 to \$90 million represents a reimbursement to the manufacturers for the money they have put up so far.

The remainder of the \$277 million consists of \$81 million that the airlines have put up as earnest money and to reserve delivery positions, and \$105 million that has been spent since July 1 under the continuing resolution.

The first—that is, the airline payments—simply amounts to a return of investment. This money never came out of the taxpayers' pockets in the first place. So returning this money does not represent a cost of termination.

The second item—\$105 million—is money which has already been spent. It makes as much sense to call this a termination cost as it would to call the entire \$795 million which has been spent since 1963 a termination cost.

The fact is that termination costs—outlays which Uncle Sam must make if the SST appropriation is rejected—amount to \$85–\$90 million. This is the figure which Congress should have in mind as it considers the SST.

Another example relates to jobs. President Nixon stated Saturday that “the Senate’s action means the loss of at least 150,000 jobs.”

But the President is alluding to the employment estimate for the full production stage. Full production for the American SST is not scheduled until 1978–80. Needless to say, the unemployment picture could change substantially in 8 to 10 years' time. And even then, the number of people actually employed on the SST would be no more than 50,000.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. What is the maximum number of people that is projected would be employed at any one time if the plane were in maximum production?

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the plane were in maximum production, it is my understanding that the maximum number at any time to be employed directly on the SST 8 or 10 years from now would

be 50,000, but it is conceivable that with the multiplier effect it could result in additional people being at work because 50,000 people on a production job would require service jobs, and so forth. I do not quarrel with that.

Mr. NELSON. What is the total projected financial outlay for the purchase of 500 SST's, which number seems to be the objective?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not that confident in my mathematics but I can tell the Senator the cost of these planes is now estimated at \$40 million a copy. I would be astonished if it did not go to \$50 million or \$60 million. That amount can be multiplied by 500 planes. It is tens of billions of dollars.

Mr. NELSON. It would be \$25 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is far more relevant to talk of the number of workers now employed on the SST and subject to layoffs. This number is 4,800 people. Of those jobs, a Boeing official said last week:

Boeing and Seattle can walk away from the SST—there are only 4,800 jobs at Boeing involved anyhow.

This is a far cry from the 150,000 jobs the President claims would be affected by the Senate's decision.

Finally, the President said it would be a waste to stop the program now that it is 50 percent complete. If this is the kind of argument we are hearing now, one can imagine the enormous economic and political pressure to go ahead with the program once the prototypes are built, and more than \$1.3 billion has been spent. No matter how severe the environmental impact of the SST, it would be almost impossible to stop it at that point.

Furthermore, there is no law which says that the work done up to this point must be destroyed. There is no reason why the blueprints, the mockup, and the hardware built so far cannot be preserved until the environmental problems are solved and private capital develops an interest in the SST program.

I hope Congress will not be swayed by these grossly misleading statements put out by the administration. The Senate acted wisely in rejecting funds for the SST.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 19436. An act to provide for the establishment of a national urban growth policy, to encourage and support the proper growth and development of our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, and towns with emphasis upon new community and innercity development, to extend and amend laws relat-

ing to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 19504. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for the Federal Prison System, "Support of U.S. prisoners" for the fiscal year 1971 had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON RELOCATION OF TOXIC CHEMICAL MUNITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Installations and Logistics, reporting, pursuant to law, that the toxic chemical munitions now on Okinawa will be relocated to a military storage site on Johnston Island in the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for calendar year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on controlling industrial water pollution—progress and problems, Federal Water Quality Administration, Department of the Interior, dated December 2, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for strengthening management controls over the procurement of munitions under development, such as 105-mm ammunition, Department of Defense, dated December 7, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the savings and greater effectiveness obtainable in the Army maintenance program, Department of the Army, dated December 7, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

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

A resolution adopted by the City Commission of Kalamazoo, Mich., in support of the "Operation Head Start"; to the Committee on Appropriations:

A resolution adopted by the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, at Muskogee, Okla., in opposition to the regionalization of the education and engineering services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs now performed by the area offices; to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

S. 4557. A bill to amend Public Law 91-273 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1414).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Gerard D. Reilly, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

By Mr. INOUE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Andrew E. Gibson, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and

C. Langhorne Washburn, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Tourism.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 4565. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the operation within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States of any civil supersonic aircraft until and unless the sonic boom and stratospheric pollution created by such operation have been reduced to zero or the effectual equivalent of zero, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the bill appear below under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 4566. A bill for the relief of Tran Thi Huong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

S. 4567. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(The remarks of Mr. MCGOVERN when he introduced the bill appear below under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 4568. A bill for the relief of Pilar Orta Olibarria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4565—INTRODUCTION OF THE SONIC BOOM AND STRATOSPHERIC POLLUTION ABOLITION ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the operation within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States of any civil supersonic aircraft until and unless the sonic boom and stratospheric pollution created by such operation have been reduced to zero or the effectual equivalent of zero.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 4565) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the operation within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States of any civil supersonic aircraft until and unless the sonic boom and stratospheric pollution created by such operation have been reduced to zero or the effectual equivalent of zero, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4565

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 "Sonic Boom and Stratospheric Pollution Abolition Act."

SEC. 2. (a) Title VI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1421-1431) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR OPERATION OF CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

"Definitions

"Sec. 612 (a) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'civil supersonic aircraft' means an aircraft designed and intended for regular operation in civil aviation at supersonic speeds;

"(2) the term 'supersonic speed' means a speed in excess of the speed of sound at the altitude at which an aircraft is operating;

"(3) the term 'stratosphere' means the upper portion of the atmosphere, above seven miles, more or less (depending on latitude, season and weather), in which temperature changes but little with altitude and clouds of water never form naturally;

"(4) the term 'sonic boom' means the shockwave produced and apparent at the surface of the earth, consisting of a wave of short, sharp increases in atmospheric pressure (known as 'overpressure' and usually measured in the United States in pounds per square foot) at a given point, created by the operation of an aircraft at supersonic speed;

"(5) the term 'stratospheric pollution' means the emission into the stratosphere by a civil supersonic aircraft, in any quantity whatever, of water vapor, sulfur dioxide, hydrocarbons, or other solid or gaseous substances not found or occurring in the stratosphere in nature, or the emission into the stratosphere of substances found or occurring there in nature in quantities, qualities or moieties detrimentally larger than or different from that which is found or occurs in nature.

"Declaration of Policy

"(b) The Congress finds and declares that the operation of civil supersonic aircraft within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States would provide certain social and economic benefits and entail certain social and economic costs to the United States. The only social benefit would be the reduction by 50 per centum, more or less, of the time required (using 1970 equipment) for commercial flights between points served by such aircraft. The economic benefits would consist of whatever profits and jobs the market demand for such fast flights might create. The social and economic costs of operation of civil supersonic aircraft would include degradation of the environment by

sonic boom, airport and community noise, air pollution, and stratospheric pollution, the last mentioned involving grave threats to the world's climate; and sonic-boom injury and damage at sea and over land to persons, property and commerce. A further social cost involves the fact that the Nation has only limited resources of scientific and other talent and money, and the manpower and capital employed in development and operation of civil supersonic aircraft cannot be utilized for other, more urgent social needs. It is the judgment of the Congress that the social and economic cost of the operation of civil supersonic aircraft within such jurisdiction would outweigh the social and economic benefits by a factor which cannot be precisely known but which is immense. It is therefore the policy of the Congress to prohibit the operation within such jurisdiction of any civil supersonic aircraft until and unless the social and economic costs presented by two of the most serious negative features of such aircraft, namely sonic boom and stratospheric pollution, have been reduced to zero or the effectual equivalent of zero.

"Prohibition

"(c) (1) No civil supersonic aircraft shall be operated within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

"(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to any civil supersonic aircraft which produces no sonic boom at the surface of the earth at any point or time during its flight and which produces no stratospheric pollution at any point or time during its flight. For the purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) a civil supersonic aircraft shall be deemed to produce no sonic boom if the overpressure created by its flight at supersonic speeds never exceeds 0.1 pound per square foot at any point on the surface of the earth, over land or water; and

"(B) a civil supersonic aircraft shall be deemed to produce no stratospheric pollution when its emissions into the stratosphere are nil or have been scientifically determined and certified by the Council on Environmental Quality; the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; the Secretary of Commerce; the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; the National Science Foundation; and the American Association for the Advancement of Science to have no adverse effects whatever on the climate and environment of the earth, and such certification by the Secretary of Commerce shall be made only after full scientific study and analysis by the Environmental Science Services Administration.

"(3) No public funds of the United States shall be expended for purposes of making any study and certification under paragraph 2(B) of this subsection. Such studies shall be undertaken by or under the direction of any department or agency of the United States only upon application of the private business interests desirous of receiving such certifications, and upon payment by such interests, in advance, to such department or agency of sums of money sufficient to cover all costs of any scientific studies, tests, and experiments which are prerequisite to such certification, and such department or agency is authorized to receive and use such sums for such purposes."

(b) That portion of the table of contents of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to Title VI is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 612. Environmental qualifications for operation of civil supersonic aircraft."

COMMUNITY AND AIRPORT NOISE

SEC. 3. (a) Section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"CONTROL AND ABATEMENT OF AIRCRAFT NOISE

"SEC. 611. (a) In order to afford present and future relief and protection to the public from unnecessary aircraft noise, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall prescribe and amend standards for the measurement of aircraft noise and sonic boom and shall prescribe and amend such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise and, within the limitations of section 612 of this title, sonic boom, including the application of such standards, rules and regulations in the issuance, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of any certificate authorized by this title.

"(b) In prescribing and amending standards, rules, and regulations under this section, the Administrator shall—

"(1) consider relevant available data relating to aircraft noise and sonic boom, including the results of research, development, testing, and evaluation activities conducted pursuant to this act and the Department of Transportation Act;

"(2) consult with such Federal, State, and interstate agencies as he deems appropriate;

"(3) consider whether any proposed standard, rule, or regulation is consistent with the highest degree of safety in air commerce or air transportation in the public interest;

"(4) consider whether any proposed standard, rule, or regulation, proposed for application to existing certificated aircraft and intended to impose more stringent standards upon such aircraft, is economically reasonable, technologically practicable, and appropriate for the particular type of aircraft, aircraft engine, appliance, or certificate to which it will apply;

"(5) consider whether any proposed or existing standard, rule, or regulation, proposed for application to aircraft not yet certificated, would add to airport or community noise levels, and, if so, shall not issue or shall withdraw such standard, rule, or regulation, and

"(6) consider the extent to which such standard, rule, or regulation will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this section and of section 612 of this title.

"(c) No standard, rule or regulation prescribed or amended under this section shall permit or contemplate, in any aircraft, aircraft engine, or appliance not certificated on the date of enactment of the Sonic Boom and Stratospheric Pollution Abolition Act, levels of community or airport noise greater than the levels of community or airport noise permitted and achieved by the most quiet of turbine aircraft certificated on or before such date.

"(d) In any action to amend, modify, suspend or revoke a certificate in which violation of aircraft noise, sonic boom, or stratospheric pollution prohibition standards, rules or regulations is at issue, the certificate holder shall have the same notice and appeal rights as are contained in section 609, and in any appeal to the National Transportation Safety Board, the Board may amend, modify, or reverse the order of the Administrator if it finds that control or abatement of aircraft noise and lawful sonic boom, or prohibition of unlawful sonic boom or stratospheric pollution, do not require the affirmation of such order, or that such order is not consistent with safety in air commerce or air transportation or the policy and purposes of this section and section 612.

(b) That portion of the table of contents which relates to section 611 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 611. Control and abatement of aircraft noise."

SONIC BOOM AND STRATOSPHERIC POLLUTION
BY MILITARY AIRCRAFT

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Defense shall, before July 1, 1971, prepare and promulgate rules and regulations to bring the operations of military supersonic aircraft of the United States, and of any foreign military supersonic aircraft which may be operating within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States as speedily and as closely as is practicable and consistent with the national defense, within the policy of this Act, to abolish sonic boom and stratospheric pollution.

REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION
FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

SEC. 5. Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971, no appropriation shall be made for any fiscal year for the development of any civil supersonic aircraft unless specifically authorized for such purpose and for such year by Act of Congress.

S. 4567—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL
RELATING TO DISTRICT OF CO-
LUMBIA ELECTION LAW REFORM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, along with Representative DON FRASER, of Minnesota, who is taking similar action in the other House, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend and reform the District of Columbia Election Act.

Mr. President, this bill is the product of diligent effort and meticulous study on the part of the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee. I am proud to place it before the Senate.

The bill complements a series of proposed new rules, regulations, and practices which were prepared for submission to the Board of Elections. The sum is a comprehensive package of reforms aimed at opening the political processes to all voters of the District.

We all know that the best method of encouraging broadened participation in elections here would be to grant the full rights of American citizenship, including self-government and congressional representation, to residents of the District of Columbia.

Local elections, by themselves, arouse little interest. Voters usually turn out in respectable numbers only when the national presidency is at stake. Response to intensive voter registration drives have been disappointing.

We cannot escape the clear connection between these sad truths and the disgraceful fact that Washington citizens still await the right to choose their local leaders and national representatives like people in every other part of the country. We must continue the struggle to remedy that sad situation.

This bill, then, aims to make a model of procedural democracy, at least, where substantive democracy is still denied.

As chairman of the National Democratic Party's Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, I am especially interested in the portions of this bill which fulfill for District voters the mandate for reform issued by the 1968 Democratic Convention.

The delegates in Chicago declared that the 1972 convention "shall require," in order to give "all Democratic voters—full and timely opportunity to participate" in

nominating candidates, that the unit rule be eliminated from all stages of the delegate selection process, and that "all feasible efforts" be made to assure that "delegates are selected through party primary, convention, or committee procedures open to public participation within the calendar year of the national convention."

Official guidelines were adopted in November of last year, and they were printed and circulated in the Commission's report issued last April. They are now being implemented throughout the country. They assure that the 1972 Democratic Convention will be the most free, most open, most unbossed convention in our national experience.

The procedures through which District of Columbia delegates to national conventions are chosen has been much better than most. In 1968, delegates and alternates were elected in a presidential primary, in which voters could choose between selecting a single slate or selecting individual members from different slates. However, candidates could not express their presidential preference on the ballot, and no presidential preference poll was conducted. They were bound to no candidate.

This bill establishes a presidential preference primary for the District, to be held on the first Tuesday of May of each presidential election year. Delegates and alternate delegates would be bound for two convention ballots to support the presidential candidate who received at least a plurality in the primary. Their support for specific candidates would be listed on the ballot.

Other provisions relating to the guidelines of the Reform Commission include:

Reduction of the voting age to 18. The guidelines call for allowing and encouraging participation in all party affairs by any Democrat of 18 years of age or older.

Eliminating of filing fees for all candidates for office. The Commission urged removal of all costs and fees involved in the delegate selection process.

Modification of voter registration procedures including, first, reducing the residency requirement to 30 days; second, the employment of at least one citizen registrar in each precinct; and third, permitting registration at every fire station and police station in the District. The Commission urged each State party to assess the burdens imposed by registration laws, customs, and practices and to seek appropriate changes.

Provision for the election of alternates in the same manner as delegates, as specifically required by the guidelines.

But the Democratic Central Committee has gone well beyond the steps called for by the Party Reform Commission. It has proposed important additional changes in the District of Columbia election laws, aimed at avoiding fraudulent conduct, at achieving fairness to the candidates, and at assuring maximum possible public participation in the electoral process.

The bill includes a specific provision authorizing referendums and advisory elections, so that District of Columbia

voters can express themselves on important issues affecting their lives.

It would establish a pioneering system of tax credits for political contributions, to counteract the dangerous tendency for Government to become the exclusive realm of the rich.

It includes campaign financial reporting requirements with teeth—including automatic disqualification of candidates who willfully fail to comply with the duty to report prior to election day on contributions and expenditures.

It would restore the right to vote to felons who have been pardoned or who have paid the full penalty society exacts for their offense.

Until the District does achieve self-government, it would encourage greater participation in school board elections by moving them to coincide with presidential elections.

It would allow any candidate or group of candidates to obtain authorized credentials for poll watchers, with full opportunity to challenge potential fraud and mistakes.

These and other more detailed provisions of the bill reflect a determination to make the electoral system work as effectively as it possibly can. They express the District of Columbia Democratic Committee's clear belief, which I share, that election laws should be not barriers to democracy but its servants.

I hope the Congress will move quickly to write these proposals into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary of the bill, along with the text of the bill itself, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 4567) to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4567

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Election Act is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act is amended (A) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That", (B) by striking out in clause (3) thereof the words "at large", (C) by striking out in clause (2) thereof the final "and", (D) by redesignating clause (3) as clause (4), (E) by adding a new clause (3) as follows:

"(3) Alternates to the officials referred to in clauses (1) and (2) above, where permitted by political party rules; and"

and, (F) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Candidates for office participating in an election of the officials referred to in clauses (2) and (3), or designated pursuant to clause (4), of subsection (a) of this section may be elected or designated, as the case may be, at large or by precinct or ward."

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'qualified elector' means a citizen of the United States (A) who does not claim voting residence or right to vote in any State or territory; and who, for the

purpose of voting in an election under this Act, has resided or has been domiciled in the District continuously since the beginning of the thirty-day period ending on the day of such election; (B) who is, or will be on the day of the next election, eighteen years old; (C) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned or is no longer subject to the jurisdiction of any court with respect thereto; and, (D) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction."

(3) Section 5(a)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon a comma and the following: "including referenda and advisory elections, approved by majority vote of the City Council, as part of any regular election."

(4) Section 5 of such Act is amended (1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and (2) by adding after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) (1) The Board shall, on the first Tuesday in May of each presidential election year, conduct a presidential preference primary election within the District of Columbia in which voters therein may express their preference for candidates of each political party of the District of Columbia for nomination for President.

"(2) No person shall participate as a candidate in such primary unless there shall have been filed with the Board a petition on behalf of his candidacy signed by at least 1,000 citizens of the District of Columbia who are registered under section 7 of this Act, and of the same political party as the nominee.

"(3) Whenever the Board shall receive a petition which appears to qualify the name of a candidate for President, it shall forthwith in writing notify the prospective candidate of such petition and shall advise him that, unless, within ten days after receipt of such notice, he requests the Board to withdraw his name from the ballot, his name shall appear on the ballot of his party in such presidential preference primary.

"(4) No voter in any such primary election may cast a ballot for more than one candidate for nomination for President.

"5. The Board shall ascertain and announce the number of votes cast in such primary elections within the District of Columbia for each candidate of each political party for nomination for President.

"(6) The delegates and alternate delegates, of each political party within the District of Columbia to the national convention of that party convened for the nomination of the candidate of that political party for President, elected in accordance with this Act, shall, on the first and second ballots cast at that convention for nominees for President, be obligated to vote for the candidate for nomination who received at least a plurality of the votes cast in such presidential preference primary for all such candidates of that party for President, but on subsequent ballots so cast each such delegate shall be free to cast his ballots in his discretion without restriction.

"(7) The Board shall by regulation specify the time within which the petitions referred to in clause (2) of this subsection shall be filed, and such other details necessary and proper to effectuate the purposes and provisions of this subsection."

(5) Subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act is amended by adding after clause (2) the following:

"(3) The Board shall employ at least one citizen as registrar in each precinct who shall be paid a reasonable amount, established by the Board, per voter registered.

"(4) Registration shall be permitted in every police and fire station within the District of Columbia."

(6) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act is amended (A) by striking out "and

(2)," and inserting in lieu thereof "(2), and (3)", and (B) by striking clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "clause (3)".

(7) Subsection (b) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out "three-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety-day".

(8) Subsection (c) of section 8 is amended by (A) amending clause (1) to read:

"(1) to vote, in any election of officials referred to in clauses (1), (2) and (3) of the first section of this Act and of officials designated pursuant to clause (4) of such section, separately or by slates, for the candidates duly qualified and nominated under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, for election to each such office, group of offices, or all offices by such party"; (B) by redesignating clause (2) as clause (3); and, (C) by adding after clause (1) the following:

"(2) to be informed by appropriate designation on the ballot which candidates are running together and which candidate, if any, in the presidential preference primary election they support; and"

(9) Subsection (1) of section 8 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(o) Each candidate in a general election for members of the Board of Education shall be nominated for such office by a petition (A) filed with the Board not later than forty-five days before the date of such general election; and (B) signed by at least two hundred and fifty persons who are duly registered under section 7 of this Act in the ward from which the candidate seeks election, or in the case of a candidate running at large, signed by at least fifty persons in each ward of the District who are duly registered in such ward, and such additional number of persons duly registered under section 7 of this Act, without regard to ward, as may be necessary for such petition to contain not less than one thousand persons. A nominating petition for a candidate in a general election for members of the Board of Education may not be circulated for signatures before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventeenth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions. In a general election for members of the Board of Education, the Board shall arrange the ballots in each ward to enable a voter registered in that ward to vote for any one candidate duly nominated to be elected to such office from such ward, and to vote for as many candidates duly nominated for election at large to such office as there are Board of Education members to be elected at large in such election."

(10) Section 9(c) is amended to read as follows:

"Any candidate or group of candidates may, not less than two weeks prior to such election, petition the Board for credentials authorizing watchers at one or more polling places and at the place where the vote is counted for the next election during voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board shall formulate rules and regulations not inconsistent with this Act to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern the conduct of such watchers, and, if necessary to prevent the conduct of such election from being unreasonably obstructed, to limit the number of watchers. Such rules and regulations should provide fair opportunity for watchers for all candidates or groups of candidates to challenge prospective voters whom the watchers believe to be unqualified to vote, to challenge mistakes in the vote count, and otherwise to observe the conduct of the election at the polling places and the counting of votes.

(11) Section 10(a)(1) of this Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) The elections of the officials referred to in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first section and of officials designated pursuant to clause (4) of such section and the

primary under section 5(b) of this Act shall be held on the first Tuesday in May of each presidential election year."

(12) Section 10(a)(7)(A) of such Act is amended by deleting "a majority" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least forty per centum".

(13) Section 11(a) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "In no case, however, shall the petitioner be required to pay the cost of any recount in any such election if the difference in the number of votes received by the petitioner in connection with any office and the number of votes received by the person certified as having been elected to that office is either less than two per centum, or one hundred votes."

(14) Section 13(b) is amended by striking "or" immediately before "delegate" and inserting "or alternate," immediately after "delegate."

(15) Section 13(d) is amended by striking "or" immediately before "delegate" and inserting "or alternate" immediately after "delegate".

(16) Subsection (e) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) In any election held in the District of Columbia with respect to any office referred to in the first section of this Act or with respect to a primary under section 5(b) of this Act, each candidate for election, and the treasurer of each independent or party committee, shall file with the Board of Elections, not less than three nor more than five days before, and also within thirty days after, the date on which such primary or general election is to be held, an itemized statement, complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing, setting forth—

"(A) a correct and itemized account of each contribution received by such candidate or committee, or by any person for such candidate or committee with his or its knowledge or consent, from any source, for use in connection with such election, together with the name of the actual contributor;

"(B) a correct and itemized account of each expenditure made by such candidate or committee or by any person for such candidate or committee, with his or its knowledge or consent, in connection with such election, together with the name and address of the person to whom such expenditure was made, the date of such expenditure, and the purpose for which it was made; and

"(C) a correct and itemized account of any unpaid debts and obligations incurred by such candidate or committee with respect to such election, and the balance, if any, of such contributions remaining in the candidate or committee's hands.

"(2) A statement required by this subsection to be filed by a candidate or the treasurer of an independent or party committee shall be signed by the candidate or the treasurer of such committee, as the case may be, and shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths. Such statement shall be deemed properly filed when deposited at the Board of Elections within the prescribed time. Such statement shall be preserved by the Board of Elections for a period of two years from the date of filing, shall constitute a part of the public records of such Board, and shall be open to public inspection.

"(3) In any case in which a candidate willfully fails to timely file a statement required under this section to be filed prior to such election, the Board of Elections shall immediately disqualify such candidate from participating therein as a candidate and his nomination shall be deemed withdrawn. No candidate for election to any such office or participation in such primary shall be certified as having been elected to that office, or as a winner of any primary held pursuant

to section 5(b) until all statements required to be filed by such candidate pursuant to this section have been filed. Any candidate or other person who willfully violates this section shall be subject to imprisonment for thirty days or a fine of five thousand dollars or both."

SEC. 2. Title VI of article I of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47-1567-47-1567e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 7. (a) Credit for Campaign Contributions.—For the purpose of encouraging residents of the District to participate in the election process in the District, there shall be allowed to an individual a credit against the tax (if any) imposed by this article in an amount equal to 50 per centum of any campaign contribution made to any candidate for election to any office referred to in the first section of the District of Columbia Election Act, but in no event shall such credit exceed the amount of twenty dollars.

"(b) If the amount of credit allowed an individual by subsection (a) for a taxable year exceeds the amount of tax (computed without regard to such subsection but after allowance of any other credit allowable under this article on such individual for such taxable year, a refund shall be allowed such individual to the extent that such credit exceeds the amount of such tax.

"(c) (1) A husband and wife filing separate returns for a taxable year for which a joint return could have been made by them may claim between them only the total credit (or refund) to which they would have been entitled under this section had a joint return been filed.

"(2) No individual for whom a personal exemption was allowed on another individual's return shall be entitled to a credit (or refund) under this section."

(b) The table of contents of such article is amended by adding at the end of the part of such table relating to title VI the following: "Sec. 7. Credit for campaign contributions."

SEC. 3. Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101 (c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Each member of the Board of Education elected from a ward shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the school election ward from which he seeks election, (B) have, for the ninety-day period immediately preceding his nomination, resided in the school election ward from which he is nominated, and (C) have, during the ninety-day period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(2) Each member of the Board of Education elected at large shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the District of Columbia, and (b) have, during the ninety-day period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(3) No individual may hold the office of member of the Board of Education and (A) hold another elective office other than delegate or alternate delegate to a convention

of a political party nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, or (B) also be an officer or employee of the District of Columbia government or of the Board of Education. A member will forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualification required by this paragraph."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 10 (a) (3) of the District of Columbia Election Act is amended by deleting "odd-numbered" and inserting in lieu thereof "even-numbered".

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec 31-101), the term of office of each member of the District of Columbia Board of Education holding such office on the date of the enactment of this Act is hereby extended by one year.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act and the amendments made thereby shall take effect as of January 1, 1971.

The summary, presented by Mr. McGovern, is as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS, AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION LAWS SPONSORED BY SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN AND CONGRESSMAN DON FRASER

I. ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE AND HOLD OFFICE, REGISTRATION

Voting age would be reduced to 18. This provision would automatically lower to 18 the minimum age requirement for holding political party or school board offices.

The residency requirement to vote would be reduced to 30 days. Residency for membership on the School Board would be 90 days.

While members of the Board of Education would not be allowed to hold other elective or appointive D.C. office, candidates for the Board could hold such other office and would not be required to resign until elected.

Convicted felons who have either been pardoned or paid the full penalty for their crime would be eligible to vote.

The Board of Elections would be required to employ at least one registrar in each precinct, and to permit voter registration at all police and fire stations in the District throughout the year.

II. NOMINATIONS

Filing fees for candidates for office in the District of Columbia would be abolished.

Nominating petitions for Board of Education candidates running at large in the District would be required to include a minimum of 50 signatures per ward (instead of the present 125) among the 1,000 signature total.

III. PARTY PRIMARIES

The Board of Elections would conduct a presidential preference primary on the first Tuesday of May of each presidential election year. Nominating petitions would be required to include at least 1,000 signatures of electors of the same political party as the nominee, who would then be listed on the ballot unless he withdrew within ten days after being notified that petitions had been filed.

Election of party officers would take place on the same day. Parties would be allowed to elect delegates, alternate delegates, central committee members and other party officials from precincts or wards instead of at large.

Delegates and alternate delegates to national nominating conventions would be elected in the same fashion. The ballot would include specification of the presidential candidate they support, if any, and would list delegates and alternates by slates.

Delegates and alternates would be bound for at least two convention ballots, or until released, to support the candidate who received at least a plurality of the vote in the primary.

IV. CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The District of Columbia tax laws would be amended to provide a 50 percent tax credit of up to \$20 for contributions to candidates for office in the District.

Candidates for office in the District would be required to file with the Board of Elections, both between three and five days before and within thirty days after the election, a list of all financial contributions received by them or by committees on their behalf, all campaign-related expenditures and their purpose, all unpaid debts and obligations, and the amount of contributed funds remaining unexpended. Failure to file prior to the election would automatically disqualify the candidate, and no winning candidate could be certified until all statements were filed. Willful violation would subject the offender to imprisonment for up to thirty days and/or a fine of up to five thousand dollars.

V. VOTE COUNT

In elections for the Board of Education, runoffs would be held only if no candidate received at least 40 percent of the total vote.

Candidates would be entitled to a recount without charge to them if the margin were less than 2 percent of the total vote or less than 100 votes.

Candidates or groups of candidates would be allowed to obtain authorized credentials to witness the voting and vote count, with full opportunity to challenge potential fraud and mistakes.

VI. REFERENDA AND ADVISORY ELECTIONS

The Board of Elections would be specifically authorized to hold referenda and advisory elections as part of any regular election.

VII. DATES OF ELECTIONS

School Board elections would be held in even numbered years as part of presidential and delegate elections. Terms of present Board members would, accordingly, be extended one year.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A BILL

S. 3354

At the request of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3354, to amend the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244) to establish a national land use policy.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 86—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE NECESSITY FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND UNITED NATIONS CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSEQUENCES, ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHERWISE, OF THE OPERATION OF CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT IN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a Senate concurrent resolution on the necessity for international cooperation and United Nations consideration of the consequences, environmental and otherwise, of operation of civil supersonic aircraft in international commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 86

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that many of the international air carriers of the world are actively planning the purchase of civil supersonic aircraft which will regularly operate in international commerce at stratospheric levels and supersonic speeds; and

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that the operation of civil supersonic aircraft in international commerce will inject into the stratosphere quantities of water vapor, sulfur dioxide, hydrocarbons, and other solid or gaseous substances which may compromise the stability and integrity of the stratosphere and have a deleterious effect upon the earth's climate; and

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that the operation of civil supersonic aircraft produces the phenomenon of sonic booms, a continuous series of short, sharp shock waves at the surface of the earth beneath the aircraft's flight path, which may have serious detrimental effects upon the human and animal populations and the ecology of the area of the earth subjected to continuous repetition of sonic booms; and

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that the operation of civil supersonic aircraft would produce increased levels of noise in areas adjacent to points of landing and take-off; and

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that the full nature and extent of the environmental impact and the ecological consequences which may result from the operation of civil supersonic aircraft in international commerce are unresolved; and

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that the environmental impact and ecological consequences which may result from the operation of civil supersonic aircraft in international commerce are of a global dimension; and

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that the preservation and improvement of national and global environmental quality are of the highest order of priority and necessity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that all issues pertaining to the operation of civil supersonic aircraft in international commerce be presented to the United Nations for the attention and consideration of the General Assembly, and that the subject of the environmental impact and ecological consequences of the operation of civil supersonic aircraft in international agenda of the United Nations Conference on Commerce be presented for inclusion on the Environment to be held in Sweden in 1972.

THE GLOBAL IMPACT OF THE SST

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, last Thursday the Senate made a historic decision to terminate the development of a commercial supersonic transport. The decisive factor was the environmental issue.

No comparable or even similar political decision of such magnitude has ever been made by this country, or any other. It was a dramatic act that stopped a major ongoing program in the face of claims and unfounded assertions that our international prestige was at stake; that our worldwide leadership would be lost; that

our balance-of-payments position would be damaged; that jobs would be wiped out and some kind of crippling technological malaise would surely overtake the country—all arguments that prevailed in the past somehow fell short this time.

Was that vote just an empty gesture, a temporary political aberration, or did it really mean something? I think it meant something, and those who doubt it have misjudged the momentum and political power of the environmental cause.

While I doubt the vote proves that the Congress yet appreciates in full measure the political force of the issue, it is pretty clear that the voice of protest is finally being heard on Capitol Hill.

Now that the vote is over, the worldwide ripples and reverberations have just begun. What does it mean and where do we go from here?

It means, I think, that the environmental issue has reached political maturity and henceforth, technological development will have to stand the environmental test. Perhaps we have reached that stage of wisdom and maturity where we can decide that we do not have to do everything that is technologically possible, or prestigious, or profitable despite the consequences.

The proponent arguments on prestige, progress, technological leadership, jobs and balance of payments are fallacious at best. That is why the documentation of their case is so meager.

We have already made too many colossal blunders in the name of prestige and progress. Our technology has too often been exploited to solve problems that do not need to be solved and create products that nobody requires. Automobile style changes at an annual cost of \$1.5 billion is just one example among many. That is a privately imposed tax and social cost that no country can afford.

The President argues, without documentation, that the SST decision will export 150,000 jobs in the next two decades. He fails to mention that the same amount of money would build a million and a half homes for people who desperately need them. Neither does he mention that there is a whole generation of 747 jets to be built and put into service by employees of the industry.

While the proponents argue the question of jobs, it should be noted that with so many unmet social needs in the country—from housing to mass transportation—we would have a labor shortage if only we would address ourselves to their solution.

The final argument they make is that, after all, it is going to be built and flown anyway and we cannot afford to be out of the competition. The answer to that is that if we deny the use of our airfields to any SST, then it is not economically feasible for other countries to build a fleet either.

The economic feasibility of the SST is highly questionable at best. Without the United States, the world's single most important market, it cannot be a successful economic enterprise.

Our decision was made because of the grave global environmental implications. A large fleet of SST's would introduce water vapor and exhaust pollutants into the fragile, stable stratosphere. Repu-

table scientists calculate that 550 SST's would increase total stratospheric water vapor by 10 percent and as much as 60 percent in heavily traveled portions of the Northern Hemisphere.

What effect this and chemical pollutants will have, nobody knows. Scientists raise the possibility, however, that the pollutants may change the temperature on the surface of the planet. This, quite obviously, is a massive gamble we have no moral right to take.

The whole issue of the sonic boom remains unresolved with little prospect that it will be. This alone is sufficient cause to halt development.

The SST, traveling 1,500 miles per hour, trails a shattering continuous sonic boom of 2.5 to 3.5 pounds per square foot over an area 50 miles wide. Put another way, each acre of land and water along the way will be subjected to 130,000 pounds of sonic boom.

It is already agreed that such pressure is intolerable to humans and animals alike. Thus, supersonic overland flights will have to be barred, substantially reducing the SST's usefulness, since speed is its only virtue.

That leaves only over-ocean flights. The ocean, itself, is a great living body composed of innumerable fragile, intricate, interdependent life systems. If vast areas of the ocean are blasted hourly with 130,000 pounds of sonic boom per acre, no one can predict the consequences. But it would be a foolhardy enterprise to launch without many years of study in advance.

Any rational, scientific approach would have to start with the assumption that this massive environmental intrusion is likely to be disastrous. This is a moral question of global proportions that concerns the status of all living creatures, not just human beings alone.

As one of the two so-called world superpowers, we have the burden of responsible leadership.

We have decided not to build the SST because of worldwide environmental considerations. Certainly, we have the obligation to do everything we legitimately can within our sphere of influence to prevent a global experiment that may adversely affect us all.

No single country has political jurisdiction or control over the oceans or the stratosphere, nor even a significant part of either. Whose responsibility is it then?

Since we share the world environment together, we must share the responsibility of its protection also. If none of us assumes this responsibility, then we will surely experience the world environment's destruction together.

Therefore, I shall introduce legislation today that will prohibit flights of commercial supersonic aircraft within the territorial limits of the United States and, at the same time, a resolution recommending that this issue be put on the agenda of the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Environment in Stockholm, which is a year and a half away.

The same logic that caused the Senate to vote down the SST should certainly compel us to pass legislation prohibiting its flights in this country.

This legislation is not in any way discriminatory. It applies the same law to us that it does to all other countries.

This legislation could save us all from a vast, unnecessary misallocation of resources to an enterprise the world could do better without, even if it worked.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have filed today the nomination of Mr. Gerard D. Reilly for associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed.

I also must report that the committee, by a vote of 5 to 2, has rejected the nominations of Mr. Hubert B. Pair and J. Walter Yeagley to the same court.

BACKGROUND

These nominations were to fill three new judgeships on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. These judgeships, plus many of the new judgeships recently filled on the District of Columbia General Sessions bench, were created by the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970, which passed the Senate on September 18, 1969, passed the House on March 19, and finally approved after conference on July 23, 1970.

On September 23, 1970, the President sent the Senate 18 nominations to fill these new judgeships.

On October 5, on behalf of the committee, I announced that a hearing would be held on October 9 on "10 and perhaps more of the nominees." At that time I also said:

I regret that we cannot consider all nominations immediately. None, however, were submitted to the committee until 12 days ago and many have not yet been considered and reported upon by the District of Columbia Bar Association. In fairness to those nominees, we will want to assure adequate time to the Bar Association and other interested groups to prepare their reports.

In any case, I anticipate that the committee will be able to consider and pass upon all of the nominees within the very near future.

On October 6, the Attorney General, in a public letter addressed to me, asked that all the nominations be considered before the election recess. Acceding to his request, the committee postponed its hearing from October 9 to October 12, to permit the processing of the remainder of the nominations.

On October 12 the committee heard all 18 nominations and reported in executive session later the same day the 15 trial court nominees. Acting upon my motion, the Senate confirmed all 15 nominations that same day.

Regarding the Court of Appeals nominees, the Committee unanimously resolved as follows:

Consideration of nominations of three judges to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals will be delayed pending submission of material requested during the committee hearing this morning:

1. Clarification by the American Bar Association of just what the age standards of

the ABA are, how they are arrived at, and how they were applied in the instances of the three appellate nominees.

2. Personal Data Questionnaires submitted by the nominees to the Department of Justice.

3. A list in writing of at least ten cases that the nominees have personally both briefed and argued before state supreme courts, the several U.S. courts of appeals, or the U.S. Supreme Court.

On Tuesday, October 13, Mr. Richard Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General, asked me, through a phone call to the committee staff director, to secure Senate confirmation of the Appeals Court nominations prior to the congressional recess the next day. The staff director informed the Deputy Attorney General of the committee's resolution of the day before and told him that one of the nominees had not yet complied with it, but said he was sure the chairman would appreciate his call and take it under advisement.

The committee staff thereafter ascertained no quorum of the committee would be in the city prior to the recess.

No further communication was or has been received by the committee from the administration regarding these nominees.

On October 24, in connection with a political appearance in Dundalk, Md.—White House press release datelined Dundalk, see appendix I hereto—the President announced recess appointments for all three nominees. All three have since been sworn in as judges.

THE NOMINATION OF GERARD D. REILLY

The committee recommends confirmation of the nomination of Gerard D. Reilly because he possesses the qualifications necessary to execute the responsibilities of a judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. Mr. Reilly is considered "well qualified" by both the committee and the American Bar Association Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary.

In recommending the confirmation of Mr. Reilly's nomination, the committee was not unmindful that, under the mandatory retirement-at-70 provision of the District of Columbia court reform bill, Mr. Reilly will be able to serve only 6 years of the 15-year term to which he has been appointed. However, the committee also took into account that Mr. Reilly's high qualifications merit him the "well qualified" standard which, under the practice of both the Senate and the American Bar Association, would permit the confirmation of his nomination despite the questions of shortened service raised by his age.

THE NOMINATION OF MR. HUBERT B. PAIR AND MR. J. WALTER YEAGLEY

The committee voted 4 to 2 against reporting the nominations of Mr. Hubert B. Pair and Mr. Walter Yeagley, because, in the view of the committee they do not possess the high qualifications which overcome the fact that neither Mr. Pair, at 66½, or Mr. Yeagley, at 61½, can serve a substantial part of the 15-year term for which they have been nominated.

To both Mr. Pair and Mr. Yeagley the American Bar Association has assigned the rating "qualified," the minimum

qualification the ABA, the Senate, and the present and previous administrations have heretofore considered necessary for any Federal judicial nominee. The ABA, the Senate and the administration have traditionally required that anyone who is 60 or over should be at least "well qualified" to be considered for the bench, unless he is already on the bench, and no one who is 64 or over should be nominated for the bench for the first time.

The committee's research indicates that only 27 of the nearly 500 presently sitting Federal judges were over 60 at the time of their initial nomination and that none were more than 65. Each of these judges who were over 60 at the time of their appointments appears to have had high qualifications traditionally sought in judicial nominees appointed for the first time after the age of 60.

The committee believes that no age standard should be arbitrarily applied. In the case of extraordinarily well-qualified nominees, such as Mr. Reilly, exceptions may be made to the age standards the Senate has traditionally observed. Qualifications and ability to serve the term to which the nominee is appointed, not age itself, should be the basic considerations.

In the case of these Court of Appeals nominations, the committee, which itself wrote the basic statutes authorizing these appointments, believes the ability to serve out the full term prescribed by law is an extraordinarily important qualification.

Unfortunately, none of these nominees will be able to serve the full 15-year term Congress has prescribed for these judgeships. In fact, Mr. Pair and Mr. Yeagley together would be able to serve an aggregate of less than on full term. The inability of these nominees to serve a substantial portion of the terms Congress has specified for their office made their rejections for that office inevitable.

Under the Court Reform Act, the D.C. Court of Appeals will for the first time have jurisdiction over felony cases, including those involving the death sentence, and over civil cases of unlimited jurisdiction. Heretofore that court has had jurisdiction only over misdemeanors and civil matters of less than \$10,000. This is a revolutionary and vital shift of jurisdiction phased over a period of nearly four years. The committee believes that the ability of every nominee to the court to serve a substantial period of time during and after this precedent-making jurisdictional transition should be an indispensable qualification for confirmation.

The D.C. Court Reform Act created the vacancies now in question. It also provided a three-phase transfer of jurisdiction from the Federal District Court in the District to the new Superior Court created by that act. Under the act, appeals from the new Superior Court will be finally reviewed by the D.C. Court of Appeals, not the U.S. Court of Appeals as at present. The last phase of the jurisdictional transfer under the act will occur on August 1, 1973. Thus, in August and September, 1973, civil matters in excess of \$50,000 and probate matters will be considered by the Superior Court for the very first time. Appeals from those Superior Court decisions, taking into account the present trial time and foreseeable improvements in it, will not reach the D.C. Court of Appeals for the first time until the early summer of 1974, about two months after Mr. Pair would

have to leave the court under the mandatory retirement provisions of the law.

I should also note that, while I favor and have advocated mandatory retirement at age 70 for Federal judges, the mandatory retirement provision of the court reform bill was originated by the administration. It is the President's proposal which would require his nominees to retire when the work of the new Court of Appeals is barely begun.

The District of Columbia Court Reform Act is the most significant revision of the jurisdictional process in the District of Columbia in the history of our Nation. The new Court of Appeals has consciously been charged under the Court Reform Act with the authority to rewrite civil and criminal jurisprudence of the District. It will make the court rules for the new Superior Court. It will indelibly affect the practice and the substance of the law in the District of Columbia for a generation to come.

Under the circumstances Congress had a right to believe that the judges nominated to execute this extraordinary responsibility would be of the highest possible caliber, possessing credentials at least as significant as Mr. Reilly's. In setting a 15-year term for these judgeships, Congress expected that nominees to these judgeships would be able to serve that term, except in the most compelling circumstances.

This expectation was unfortunately dashed by the administration. What we received were nominees unable to serve the whole of their terms during this vital transition period. We were sent two nominees who possess only the minimum qualifications that the Senate, the American Bar Association, and each administration have historically required to ascend the bench. In fact, under these same standards these two nominees would be ineligible for appointment to the Federal bench.

The committee has executed its responsibilities in this case with much regret. These nominations were ill considered and handled in the most crudely political fashion by the administration. The nominees the committee has had to reject are men who have labored long in the vineyard of the Federal service. They deserve better treatment by the President than to be nominated to an office for which it was virtually certain their nominations could not be confirmed.

I would have preferred to confirm these nominations. Having spent more time on the court reform bill which created these vacancies than any other Member of Congress, I have an extraordinary interest in seeing the new court system get off to a fast and effective start. But it is precisely my interest in the court being effective and my constitutional obligation to assure that nominations to that court are qualified that compelled my vote against two of these nominations.

I hope the President will submit new names for these positions as promptly as possible, so that the court of appeals will be populated by judges of indisputable qualifications who can serve most or all of the 15-year term Congress and the President have agreed is appropriate of that office.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the President on October 24, 1970, announcing the recess appointment of three judges to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

When the Congress recessed on October 14, the Senate District of Columbia Committee left unfinished a matter of extreme urgency. The Committee failed to recommend confirmation of my nominations of three new judges to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Since the fair administration of justice in our Nation's Capital urgently requires better handling of the enormous workload confronting the courts, I am today announcing the recess appointments of those three judges.

They are: Hubert Pair, a distinguished attorney, Walter Yeagley, an Assistant U.S. Attorney General who has served in that capacity under four Presidents, and Gerard Reilly, a distinguished attorney and former member of the National Labor Relations Board.

These three outstanding nominees have received the approval of the American Bar Association, the District of Columbia Bar Association, and the Federal Bar Association. It is not clear just why the District of Columbia Committee under the Chairmanship of Senator Tydings failed to act on these nominations. I understand that there has been some objection on political grounds, but I believe that the unquestioned qualifications of these men should override consideration of politics. I have also heard that the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee objects to these nominees because they are more than 60 years old. Certainly the great contributions of American jurists after the age of 60 is sufficient evidence to counter that criticism. More than ever today we need mature and experienced judgments in our courts.

As I make these recess appointments, I am confident that the United States Senate, when it reconvenes next month, will vote to confirm these distinguished judges.

NOTE: The statement was released at Dundalk, Md.

MR. SPONG. Mr. President, I want to make clear my position in regard to the nomination of Mr. Gerard D. Reilly to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals which has been filed with the Senate today, and in regard to the nominations of Mr. Hubert B. Pair and J. Walter Yeagley to the same court which were rejected by the Committee on the District of Columbia on December 2, 1970.

These nominations were to fill three new judgeships on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals which were created by the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 which became law earlier this year. In addition, this act created 15 new judgeships on the District of Columbia general sessions court. Nominations to these 15 judgeships were reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia and approved by the Senate on October 12, 1970.

On this date the committee announced that the consideration of the nominations to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals would be held up pending further information in regard to the Amer-

ican Bar Association's age standards, the personal data questionnaires submitted to the Justice Department, and a list of at least 10 cases that the nominees have briefed and argued at the appellate level. This information was not obtained by the committee prior to the start of the election recess on October 14, 1970. On October 24, 1970 these three nominees received recess appointments to the court of appeals, and at this time all three have been sworn in and are sitting as judges.

On December 2, 1970, the Committee on the District of Columbia met in executive session to consider these nominations. At that meeting the committee recommended the confirmation of the nomination of Gerald D. Reilly and rejected the nomination of Mr. Hubert B. Pair and Mr. J. Walter Yeagley. I voted against the confirmation of the nominations of all three of these nominees.

The District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 expanded greatly the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. For example, the Court of Appeals will have for the first time jurisdiction over felony cases, the \$10,000 limit in civil matters has been removed, and the Court of Appeals will make the court rules for the new Superior Court. The transfer of jurisdiction has been spread over a period of 4 years, and this period will be critical to development of the law and the judicial system of the District.

The Court Reform Act provides for terms of 15 years for Court of Appeals judges and provides for mandatory retirement at age 70.

All three of the nominees are over 60 years of age: Mr. Pair, 66½; Mr. Reilly, 64; Mr. Yeagley, 61½. Thus, under the provisions of the act none of the three nominees to the Court of Appeals will be able to serve out their 15-year terms and two of the nominee will barely be able to serve out the period of the transfer of jurisdiction to the Court of Appeals. I believe that it is vital at the crucial beginning stage of development of the new court system that the judges on the Court of Appeals be available to serve a substantial portion of their 15-year term, and that it is even more important that the experience gained by the judge during the period of transfer of jurisdiction be available to the court for some time. It is for this reason that I voted against the confirmation of the three nominations to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

During the consideration of these nominations the question of the age standards of the American Bar Association and the policy of Congress and the Executive in regard to the age of nominees to the bench have been discussed. Despite some early confusion it appears that the ABA, Congress, and the Executive have followed the policy that an individual 60 years of age or over should not be appointed unless he at least held the rating of "well qualified" and that no one over 64 should be appointed unless he had prior judicial experience. Applying this policy to the nominees to the Court of Appeals, it is clear that two of the nominees would not qualify since

they are over 60 and receive a rating of only "qualified", while the third candidate, who is rated "well qualified," meets the age requirement by a few days.

The ABA has attempted to make a distinction in regard to these nominations because of the mandatory retirement age of 70. To me, the policy in regard to nominees over 60 is more, not less, relevant with mandatory retirement at 70 than with lifetime appointments.

It is not easy to be a party to the rejection of presidential nominees, particularly when, as is the case here, they are men of character and integrity. Nevertheless, to me the compelling and overriding considerations are twofold:

First, there should be assurance that the quality of the administration of justice under the new court system for the District is the equal of any in the Nation, particularly at the appellate level.

Second, that in endeavoring to achieve this we avoid setting a precedent that would not recognize the need for prolonged service by competent jurists during the more productive years of their lives.

I hope the President will give this consideration in future nominations for high judicial positions.

Having made clear my position in regard to the policy of nominating men to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals who cannot serve out their term and in view of the feeling of the committee that this nomination should be approved, I do not intend to oppose or vote against this nomination.

MISREPRESENTATION OF SENATOR DOMINICK BY COLUMNIST ROWLAND EVANS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, a column published in the Washington Post of Sunday, December 6, 1970, contained some serious misrepresentations about the junior Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) and me.

I am not concerned about the misrepresentations about me, for I have become accustomed to them.

But I am concerned about the misrepresentations about Senator DOMINICK. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the letter I have written today to the columnist in this matter.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., December 7, 1970.

Mr. ROWLAND EVANS, JR.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVANS: Your Sunday column (December 6, 1970) is in serious error.

While it is true and accurate in stating that I was, and am, displeased that so little was sent to the Republican Senatorial nominee in Maine who ran a surprisingly strong race and significantly reduced the winning margin of the incumbent from his last Senatorial election, other portions of your column are seriously inaccurate.

I am not backing Senator Cook or any of the other candidates for the position of Senate Republican Campaign Committee Chairman. I have made no commitment to anyone nor made the slightest indication of favoring any one over all others for the position.

I have not been annoyed in any manner by Senator Dominick. Nor has Senator Dominick's expression to me been limited to a mere form letter. To the contrary, Senator Dominick has personally talked with me several times about his desire to be the Campaign Committee Chairman—and these talks have gone back as far as three or four years ago, in addition to his talks with me this year. His talks this year preceded the form letter he wrote to all Republican Senators.

I do not know from whom you received the false information. I do know that you did not receive it from me or anyone on my staff or from any authorized person. Had you checked with me, you could have avoided the misrepresentations which someone else apparently gave to you.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

THE IMPORTANCE OF COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, recently Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., former executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development and now professor of engineering and public affairs at the University of Washington, delivered an address to the American Society of Civil Engineers on the importance of coastal zone management. His is the most recent in a long line of support given to the pending legislation to improve the management of this important area of the United States. Dr. Wenk's statement of the primary issues cogently summarizes the problem. He said:

Let me restate the primary issues: it is how to provide for many diverse and often conflicting coastal demands, public and private, and still obtain the greatest long-term social and economic benefits. We face an increasing pressure for more intense and variegated use of a scarce resource, and in the confusion of aspirants, we have responded on a first come, first served basis. We have almost completely neglected planning. Unless regional alternatives among competing uses are illuminated and then evaluated, we will rather helplessly continue to respond to claims motivated by short-term advantages to individuals, industry or local governments, and perhaps to inflexible momentum of the federal bureaucracy. Private beach development restricts public access. Dredging and filling may downgrade commercial fishing. Offshore drilling rigs limit freedom of navigation, and estuarine waste disposal depreciates all surrounding recreational use. While each single action may be justified on its own merits, the effect of piecemeal development can be chaos.

Mr. President, the importance of the coastal zone to the United States is highlighted by the support the National Governors' Conference and the National Legislative Conference gave to the pending legislation. They have both ranked coastal zone management high on their list of priorities. In addition, the Council of State Governments has formed a Coastal States Organization, chaired by Dr. William Hargis, director of the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences, which has actively pursued the interests of the coastal States to seek better management of this important area.

In order to highlight the importance of the coastal zone, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wenk's speech, entitled "National Policy for

Coastal Management," be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL POLICY FOR COASTAL MANAGEMENT
(By Edward Wenk, Jr., Professor of Engineering and Public Affairs, University of Washington, Seattle)

Six years ago, almost exactly to the day, I had the privilege of addressing this audience on what was then a new, unfamiliar and even uncrystallized theme of *ocean engineering*. At that time, the field of oceanography was just beginning to attract and sustain national attention, and I endeavored to highlight the critical role of engineering in converting the unrealized potential of the sea to contribute to national goals. Senator Bartlett referred to the address as a catalyst for legislative proposals that emphasized technology to explore and to utilize the sea, rather than simply expand marine science. These engineering concepts found their way into both language and title of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, PL 89-454.

Any author is bound to be gratified with such response. But subsequently as I learned more about the promise of the sea and the problems of translating benefits to enhance life on this planet, I found that address had two serious shortcomings. First, that address was devoted to the global ocean's 140 million square miles and failed to differentiate geographical sectors of the sea—and thus to delineate the special importance and ecology of that portion of the marine environment near our coasts. Secondly, while it recognized that converting scientific knowledge to practical use required a synthesis of technical knowledge with social goals and institutions, the paper was vague on specific measures. I am thus pleased to have this opportunity to elaborate on these missing details. I thus want to concentrate on issues concerning the coastal margin, and policies urgently needed for its management as a public trust.

The coastal area I refer to may be defined as the band of water and land that surrounds the continent, in which the sea exerts a measurable influence on the uses of the land and its ecology, and the land exerts a measurable influence on the uses of the coastal waters and on their ecology. This band, 17,000 miles long, extends offshore to the outer edge of the continental shelf and on shore at least to the upper reaches of the lunar tide and adjacent shoreline. Bays, estuaries, lagoons, wetlands, and beaches that punctuate this irregular boundary are necessarily included; so are the Great Lakes.

The coastal zone is cartographically where the land meets the sea. But equally important the coastal zone is the strip where people meet the sea. Until the last few years, it is remarkable that the marine environment was studied by scientists and policy makers alike as though the planet were uninhabited. The Marine Sciences Act, referred to earlier, awakened the nation to a new level of appreciation that the critical dynamic elements in formulating and achieving public purposes to use the sea more effectively—were people! Thus, in addition to considering interactions of wind and waves, currents and tides, marine flora and fauna, it was necessary to consider human institutions—their roles, interactions and conflicts; for progress toward effective use of the sea had been impeded by more than scientific ignorance.

In such conflicts among different users lies the nub of the problem along the shore. This is "where the action is."

The 30 coastal and Great Lake states contain more than 75 percent of our population. Practically all of the megalopolis projected to the year 2000 touch the sea. Eighteen of the

21 million increase in population during the decade of the sixties live there. A preponderance of heavy industrial investment is located there. It is a locale for \$40 billion annually of maritime trade, \$1 billion in offshore oil and \$500 million in fisheries. And because fuel, ore and bulk chemicals can be transported most economically by the sea, this gateway has sustained an ever growing frenzy of diversified industrial development.

Beyond its economic significance, the salubrious climate and esthetic pleasures of our shores become the recreational refuge for a busy people; thirty million turn annually to the sea to swim; eleven million to fish; eight million to sail.

Paradoxically, with this heightened pressure on coastal areas, the resource itself is shrinking and subject to creeping abuse.

From urban centers and industry concentrated along the coast flow the subtle, potent contaminants of an affluent society: chemical waste from factories; heat from power plants; domestic waste and sewage from cities and towns; insecticides and fertilizers from land runoff; low-level radioactive waste from reactors, laboratories and hospitals; and petroleum wastes from distributed sources. The sheer bulk and chemical stability of waste products can no longer be diluted, dispersed or degraded.

Not only is this sector of the marine environment where the action is, it is characterized by an anarchy of utilization; everybody wants to do "his thing." Inevitably, competition for a scarce resource begets conflict.

In the early stages of a shoreline's development, scattered individual actions have relatively innocuous impact on the ecology and on other potential users. But as that pressure on the environment grows, the environment is modified. Each user influences his neighbor. Early entrenched users preempt later, equally legitimate demands. For example, we have filled wetlands, exhausted sites for dredging spoil, wiped out breeding grounds for shad and other anadromous species, removed waters from shellfish culture because of pollution, sharply reduced public access to choice beaches by limitations of private ownership.

The nation seemed curiously unaware of the massive neglect of our coastal zone until the national conscience about the quality of our environment was teased by a trip-hammer of incidents:

The *Torrey Canyon* oil spill in 1967 captured international attention. It was followed by loss of the *Ocean Eagle* in San Juan Harbor; two large barges off Cape Cod; the *Arrow* in Halifax. In January 1969, the Santa Barbara oil drilling casualty generated another shock wave of attention to coastal problems. Another occurred recently off Louisiana.

Gradual seepage of pollutants into Lake Erie led to virtual certification of its untimely biological suffocation. In five decades the lake has aged the equivalent of 15,000 years; natural fishing will require 500 years to cleanse it. And in Lake Michigan, Coho salmon have been found to concentrate DDT in such levels as to require condemnation from markets. From Penobscot Bay, Maine to Chesapeake Bay, lobster and clam production have been shut down, and even some fish have been found infected with human pathogens. Crabs have been killed in Virginia from DDT poisoning. Marine life concentrates heavy metals and while thriving itself becomes heavily poisonous to humans. Commercial fishing off Alabama has been banned when mercury concentrations were discovered six times acceptable levels; and there is now concern that the methyl compounds of mercury biologically converted at sea are many times more toxic than the original sources. Beaches have been closed in New York. Atlantic City was ordered to install new long outfalls because of back-pay pollution. In the case of oil spills, there is convincing evidence that heavy injections of chemicals

to dissipate oil slicks menace sea life as seriously as the oil itself.

These incidents made headlines. Less conspicuous, but having longer-run impact is the filling of wetlands and the gradual urban consumption of wilderness areas. The 700 square miles of San Francisco Bay have been reduced to 400 by diking and filling of tide and marshlands. Dredging unsettles bottom sediments, removes bottom dwelling life, blankets fish nests, masks out light required by aquatic plants, and smothers ecologically sensitive bottom organisms. Dam construction alters estuarine salinity; jetty and groin construction upset beach ecology. Hurricane barriers disturb circulation of bay water—all affecting marine life. And enormous quantities of solid wastes, routinely barged to sea often contain poisons that leak quietly into the marine environment for years later.

What makes this problem all the more serious is the complex mixture of public and private ownership in a confusion of legal jurisdictions. Fish, water, ships and people freely cross these political boundaries, yet only a fraction reside there: the users are transients, with other regional loyalties. As one policy official said: "The fish don't vote,"—thus leaving a serious question as to who in the political process will represent the public interests for rational coastal utilization.

Just how important is this issue?

In early 1970, the Committee on Natural Resources and Environmental Management of the National Governors' Conference polled its members to enumerate concerns and assign priorities. With the rating scheme employed, in a list of 12 problem areas, "coastal zone management" ranked second to "water resources." But if this were weighted to reflect the fact that only 30 of the 50 states could be regarded as having coastlines, the result would be a virtual tie for first place.

It is interesting that water resource problems have been with us since the founding of the nation. Coastal zone conflicts were only dimly perceived five years ago, and probably would not have made the "hit parade" of top ten state concerns as recently as three years ago.

What produced the change? First, there has been a heightened national awareness that our planet cannot indefinitely absorb insults of man-induced changes and still serve future generations. This concern has been intensified, incidentally, both because the pollutants have increased to become more visible, and because research has revealed toxicity of even minute traces of some pollutants that remain invisible. Second, while coastal problems had been encountered and treated by Federal and State agencies for decades, the correctives were as piecemeal as the problems. It was not until March 1967 when the Marine Sciences Council¹ took note of the problem on a national scale that a President spoke to the need to arrest and reverse the pollution and erosion of the coastal zone. In March 1968, President Johnson recommended new funding for "research and planning to improve our coastal zone," an initiative later characterized in his message of January 1969 as efforts to "enhance the many uses of our seashore and coastal waters by directing national attention to the need for skillful management of this coastal zone." And in that month, the Stratton Commission² released their perceptive assessment of the problem and recommendations to establish state-managed coastal authorities. In those three years, swift progress was made in diagnosis and prescription of remedy. In

¹National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, chaired by the Vice President.

²Authorized by PL 89-454, appointed by President Johnson on January 9, 1967 and chaired by Dr. Julius A. Stratton.

the last year, there has been a hopeful beginning to utilize the remedy.

Let me restate the primary issues: it is how to provide for many diverse and often conflicting coastal demands public and private, and still obtain the greatest long-term social and economic benefits. We face an increasing pressure for more intense and variegated use of a scarce resource, and in the confusion of aspirants, we have responded on a first come, first served basis. We have almost completely neglected planning. Unless regional alternatives among competing uses are illuminated and then evaluated, we will rather helplessly continue to respond to claims motivated by short-term advantages to individuals, industry or local governments, and perhaps to inflexible momentum of the federal bureaucracy. Private beach development restricts public access. Dredging and filling may downgrade commercial fishing. Offshore drillings rigs limit freedom of navigation, and estuarine waste disposal depreciates all surrounding recreational use. While each single action may be justified on its own merits, the effect of piecemeal development can be chaos.

In this technological age, man can do many more of the things he once could only wish to do. What then should be our goal? With regard to the coastal zone, I would urge attention to seven basic principles:

1. We need a national policy to balance protection and development of coastal resources for this and succeeding generations.
2. Every foot of coastline should eventually be subject to a comprehensive management plan for land and water use, reflecting needs of and private concerns such as industry, transportation, recreation, fisheries, wildlife and nature conservancy, and residential development.
3. The plan should be prepared at the state level of government and subject to review and approval by the governor.
4. The state should provide and exercise necessary regulatory authority, land acquisition and public facility development to implement its management plan.
5. Provisions should be made for public notice and public hearing in development or modifications of such plans.
6. Provisions should be made for conducting, fostering and utilizing relevant ecological and policy research so as to provide a factual basis for estimating the impact of man's intervention on the natural environment, including provision of estuarine sanctuaries to study natural and artificial ecological processes.
7. Provisions should be made for multi-jurisdictional cooperation, with special emphasis on regional planning for ecological areas that cross state lines.

There are two planks of logic behind assignment of authority over coastal problems to the states. First, individual states already have legal jurisdiction over coastal resources; they decide how mineral resources beneath coastal waters are to be exploited, how coastal fisheries are to be harvested. They decide how coastal land and waters may be altered and which uses should receive preferences in tradeoffs.

Secondly, both ecology and citizen preferences are sufficiently variegated that no uniform authority at a federal level is feasible, much less desirable.

If the states had this authority over coastal resources, why haven't they acted?

That same committee of the National Governors' Conference specifically asked, "What are the factors responsible for inadequate resource management? Lack of funds was predictably prominent in responses. But the impediments next in order of importance were: Lack of motivation and concern by the public as a whole.

Lack of technology and research.

Lack of proper plans, goals, objectives and priorities.

I would add to their list the following additional barriers:

In most states, there is no single focus for guiding rational development because conservation, economic promotion, pollution control, tourism, highways and community planning are considered separately.

Legal control over land use is complex and ineffectual.

Ambiguous and overlapping jurisdiction between local, state and federal governments create problems because political fragmentation makes no sense in an environmental continuum.

Finally, zoning of land and water permits for explicit projects and coastal planning will never be effective unless states are prepared to enforce decisions.

The states are keenly aware of these problems. Many have taken significant courageous steps to strengthen their internal capabilities. A Coastal State Organization was created by the National Governors' Conference. And citizen groups are focusing interest on coastal preservation and supporting political leaders who advocate rational management.

But all have been waiting for federal leadership in response to recommendations by the Stratton Commission and the Marine Sciences Council that would set the stage for national policy and machinery to set standards and to help the states meet the difficulties listed earlier. In converting the previously mentioned principles to action, both those bodies called for:

A federal grant-in-aid program to states for: (a) initial development of planning and regulatory mechanisms, and (b) implementation of a management plan; and

Coastal management authorities that would be designated by the governor in each state to receive management plan grants.

What has happened subsequently?

In September 1969, Senators Magnuson and Hart introduced a comprehensive coastal management bill, S. 2802. In November 1969, the Nixon Administration sent to Congress its comprehensive estuarine inventory and proposals for protecting and developing the land and water resources of the nation's coastal zone.

In January 1970, President Nixon transmitted a budget to the Congress that included a new sector for management of the coastal zone.

At this point of chronology, it is necessary to digress to mention a set of parallel problems and developments having critical influence on coastal management legislation. The problem—identified by Congress as far back as 1960—is the fragmentation in governmental agencies superimposed on the already complex splintering of scientific disciplines, technologies and private interests. An elaborate constellation of eleven major federal agencies have had jurisdiction over marine affairs—each sanctified with statutory authority over one element such as national security, environmental observation and prediction, fisheries development offshore oil regulation, navigation, data management, maritime shipping, coastal preservation, water quality protection, categorical research and education, etc. Despite their individual best efforts, this collection of programs and policies did not add up to a coherent whole. After much debate, the Congress in 1966 passed the Marine Resources and Engineering Act setting forth a Marine Affairs Mandate and establishing the Cabinet-level Marine Sciences Council to advise and assist the President in orchestrating the bureaucracy. Given the centrifugal forces of internal departmentalism, the council has been deemed by Congress and outside observers to have been a success—in giving the aggregate of missions momentum and a coherent sense of direction, priorities and strategies. Perhaps most important, it injected a "maritime presence"

in the White House and became a major source of Presidential marine initiatives in two administrations. But the Council as a steering mechanism is not the equivalent of an operating agency.

In January 1969, the Stratton Commission brought forth major recommendations to consolidate many marine agencies into a single, independent agency. Many Congressmen endorsed this proposal. So did many representatives from industry, academia and state government. This July, President Nixon submitted Reorganization Plan Number 4 of 1970 to the Congress to consolidate roughly half of the participating agencies into a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to be located in the Department of Commerce. Although not going as far as many of us advocated, I am personally convinced his proposal is sound. As could be expected, this reform had been privately opposed by cabinet officers concerned over loss of components, and by the Bureau of the Budget which fantasied a second space program looming on the horizon, with NASA-type horsepower to strain an already tight budget. The President, however, rejected these considerations and took a giant and courageous step toward improved federal management for marine affairs.

Over the past few weeks, the Congress received some objections to this proposal from conservationists. They contended that where the Department of Commerce had responsibilities for economic development and industrial growth, it could not loosen its bias to assure a balanced approach to protecting the marine environment.

I share their concerns about importance of environmental quality, but I don't agree with their conclusions. No single federal agency wears all white hats, or black hats. All are subject to continuing pressures from interests whose toes are stepped on in protecting the broader public interest or even competing private interests.

Washington, in fact, has wall-to-wall toes. At an earlier time when it was thought the Department of Interior would be host to NOAA, that agency was deemed in a poll by *Oceanology International* magazine to be lacking in objectivity in favoring industrial interests. The assurance that Commerce—or any other agency—will protect the public interest in environment depends on vitality, competence, dedication and integrity of appointed officials and oversight by Congress provided by the Constitution. I have every confidence that the President will keep this question of environmental quality in mind in his appointments of NOAA officials. The Council on Environmental Quality has technology assessment responsibility for the marine as well as the land environment. Moreover, whatever advisory body is established to NOAA should include a variety of viewpoints and competences among its members—themselves individuals who are distinguished by professional qualifications rather than their identity as lobbyists. The committee must include a balanced representation of those concerned with the environment.

Marine affairs have historically been approached without partisanship, and fortunately, the Congress did not react to the President's Reorganization Plan on a partisan basis. In this recent consideration, Congress recalled that Hubert Humphrey, from his experiences as first council chairman, has supported consolidation in a public statement back in 1969.

A Democratic Congress, with bipartisan support in both Houses, accepted the President's proposition. On October 3, NOAA became law.

With regard to coastal matters, NOAA is already involved in such functions as coastal charting, fisheries research, hurricane forecasting, buoy development, data management, and Great Lake surveys. This consolidation of functions was an essential first

step. But now there is an air of expectancy to hearing the second shoe drop. It is important to recall that the functions now assigned to NOAA necessarily embrace only those missions that had previously been assigned to its constituent elements. No new missions have been formulated. Not included, therefore, is any declaration of national policy and provisions for its implementation to deal with the coastal zone to meet the management problems enunciated earlier. On a related point, however, President Nixon released a report of his Council on Environmental Quality regarding hazards of ocean dumping, but stated that new legislation to regulate such practices will be submitted next year to Congress, to be carried out under the new Environmental Protection Agency (created under Reorganization Plan 3 of 1970).

In lacking explicit national policy on coastal management, we also find missing the designation of a Federal agency for implementation. NOAA is a logical candidate because it already has the needed technical capabilities for observing and analyzing the inshore environment, and assessing impact of modification. In my view, to subdivide the marine environment artificially and assign this coastal function to another agency would renew wasteful splintering that NOAA was intended to correct. On the other hand, the suitability of NOAA as host agency depends on proof of its objectivity within the Department of Commerce, and of its viability in terms of budget allowances for fiscal year 1972; without reasonable growth to meet the unfilled mission promises of the past, the exercise to establish NOAA would have been futile. Unfortunately, imminent jockeying for jurisdiction over the coastal zone in both Executive Branch agencies and Congressional committees could paralyze urgently needed legislation such as S. 2802 now before Congress.

On a second point, neither of the legislative proposals now before Congress provide for the necessary estuarine research. As the Marine Sciences Council stated, "We still lack much of the knowledge needed to provide the understanding required to assess and predict the effects of man-induced and natural modifications of the marine environment. In the absence of this information about the ocean's ability to absorb stresses and remain healthy, human activities may generate transformations that destroy, perhaps irreversibly, desirable properties of the marine environment."

The scientific information required includes establishing baselines or standards from which we can detect and measure environmental changes which occur over the next 10, 20 or 50 years. We need to know what pollutants and in what quantities are entering the ocean; how much pollution the marine environment can absorb without substantially harming other uses; how marine pollutants circulate and disperse, degrade and convert to other chemical and physical forms; and what effect man's physical modifications of the coastline have on water dynamics, marine life and sedimentation. Much remains to be learned about how pollutants enter the life cycle of marine organisms and what effect they have on them; and about how to treat ocean pollutants. An adequate pollution monitoring system could furnish information which would provide the scientific basis for assessing and predicting man-made changes, identifying and controlling pollutant buildup, managing waste disposal and safeguarding the physical and biological quality of the oceans."

If management decisions on coastline use are to be based on rational analysis and not on winds of political pressures, we will need scientific information and engineering studies, focused on comprehension of the environment. With such information, we can generate criteria to define options and make choices among alternative regulatory actions,

public and private uses of the seas and coastal lands, and costs. This information is fundamental to the political decisions needed to manage the environment.

Thus, we urgently need support for a research capability that would build on existing federal, state and private capabilities.

The Department of Interior was requested by the President one year ago to develop background on what new research activities are required for coastal management and how they should be organized and funded. Since then, there has been only ominous silence from Interior, with no provision in their fiscal year 1971 budget for strengthening this capability.

NOAA could furnish the home for such a research responsibility, perhaps beginning even without additional authority. One early test of its viability will be reflected in whether it takes such initiatives in coastal research and whether it requests adequate funds for fiscal year 1972 to meet the urgent needs for necessary scientific and engineering expertise to buttress coastal management policy.

The nation has three major issues on its immediate agenda: (1) the establishment at the federal level of national policy on coastal affairs and adequate funding for its implementation; (2) steps within each state to create the necessary policy and the machinery for planning, for management and for public participation—including regulations, zoning, issuance of permits, acquisition of land, and coastal development for the public; and (3) strengthening of coastal research and analytical capabilities free of politics to guide rational management.

These issues are of great moment to us as citizens. Their fate is uncertain. Powerful opposition can be expected at a state level from those having narrow self interest, and can be met only if we exercise our social responsibilities as citizens and as civil engineers.

The civil engineer has distinguished himself in dealing with natural forces to serve human needs. He has made positive contributions to the entire field of water resource management. The engineer should follow that tradition in the coastal zone:

By articulating public vision as to ways and means to satisfy our national goals, including expression of viewpoint on pending issues;

By participating in the economic-social-legal institutional framework in which action takes place for public or private investment;

By seeking knowledge to foster better decisions—knowledge as to our environment and consequences of our tampering with it; knowledge of our society and its processes;

By breaking down narrow technical specialization or parochial self interests, to see the forest rather than the trees, to couple together better the producers of technical knowledge and consumers.

In dealing with these issues, every skill of the engineering profession will be needed. But so will its leadership.

C. P. Snow has written that the engineers, "the people who made the hardware, who used existing knowledge to make things go, were . . . interested in making their machine work, but indifferent to long-term social consequences." James Killian, the late President's Eisenhower's science advisor, has written "The engineer's concern for social problems must grow steadily as his work affects society more profoundly." And Whitlock and Edington before the ASEE have said, the problems are those whose answers are not found in engineering courses, but those which concern people, sociological needs, esthetic judgments and political decisions. "The complexity of our society today makes an engineer who cannot handle such problems not only limited but dangerous."

Our society does not seem to appreciate that its affluence now permits collective

political decisions in applying science and technology to our major social problems, yet we don't have a way of doing this. For a long time, for example, we used engineering to protect man against his environment. Now we must also consider how to protect the environment from man.

In closing, let me recall for you that there is a new interest in the engineering profession that was generated by studies in the arena of technology assessment, sponsored by Congressman Daddario and emphasized in the recent Presidential study of national goals. This concept is sure to gain momentum as we recognize that technologies created to accomplish some particular purpose develop such potency that they produce severe unwanted side effects. A powerful and objective analytical capability is thus required to study and anticipate these consequences—thus to provide the decision-maker in government or industry with options—to weigh future plans or arrest initial technological developments before they reach a momentum such that correction is expensive or politically difficult, or both.

To perform such assessments will require both intellect and institutions to synthesize social needs and priorities with technical information—to match engineering prowess with wisdom.

Some engineers already perform this function. Few, however, have the breadth of training or interests to rank as technologists. Few raise their voices publicly and many seem timid to provide even privately to their management early warning of unintended or unanticipated influences of technology.

It should be clear that technology assessment is just what coastal management authorities in each state will have to perform on a systematic basis.

This raises an enigmatic and challenging question as to whether the country—or our profession—is prepared for this new role.

This profession must respond to this challenge.

YULETIDE IN PRISON

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, as Christmas approaches and the cities of America are brightly lighted, spreading cheer throughout, it behooves us to remember hundreds of Americans for whom there will be no joy this Yuletide—the Americans held prisoner in Southeast Asia.

At this Christmas season families of American prisoners at least have one reason to be encouraged—as compared with Christmas seasons in the past. In previous years the families were beset by the desolate feeling that few cared. Now, however, they know that many fellow Americans really do care; and following the courageous but unsuccessful rescue effort they know that their Government really cares.

The families have been buoyed by the knowledge their Nation, indeed, is deeply concerned about freeing the prisoners. This is hardly a substitute for having their husbands, sons or fathers back home; but the knowledge does add to their store of courage to face the future.

BIG THICKET PETITIONERS FOR A 200,000-ACRE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK TOP 4,000 MARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the ranks of the active and concerned Americans who are petitioning for a Big Thicket National Park of 200,000 acres

have swelled to near the 4,000 mark with the addition of more than 2,900 signatures received in my recent mail. These citizens and thousands of other like-minded Americans are united in their goal of preventing this great wilderness area from being reduced to cutover lands. The Big Thicket, which once spanned over 3½ million acres, has quite literally been cut down to less than 300,000, and each day that this attrition continues unabated, the Thicket suffers the loss of another 50 precious acres. This nationwide citizen support is therefore both critical and timely. With it, this hard fought battle to save one of America's greatest remaining wilderness areas may be won.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a synopsis of these 11 additional petitions be printed in the RECORD.

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

PETITION

We the undersigned believe and wish that 200,000 acres of the wilderness and virgin forest area described commonly as the Big Thicket be set aside and reserved as a national park and that these acres be adjoining each other and that as a wilderness area these 200,000 acres be designated as the Big Thicket and that the Big Thicket as a national park be preserved and protected by the laws which govern the protection of other national parks as set aside by acts of the Congress of the United States of America.

SYNOPSIS OF SIGNATURES RECEIVED

FROM THE DENTON, TEX., AREA
Pat Jeter, Martin Shockley, William E. Hendrex, Kenneth J. Kinslow, Kara Lee Selman, Gary M. Faw, Michael Louis, Paul Lewis, Dorothy Copening, John Nunnally, Dawn S. Pettit, Dale Graham, R. B. Escue, Jr., B. Dwain Vance, J. R. Sybert, Kathy Baldwin, Joseph R. Spradlin, Frederick G. Gaffrey III, Myrin Marcum, Peter A. Gunter, Linda J. Castle, Jim Van Dorn, Joseph Holley, Frank M. Rachel, C. Holmes, James Whittington, Larry D. Justiss, Darlene Graham, Avena Ward, Cynthia Raff, Ronald Spleker, Pat Stanley and 1,632 others.

FROM THE FORT WORTH, TEX., AREA
Virginia Groody and 82 others.

FROM THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA
John H. Stade and 67 others.

FROM THE ENID, OKLA., AREA
Dr. Robert L. Simpson and 51 others.

FROM THE GAINESVILLE, TEX., AREA
William C. Stanley and 92 others.

FROM THE RICHARDSON, TEX., AREA
Julie Frelich and 30 others.

FROM THE DALLAS, TEX., AREA
Dr. Wayne Meyers, John M. Williams, P. M. Jaques and 398 others.

FROM THE SIERRA CLUB OF DALLAS, TEX.
Richard C. Blue and 15 others.

FROM THE COSA MESA, CALIF., AREA
Kenneth S. Croker and 63 others.

FROM THE LAS VEGAS, N. MEX., AREA
Elmer W. Schooley and 69 others.

FROM WEATHERFORD COLLEGE, WEATHERFORD, TEX.
Cassie Casler and 149 others.

FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Dr. Phillips Hamlin and 65 others.

FROM THE FULLERTON, CALIF., AREA
Keith I. Robins, M.D. and 126 others.

THE SST

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, it is indeed a funny world we live in.

A month ago we held national elections. The issue for the Democrats was employment or rather unemployment. Many Members of this body campaigned against the administration's record on the employment problem.

Some Republicans will not return because of that problem.

All of us agree that unless the problem is solved, it will be an issue in 1972.

And yet, just last week, 52 Senators decided that jobs and employment are not really that important, so they voted to abolish jobs for 150,000 working men and women.

Now, of course, they will not own up to this. They will talk instead about ecology and environment and about all the money saved. They will talk about a victory over technology.

Mr. President, yesterday was no victory over technology. It was a loss for the people and a loss for America. It was a loss of jobs and pay at the holiday season for 150,000 Americans who want to work.

No family assistance plan in the world can make up for that loss, no unemployment compensation, no welfare.

Mr. President, I would like to make one point. If a victory over technology and progress is won at the expense of human welfare, is it a victory?

THE RECESSION—SECOND INFLATION ALERT

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, it is obvious from the latest statement on the state of the economy put out by the administration that it is becoming more worried about the recession we are in. The executive branch is beginning to talk about expansionary policy needed to reverse the rising unemployment rate and the sagging economy. Part of the administration's problem has been its failure to recognize the economic facts of life.

Sylvia Porter's column in the Washington Star of December 1 puts very clearly and succinctly the actual state of economic recession caused by present administration policies. I am sure other Members of Congress will want to read her column, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Miss Porter notes that the present recession, now in its 17th month, is the longest of any of the five business downturns since World War II. Administration policies, she points out, have had less impact on inflation than in any of the four previous recessions. She says:

In fact, the upsurge in prices—prices at the wholesale level and touching the cost of living—has been by far the sharpest recorded in any post-war recession period.

Any claims that the "Game Plan" is working would, she stresses turn "the credibility gap into a credibility chasm," and she points to the "nightmare combination of climbing unemployment, still sharply rising prices, sluggish business activity, fading profits, spreading bankruptcies and Wall Street disasters . . ."

She cites a renowned economist, Martin Gainsbrugh of the National Industrial Conference Board as indicating that if, as seems likely, there is no real growth in 1970, it will be "the first occasion since 1938."

One would have thought that the second "Inflation Alert" would have addressed itself to these problems. Instead, I can only find the repetition of the same old clichés. The administration refuses to adopt a well-rounded set of economic policies which would permit us to proceed expeditiously to high employment, and steady growth without inflation. While monetary and fiscal policies should be more expansionary at the present moment, there is a crying need for wage and price guidelines and selective credit controls to assure the American people that inflation will not resume its acceleration, and indeed, that prices can be stabilized while we seek our major goals of resumed growth and full employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

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

BRANDING IT A RECESSION

(By Sylvia Porter)

The "recession" of 1969-70 is now beginning its 17th month. The Nixon administration has not yet called it by its obvious name nor has it been formally designated a recession by private authorities either, but that is what it is.

In fact, it already is the longest of any of the five business downturns since World War II. The table below in this column will document that.

The recession of 1969-70, created by administration policies and the Federal Reserve System to curb the inflation spiral, so far has had less impact on inflation than any of the four previous postwar recessions.

In fact, the upsurge in prices—prices in general, at the wholesale level and touching the cost of living—has been by far the sharpest recorded in any postwar recession period.

It is understandable that the White House would not admit this is a recession during the election campaigns.

But the elections are over and 1972 is a long way off. The administration cannot continue pretending indefinitely that what is is not—even in the fuzzy, unscientific world of modern economics and politics.

Nor can the non-profit independent research organization which dates business cycle turning points, the National Bureau of Economic Research, delay much longer. Other prestigious non-profit research organizations are not that shy and they are going on the line. Martin R. Gainsbrugh, chief economist of The Conference Board, Inc., for instance, puts the start of the 1969 recession in July 1969, because that is the month in which industrial production reached its peak at an index of 174.6. This index is now at 162.3, off 7 percent.

Nor at this stage can any administration spokesman honestly claim the "game plan" for economic stability worked as plotted in 1970—not without turning the credibility gap into a credibility chasm. A nightmare combination of climbing unemployment, still sharply rising prices, sluggish business activity, fading profits, spreading bankruptcies and Wall Street disasters is hardly a successful game plan!

As of Dec. 1, here is a blue-print for the 1969-70 recession to date. Prices are annual rates, latest reporting date.

Recession cycles	Months duration	
	Prices as whole	Cost of living
November 1948 to October 1949	11	
July 1953 to August 1954	13	
July 1957 to April 1958	9	
May 1960 to February 1961	9	
July 1969 to December 1970	17	

Recessions	Percent	
	Prices as whole	Cost of living
November 1948 to October 1949	-1.7	-2.0
July 1953 to August 1954	+1.2	+2.1
July 1957 to April 1958	+1.7	+2.2
May 1960 to February 1961	+1.2	+1.0
July 1969 to December 1970	+4.3	+6.0

Now, signs are increasing that the 1967-70 recession is starting to ease up—reflecting the easing of credit, the stimulating budget deficit, spurs to housing. Now, signs also are increasing that there will be some further slowing of the pace of price rise in 1971.

But as far as 1970 is concerned, Gainsbrugh figures that this year may be marked by no real growth (dollar growth minus the contribution of price increases) at all, "the first such occasion since 1938."

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, the President's speech Friday night concerning the state of the economy had a note of optimism that ought to have been reported, but that was largely overlooked.

It should be stressed, for instance, that the President is confident that the worst of inflation is over and that this is proved by the lowered rise in the consumer price index, the lower rise in wholesale prices and the lowering of interest rates.

It is also important to call attention to the President's very cogent remark about unemployment. The fact is that unemployment is at the level of the first half of the 1960's—the Kennedy years—before the Vietnam war buildup began.

The President is devoting long hours to the problems of the economy and employment. He has held to a flexible course that he is convinced is the right course for the long run—a course that is slowly but surely proving to be the right one.

Surely, if he had more actual support and less political criticisms from potential candidates for President and the professional doomsayers in the other party, he would make progress even faster.

The shame of it is that nearly every family in America has been affected today by the faulty fiscal policies of the 1960's, and much of the President's opposition is more interested in shifting the blame than in remedying the trouble.

The President has made it clear that he is not to be deterred or disheartened by those efforts.

Nor is he yielding to pressure to take the steps of wage and price control advocated by those who have no faith in a free economy.

The President has laid out the problem and his policies for dealing with it. Now he needs the support of business, labor, and political leaders.

MAIL CONCERNING GENOCIDE CONVENTION HAS INCREASED

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, since the genocide convention was ordered re-

ported to the Senate by an overwhelming majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, my mail on this subject has increased tremendously. I am also happy to note that the vast majority of people who are writing to me on this subject are very much in favor of U.S. ratification of this treaty as soon as possible.

For example, last week I received a letter of particular note from the "Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs." This organization, which urged me to vote for the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, is dedicated to the principle of ethnic, racial, and religious freedom.

Mr. President, I believe this letter is worthy of consideration by all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

EMMA LAZARUS FEDERATION
OF JEWISH WOMEN'S CLUBS,
New York, N.Y., December 1, 1970.

Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs, a national organization dedicated to the principle of ethnic, racial and religious freedom, strongly urge you to vote for the United Nations Convention to punish the crimes of Genocide.

As Jewish women we especially feel that it is our obligation to call upon our nation to inscribe its name to this United Nations Convention. The memory of six million of our Jewish people and the millions of others who were victims of the Hitler holocaust demands that we join the rest of humanity in outlawing this most heinous of crimes.

Last year our Federation presented to the U.S. Foreign Relations Committee the signatures of 60,000 Americans requesting speedy ratification of the Genocide Convention by our Government.

After 20 years of delay this document is before the august body of the United States Senate for debate and vote. We hope you will vote for the ratification of this document and thus end the long delay in joining the 75 other nations of the world who have already signed this treaty to protect human rights.

Respectfully yours,
LEAH NELSON, President,
Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish
Women's Clubs.

DEATH OF EDWARD KANE (E. K.) FERNANDEZ

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is with a sense of deep personal loss and great sadness that I pay final tribute to the memory of one of Hawaii's most colorful and outstanding businessmen—Edward Kane (E. K.) Fernandez, a humanitarian of great influence in the entertainment and business circles of Hawaii for over half a century. He would have been 87 on December 14.

E. K. Fernandez was as legendary a figure as modern Hawaii has produced. His career in the Aloha State was as colorful and inspiring as the life he made for himself in the land he loved so dearly.

"E. K." as he was affectionately called by his family admirers and associates, enjoyed a career which covered

Hawaii's transition from a monarchy to a territory to the 50th State. He was born on December 14, 1883, in Honolulu, the son of Abraham and Minerva Fernandez.

As an outstanding and dedicated showman, E. K. Fernandez brought laughter to millions of children and adults in many parts of the world. He rightly earned the title, "P. T. Barnum of the Pacific," by his record of "firsts," by his phenomenal volume of business, and by the multitude of people he entertained. He was a successful showman for 57 years, taking his circuses and carnivals to the Orient as well as the mainland.

As a farsighted and innovative showman, he brought the first movie projector to Hawaii, set up the first movie theater chain, and introduced the first merry-go-round and ferris wheel. For over half a century, he was the leader of show business in the Pacific area.

In 1913, E. K. Fernandez brought the first sound picture to Hawaii and 2 years later he staged his first big circus—a show with 20 performers and six animals. E. K. was quick to realize the potentials of vaudeville, and his first performing act was a skating bear which made the rounds of the plantations tied to a wagon.

In some ways, E. K. Fernandez was more strait-laced than P. T. Barnum, although the two abhorred indecency and fraud. E. K. once said:

I don't like liquor, I don't like anything dirty and I don't like anything crooked.

He was well-known as a devoted Mormon who was fair and generous with his circus workers and entertainers, and fair to his customers.

Mr. President, to me and to his countless numbers of friends and admirers, E. K. Fernandez will always live in our hearts as a humanitarian who had a big heart. He will be long remembered as the man who gave more generations of Hawaiians more fun, laughter, and good times than anyone in Hawaii's history.

Besides being looked upon and revered as an outstanding citizen, E. K. Fernandez was recognized as the Father of the Year in the entertainment field in 1963 and was honored that same year by the Showmen's League of America and the International Association of Fairs & Expositions. He was also awarded the title of Humanist by the Rosicrucian Order in 1962.

E. K. Fernandez is survived by his charming wife, Rose, whom he married in 1933. Other survivors include four children of his first marriage: a daughter, Mrs. Arthur Nobriga, and three sons, Edwin, Jr., Walter, and Dr. Leabert Fernandez. The two children from his second wife Rose include a son, Kane S. and a daughter, Mrs. M. Price Porter.

Mr. President, Hawaii and her people have lost a most active, civic-minded, and distinguished citizen and showman, E. K. Fernandez' passing is mourned by the host of friends he made during his lifetime of selfless and dedicated service to his community and State.

Mrs. Fong and I extend our heartfelt sympathy and sorrowful aloha to his beloved wife, Rose, and to his family in their bereavement.

THE THREAT OF PROTECTIONISM TO THE AMERICAN CONSUMER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the last few years we have witnessed the emergence of the greatest interest group of them all—the American consumer.

For years—perhaps throughout most of history—the consumer has been systematically excluded from the exercise of his rightful power. Caveat emptor: Let the buyer beware. And the American consumer has suffered deteriorating services, shoddy quality, unsafe products, and the crass and often deceptive manipulation of his demand and, most of all, rising prices which made a mockery of competition.

When I say that the consumer is "coming of age," I refer to the great interest and the occasional success in recent years in passing product safety legislation, in advancing the notion of consumer class action suits, and in a growing mood of public anger coupled with a most encouraging willingness to put this anger to work through the political process.

But there is one matter now before the Congress which may have more significance—and potential danger—to the consumer than any legislation we have seen this Congress.

I refer, of course, to the trade bill as passed by the House and soon to be considered by the Senate.

The bill is violently and unequivocally anticonsumer.

Under the guise of protecting American jobs, it threatens to unleash a world trade war which could only, in the end, damage the American dollar, seriously retard the economic growth of the underdeveloped nations, and jeopardize the livelihood of millions of farmers and workers dependent upon exports.

But its most pernicious impact will be upon the consumer. And that means upon just about all of us.

Virginia Knauer, the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, called the bill as currently written "the most significant 'anti-consumer' legislation now in the Congress."

The highly respected Consumers Union states that—

Shoe and textile quotas would inevitably cause sharp price increases which would seriously affect every family's budget.

The American Retail Federation, representing nearly 800,000 retail stores through their State and national trade associations, estimates that shoe and clothing prices would rise by anywhere from 15 to 25 percent with the imposition of legislated quotas.

And Federal Reserve Board Governor, Andrew Brimmer, has estimated that quotas on shoes and textiles could cost the American consumer \$3.7 billion a year by 1975—\$1.8 billion extra for his clothes and \$1.9 billion for his shoes.

That is a billion dollars more than the Government is now spending on health—more than all our foreign aid programs—almost as much as we are now spending on all Federal assistance to communities and housing.

That is like a tax of over \$66 per family—and the most regressive possible kind of tax falling most heavily on the poorest families which buy most of the

low cost shoes and clothing. For sheer regressivity, in fact, this would be the most imaginative tax since the French kings put a tax on salt that ultimately cost the heads of most of the French aristocracy.

Let there be no mistake. No one that I have heard pointing out the potential disaster of this trade legislation is unmindful of our troubled industries or unconcerned over today's unemployment. I think my own record will show that I place high employment and fair wages to the American worker above practically any other national goal or Federal responsibility.

But economic justice is hardly served by a measure which can only fan the fires of inflation, rob the weekly paycheck before it gets out of the envelope, and fall most heavily upon those least able to pay.

The quotas on textiles alone, for example, will roll back about \$400 million worth of imports at foreign unit prices. With the addition of transportation costs, import duties—which are already very high on many apparel items—and importer's markups, the wholesale price value of excluded merchandise would be from \$700 to \$800 million. This will deny about \$1.4 billion worth of merchandise to the American consumer. Much of this merchandise represents "discount" apparel, upon which our low-income consumers are greatly dependent.

To deny these goods to the American public means that the consumer will either have to do without or he will have to purchase comparable domestically priced goods at prices 20 to 40 percent higher.

The replacement of this \$1.4 billion worth of imports by domestic goods will add from \$500 to \$700 million to the consumer's apparel bill. The rollback of about \$200 million of shoes, denying some \$450 to \$500 million worth of retail merchandise to the consumer would add about \$450 to \$500 million to the consumer's shoe bill assuming the imported footwear were replaced by domestic goods.

On these two items alone, then, we have a conservative estimate of well over a billion dollars loss to the American consumer simply on the basis of replacing the lost imports.

But this is only the beginning of the inflationary impact of these quotas.

The shoes and textiles which are allowed in will tend now to be the higher-priced imports, denying the lowest-priced goods to those who may have no other means of affording a second pair of shoes or a new shirt or sweater.

The prices on the remaining imported goods will rise, since there will no longer be any need for vigorous price competition to get a larger share of the U.S. market.

Perhaps most important, the prices of domestic goods will surely rise with the removal of the competitive restraint of imports. That, in fact, is what our free market economic system is all about. The price tags reflect what the traffic will bear, limited only by the ability of the consumer to go without entirely or purchase another good at a lower price. An

increase of 5 to 10 percent in the prices of retail apparel, for example, would cost the consumer \$2.5 to \$5 billion in clothing bills alone.

Altogether, then, we can certainly look forward to price rises of \$3 to \$4 billion in the next few years just on shoes and apparel to pay for "relief" which our Tariff Commission has yet to find justified at any price.

But even this would only be part of the story. The oil industry also got a piece of the protectionist action in the current bill. This is not new protection; it is hard to see how the oil giants could reap any more anticompetitive benefits from import quotas than they already have. What the bill does, for some reason which I have yet to comprehend, is to lock in the current oil quotas system, removing the discretion the President now has for abandoning the quota system in favor of some other system, such as tariffs, for assuring our national interest in a continuing supply of domestic oil.

The President's own Task Force on Oil Imports last year recommended just such a switch—from a quota to a tariff system—primarily for the good of the American consumer. This task force estimated the cost to the consumer of the present quota system at \$5 billion a year—some \$29 to every man, woman, and child in my own State of Minnesota alone. Thus, the anticonsumer trade bill now before us would make absolutely certain that the consumer continued to foot this absolutely unnecessary and grossly unfair subsidy to our oil producers.

I have still mentioned only textiles, shoes, and oil. The floodgates of protectionism have not yet opened. But these quotas are a great crack in the dike, and no one thinks that protectionism can end with shoes and textiles alone receiving the goodies.

Dozens of other industries have been waiting in the wings with their cases—seeking, as always, to limit competition from abroad at the expense of the American consumer. Honey and mushrooms, ice skates and iron ore, wigs and watches, scissors and strawberries, tomatoes and toys: These are only a few industries which have been seeking the kind of protection which shoes and textiles managed to secure in the pending bill.

But dozens of other industries would at least qualify for the trigger mechanism of the pending bill—goods such as canned oysters, TV's, eggplants, nonelectric bells, antibiotics, crowbars, zirconium, caffeine, umbrellas, clothespins, automobiles, and brass instruments—plus 106 more were on such a list prepared by the U.S. Tariff Commission. This list contained between \$7 and \$8 billion worth of imported goods—at their foreign wholesale prices and probably double that on the American retail shelves.

Perhaps, many of these industries would never try for protection, and most would undoubtedly be unable to demonstrate the injury criteria. But they all do meet the one mathematical and, therefore, most visible, criterion for tariff adjustment. And it is almost in-

conceivable, given the protectionist's foot in the door through textiles and shoes, that the Tariff Commission and the President will be able to deny protection to other industries seeking tariffs and quotas and meeting the trigger mechanism formula for the growth of imports relative to domestic consumption.

We need trade legislation—better legislation than we now have to carry forward the spirit of the Kennedy round, but with greater assistance and sensitivity to problems of foreign dumping, declining industries, unemployment, and the protectionism of other countries.

But these ends can be accomplished responsibly. They can be met with legislation that does not threaten to set back the entire course of world trade and jeopardize the jobs of the millions of American workers dependent upon our \$40 billion worth of annual exports. And a responsible and fair trade policy can be achieved without sacrificing the American consumer to shortsighted special interest protectionism.

Consumers of America: If you are not a majority, then who is? Make yourselves heard. Inflation has cost you far too much already. A responsible trade policy needs your voice in Washington now. For \$3.7 billion, perhaps "consumer power" can truly come of age.

OIL PRICES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of the statement which the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) presented to the President's Oil Policy Committee in connection with its review of oil prices.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOWER

I appreciate the opportunity to submit my views concerning the recently announced increases in the price of some crude oil produced in the United States.

I will assume that other interested persons will submit to you, during the course of your investigation, the ample statistical data which documents the decreased levels of operating profits of domestic oil exploration companies. I feel certain that this data will show that decreased profits in this industry are the result of the near static price level of crude oil over the past 15 or so years, while the costs of finding new reserves have greatly increased during this period. I believe that a substantial increase in the price of domestically produced crude oil is justified to restore this loss of profits.

But, there is an even more important justification for increasing the price of crude oil. Our national security is directly related to a strong, viable domestic oil exploration industry.

I will explain how an increase in the price of crude oil affects our national security by stating and then discussing the elemental concepts of this relationship.

(1) Domestic exploration for new reserves of crude oil is at a 15 year low. Drilling activity can be measured in several different ways: the number of drilling rigs in existence, the number of drilling rigs actually cutting holes, the dollars invested in drilling equipment, or the number of feet of holes drilled, to name some of the measures most often used.

In this instance, measure used is unimportant because all such measures show a marked decline over the past 15 years.

(2) The continued existence of our domestic oil exploration companies is contingent upon their exploring for new reserves of crude oil. Each day, fourteen million barrels of oil are consumed in this country. We produce approximately 10 million barrels per day of this oil. New reserves of crude oil must be found to replace those being consumed.

If the consumed oil is not replaced, it is easy to see that we will use up all our producing reserves. As a matter of fact, at the present time, we possess only about a 9 year's supply of known producing reserves of oil, at the present rate of consumption. This is an overly optimistic figure, however, because the rate of consumption is almost certain to increase in the future. Our producing reserve cushion has decreased from in excess of a 20 year's supply in the early 1960's to the present level of about 9 year's supply. This 9 year reserve figure is misleading in another way. The flow of this oil cannot be substantially increased above the present level of production. Not only are there physical limitations, such as lack of additional pipelines and refinery capacity, but also, formations which contain the oil can only give up that oil at certain ideal rates. If these ideal rates are exceeded, significant percentages of oil will probably be irretrievable due to loss of pressure and other technical reasons.

So, we probably have less than a 9 years' supply of proven crude oil which we cannot produce as fast as we may need it. Without additions to this reserve supply, it will almost certainly continue to decrease.

(3) Increasing the price of crude oil increases the operating profits of domestic oil exploration companies.

This statement seems self-evident.

But the real issue is whether the increase is large enough to offset inflationary and other cost increases. Cost increases must be made up. These inflationary increases must be offset just to get the oil companies back to normal. I feel that a 25 cents per barrel increase is not enough to offset inflationary cost increases. This 25 cents per barrel increase under investigation represents only an 8 percent increase in the price of crude oil. Cost increases attributed to inflation have increased more than 8 percent. So, not only must operating profits increase, they must increase enough to offset inflationary and other cost increases.

(4) The amount of operating profit of domestic oil exploration companies is the primary factor which determines the amount of exploration for reserves of oil that these companies can perform.

Oil exploration companies must finance exploration for new reserves from one of two sources: invested capital or operating profit. Thus, the amount which can be invested is limited. The primary source of exploration funds is operating profit. If operating profit decreases, the amount of exploration must be decreased. Thus, when the management of these companies decides how much exploration that they can do, the primary factor which determines this is the amount of operating profit.

(5) It follows, therefore, that increases in the price of crude oil are prerequisites to increasing the amount of exploration for new reserves of oil and that increases in the price of crude oil should result in increases in exploration, if these increases are large enough to offset increased costs.

During the 1960's domestic exploration companies spent an average of 7.2 billion dollars per year searching for new reserves. But between now and 1985, this country will consume approximately 100 million barrels of oil. It is estimated that, in order to find

that quantity of new oil, expenditures of around 22 billion dollars per year throughout the 1970's will have to be made. Thus, our exploration expenditures must triple.

(6) Increased domestic exploration for oil translates into increased productive capacity.

The reason this statement is true is that fortunately this nation possesses the necessary physical ingredients for successful oil exploration.

First, we have the necessary undiscovered reserves of crude oil. The U.S. Geological Survey estimated undiscovered crude oil in place exceeded two trillion barrels of oil within the United States and its continental shelves to a depth of 200 isobaths. While our future needs are great, our reserves are greater.

Secondly, we possess requisite men, machinery and technology to convert domestic exploration dollars into proven producing capacity. We know this is so because, until very recently, this nation enjoyed virtually unlimited supplies of crude oil to meet the increasing demand. The availability of large quantities of crude oil is one of the main reasons this nation holds a position of preeminence in the world today. Abundance of oil is one of the primary reasons we enjoy the highest standard of living anywhere on earth.

So, we have the undiscovered reserves of oil and the means to find them. Needed are continued adequate economic incentives in the form of operating profits.

(7) Adequate domestic oil producing capacity is necessary for the maintenance of our national security.

National security demands that we have available the reserves of oil necessary to propel our armed forces when needed and to maintain the mobility which is so vital to our military strength. But, national security, as it relates to crude oil, means more than that. It means, also, world-wide bargaining power. We must maintain that international bargaining strength which is based on the knowledge that this nation can supply its own energy needs and those required to meet our commitments. Further, national security includes the capability to provide for our vital industrial and consumer needs.

It is estimated that unless new reserves of crude oil are found, we will have used up all our surplus producing capacity by the end of 1971. This means that increases in consumption will have to be met through increased imports of crude oil from foreign countries.

It has been recognized that it is not wise to allow limited imports of crude oil to meet our needs. In 1959, President Eisenhower implemented the Mandatory Oil Import Quota System. He said that the new system was "designed to insure a stable, healthy (oil) industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program as the certified requirement of our national security would make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

President Eisenhower correctly recognized the national security aspects of the domestic oil industry, that there were maximum safe import levels and that to exceed these levels would impair the viability of the domestic oil industry. The Presidents since President Eisenhower, have similarly recognized that vital relationship. Thus, we must not allow ourselves to rely on imports of foreign oil to the detriment of our domestic industry.

The events in the Near East in the past few months have demonstrated again the wisdom and necessity of maintaining a strong domestic oil producing industry. The relatively minor disruptions in the flow of mideast oil produced serious repercussions around the world. Yet, the deficiencies in the United States supply of crude oil caused

by these disruptions have largely been made up by increasing the production of oil in Texas and Louisiana. This higher level of production from secure domestic sources cannot be sustained indefinitely. We must continue to add to our producing reserves.

(8) Maintaining our national security is necessary. Can there be any serious argument against the concept of this nation's maintaining a strong national security posture? Can there be any doubt that if this nation reduced its level of national security that other hostile countries would not take advantage of this reduced level of security? In my opinion, we must continue to maintain a strong defense posture. A vital link in this posture is a viable domestic oil industry.

(9) Therefore, it follows from the foregoing that increasing the price of domestically produced crude oil is necessary.

I realize that you already understand and acknowledge much, if not all of what I have submitted. However, this investigation seems an appropriate time and place to review the basic concepts which relate adequate prices of domestic crude oil to our national security.

HELICOPTERS FOR PAKISTAN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on November 19, in a letter to the President, I urged that:

Every helicopter and crew not now urgently required in Vietnam be moved from the conflict to help in the Pakistani relief effort. They should be accompanied by as many fixed wing transport aircraft as can be spared under the same standard, for collection and delivery of supplies to airfields nearest the points of need.

I suggested further that it would be worth while at least exploring the chance that:

North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front forces might cooperate to allow an even greater diversion than might otherwise be the case, through a temporary cease-fire or other arrangement.

Both prior to that time and since, news reports on the dreadful catastrophe in East Pakistan have been filled with evidence of the need for the means to transport relief supplies to remote areas of suffering. There has never been any doubt that the death toll would mount far beyond the tens of thousands who perished in the flood unless food, water, and medical supplies were widely distributed within a very short period of time.

The most urgent need, in the words of Pakistani Relief Commissioner A. M. Anisuzzaman, has been "helicopters, helicopters, and helicopters."

I understand that we have some 4,000 helicopters in Southeast Asia, in the range of 1,000 miles from East Pakistan. Nearly 2 weeks after the disaster there were six U.S. helicopters flying and four being assembled in Pakistan. None came from Southeast Asia. We supplied a total of 10; other countries brought the number to something under 30.

On December 2 I received a reply to my suggestion from Secretary of State William Rogers, in which he indicated that we could supply helicopters from the United States more quickly than they could be diverted from the field in Vietnam. I do have some doubts about one of the reasons he cited for that conclusion—that those in Vietnam would have to be taken apart for shipment—in light of the

fact that at least a portion of those helicopters can fly at speeds of at least 200 miles per hour, and can be refueled in flight.

But in any case, I appreciate the Secretary's attention to my proposal, and I want to share his response with Members of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an interim reply from the White House, dated November 19, followed by Secretary Roger's letter of December 2.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 19, 1970.

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter to the President of today's date regarding the disaster in East Pakistan. I shall call your concern and suggestions to the President's early attention.

With cordial regards,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, December 2, 1970.

HON. GEORGE S. MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: The President shares your deep concern over the tragic reports about the disaster in East Pakistan. From all indications, it is one of the greatest natural disasters in modern history.

Your support for the moves that have been taken to meet the immediate relief requests of the Government of Pakistan is appreciated. As these have been received, additional military and commercial aircraft have been sent with food, medicine, clothing and other relief supplies for the victims of the cyclone along with the means (helicopters and boats) to move the supplies into the disaster area.

Much more remains to be done, and the Administration is firmly committed to do whatever it can, both during the immediate emergency relief phase and over the longer term to assist in reconstruction and rehabilitation of the devastated area. This will be a long-term effort and will require continuing support from the Congress.

The suggestion that as many helicopters as possible be moved from Vietnam to East Pakistan was taken fully into consideration by the Department of Defense when it was initially determined that airlift support was needed. Evaluation at that time indicated that helicopters could be moved to the disaster area more quickly from the U.S. than from the field in Vietnam. We were able to airlift 10 helicopters into East Pakistan and make them operational over the disaster area within 2-3 days of the request for them, whereas helicopters from Vietnam would have had to be removed from the battlefield, serviced and taken apart for shipment. We were prepared to send more helicopters if the Government of Pakistan determined that they were needed.

Our objective in this entire operation is in the true American humanitarian tradition of helping save, and sustain, as many lives as possible. When and if it is feasible and necessary, we are prepared to draw on our resources in the Pacific to aid in the war against death in East Pakistan. For example, a communications support team for the helicopters operating in East Pakistan has been sent from Vietnam.

Thank you again for your encouragement for the Administration's relief effort. Your suggestions are appreciated and your con-

cern reflects the bipartisan response Americans have always given to others in need.

With best personal regards,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS.

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE GENERATION GAP

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, in a speech prepared for the Thomas C. Hennings lecture at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) discussed one of our most important problems, "Foreign Policy and the Generation Gap."

Mr. President, we have many problems in our society. And like it or not, our foreign policy greatly affects how these problems are met.

The conduct of foreign policy offers a nation the opportunity to put the principles it expounds into practice. Unfortunately, all too often policy falls short of the rhetoric, leading to the disillusionment of many.

And when the conduct of foreign policy goes wrong, as it has in Vietnam, it can affect the priorities of a nation. Through a series of relatively insignificant, almost private, decisions, the United States slowly became embroiled in a war which exposed the difference between our rhetoric and our actions, and cost over 52,000 young men their lives while crippling and maiming thousands. It has cost the U.S. Government over \$135 billion dollars. Indeed, Vietnam has diminished our available resources, both human and financial, to meet our urgent domestic problems.

Senator CHURCH eloquently sums up the effects of foreign policy gone wrong and suggests what can be done to correct it. He states:

I should think that the lessons of Vietnam may have just as much impact on young peoples' conceptions of American foreign policy in the future as the lessons of the Second World War had upon the conceptions of their parents. Having witnessed the involvement of the United States in both great wars of this century, our contemporary leaders drew the conclusion that since we couldn't withdraw in isolation from the world, we must therefore take charge of it. Thus the United States, at the end of the Second World War, stepped into the vacuum created by the receding European empires. Tommy Adkins was replaced by G.I. Joe; American Marines occupied barracks once filled by the French Foreign Legion. Though we believed our motives to be pure—quite unrelated to the practice of neocolonialism with which we stand charged—the obligations we assumed soon came to exceed those of all the old western empires combined. The United States, without much forethought, pledged itself to oversee the vast regions once occupied by the bankrupt European nations. Overnight, we became the policeman, banker and judge of most of the world.

In place of the British fleet, the U.S. Navy took up the deep-water patrol. From the Mediterranean to the China Seas; American troops were garrisoned at outposts so far-flung as to dwarf the reach of Imperial Rome. In our zeal as self-anointed protector of half a hundred foreign governments, we retained the draft to summon young Americans to battle in places they had never heard of before, a compulsory duty never imposed on French or British citizens, even at the height of their colonial power.

The obsessive fear which drove us to this extremity—the specter of a monolithic communism engulfing the globe—has long since been shown to be illusory. Communist countries are deeply divided. President Nixon is cheered in Bucharest and greeted with enthusiasm in Belgrade. The red titans, Russia and China, hurl invective at one another and engage in sporadic warfare along contested borders.

While these developments outmoded our old concepts, we kept on adhering to the same engrained habits of thought. We continued to see ourselves as the benevolent sentinel of what we still call the "free world," when in truth it is mainly composed, like the Communist world, of despotic governments that are the very antithesis of all we stand for as a nation.

So it happened that American foreign policy fell out of touch with traditional American ideals. In the name of "pragmatism," we embraced every form of government on our side of the tug-of-war. Their frontiers became ours to defend, for which purpose we stationed more than a million soldiers abroad; their internal stability became ours to promote, for which purpose we dispensed more than \$150-billion in foreign aid. To be sure, we told ourselves we were financing development, but we decreed that it must take place within the framework of the existing order. Our principal concern, like that of all presiding imperial powers, became the preservation of the status quo.

This objective cannot be reconciled with our historic conception of ourselves as an exemplary society. Americans who believe in freedom at home will not wed themselves for long to a foreign policy which supports despotism in other lands. When the United States keeps sending arms to the Greek colonels who strangled freedom in democracy's home, when we subsidize the Fascist Franco; when we lavish money on a dictatorship in Brazil which is known to countenance the torture of its own citizens, why in the name of decency are we surprised when idealistic young Americans question our purposes abroad and doubt our words?

VI

The remedy—the only remedy—is to bring America home again, not to a neoisolationism of which I am sometimes accused; not to an abandonment of the United Nations or those alliances, such as NATO, which really contribute to our security; not to a condition of military weakness which might tempt our enemies—but home again to the forgotten truth that the first mission of the federal government was never to decide which faction should govern some little country on the fringes of China, but to attend to the genuine needs of the American people!

For too long, our people's problems have gone unattended here at home. For too long, our presidents have been mesmerized by the quests of Caesar. For too long, our resources have been poured into distant lands, with which we have had no former link or economic interest, no strategic stake or post-colonial responsibility.

The time has come to put right our priorities, before we exhaust ourselves in futile foreign adventures, as other great powers have done before us. At song fests we raise our voices to sing: "This land is our land." Well, it cries out for more attention. American cities rot at their cores, the countryside empties of people, family farms disappear. Smog spreads its noxious mantle, water turns rancid, and the problems of waste disposal grow daily more severe. Race relations worsen, the streets are shamefully unsafe. Crime breeds on addictive drugs. And poverty persists amidst plenty.

This gather crisis in our own land bears far more importantly on the future of the republic than anything we have now, or have ever had at stake, in Indochina. Atten-

tion to these festering problems on the homefront, reinforced by an ironclad resolve to solve them, would do more than anything else to enlist the energies, quicken the interest, and restore the allegiance of the doubting young.

Such a new direction requires a radical revision of American foreign policy. Massive intervention in other peoples' affairs must give way to priority attention for our own. Military adventurism—which has kept this country engaged in marathon warfare for the past 30 years—must be replaced with sufficient self-discipline to restore our armed forces to their legitimate role, the defense of the United States. Above all, the American foreign policy tail must stop wagging the American dog!

That accomplished, we could shift focus back upon those internal problems which so deeply concern young people, such as attaining racial justice, eliminating poverty, improving the quality of life and humanizing our institutions. With credibility, we could then beckon young people back into the mainstream of our political process.

It is fitting that Senator CHURCH'S message to those honoring Tom Hennings, a distinguished Senator from Missouri, can be summed up by another great American and distinguished Missouri Senator, Carl Schurz, who stated almost a century ago:

Our country, right or wrong! When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right!

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entirety of Senator CHURCH'S speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE GENERATION GAP:
THOMAS C. HENNING'S LECTURE, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO., DEC. 3, 1970

(By U.S. Senator FRANK CHURCH, D., Idaho, Member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE GENERATION GAP

You do me high honor in asking me to deliver this Thomas C. Hennings, Jr. Memorial Lecture. Having served with the Senator in the years immediately preceding his death, I remember well the malaises against which he fought during the Fifties: wiretapping . . . unprincipled attacks upon the Supreme Court and its Justices . . . racism . . . the filibuster, the legislative weapon of recalcitrance . . . juvenile delinquency . . . and many more.

Tom Hennings turned his energies, for the most part, upon those afflictions which plagued our own body politic. He did so during an era when our national leadership was largely preoccupied with external affairs. So his fight was uphill all the way. And when he lost, as he often did, the thing I would have you remember about Tom Hennings is that he never quit. He never threw up his hands and cried, "The system must be trashed!"

In this connection, let me recite a personal experience. A few weeks ago, I went to Pittsburgh to address the student body of Carnegie-Mellon University. Though I was well received, two plainclothesmen accompanied me the entire time I stayed on the campus, and I was given a police escort back to the airport. University officials explained—almost nonchalantly—that this had become "standard procedure."

On returning to the airport that evening, we drove past the Hilton Hotel in downtown Pittsburgh. Inside, hurling verbal thunderbolts at the party faithful, was the

Vice President of the United States; outside, the hotel was surrounded by young people shouting obscenities.

As I flew back to Washington in the gathering gloom, I kept turning over in my mind that memorable passage in President Nixon's inaugural address, delivered nearly two years before, from the steps of the nation's capitol.

"In these difficult years," the new President had admonished, "America has suffered from a fever of words; from inflated rhetoric that promises more than it can deliver; from angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds; from bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuading."

"We cannot learn from one another," Mr. Nixon had said, "until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."

Today, 22 months later, the shouting is louder than ever. We have grown not closer together but farther apart. Angry Americans clash in the streets, schools burn, armories are sacked, courtrooms bombed. Startling numbers of policemen and firemen are shot in the performance of their duty. Fanatic new groupings boast publicly that they are waging "guerrilla warfare" against their fellow Americans. Violence stalks the land.

American campuses are in the midst of a crisis unequalled in the history of the United States, reports the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. This campus crisis, the commission declared, reflects deep divisions in American society and is seen in "violent acts and harsh rhetoric and in the enmity of those Americans who see themselves as occupying opposing camps."

No longer do we face our problems together. Instead we divide into minority blocs and special interest groups; student militants, hard hats and Black Panthers, to name a few. Factionalism is so much in fashion that those who claim no particular label are lumped together in a grouping of their own and touted as the "forgotten Americans."

As the balkanization of our society worsens, rational dialogue across the barriers all but ceases. "Non-negotiable" demands are leveled in language foul from faces flushed. *Power* is the ubiquitous symbol and catchword: white power, black power, red power, student power, flower power.

Intolerant slogans depict the ugly mood: "America, love it (my way) or leave it."

"Off the pigs."

"Tell it to Hanoi."

And on and on and on.

With Job, the time has come for America to implore: "How long will ye vex my soul and break me in pieces with words?"

II

The America of my boyhood was a poorer land, marked by breadlines, bank failures and industrial strife. Parents worried about keeping meat and potatoes on the table. Yet I grew up amidst friendly neighbors on secure streets. To be sure, people took their politics seriously. Times were hard. But I can't recall anybody who didn't believe his country was the greatest in the world. Failure to stand up for the national anthem was unheard of, and never did I witness disrespect for the flag.

This underlying belief in the American system—call it old-fashioned patriotism if you will—filled our history and literature. "We are acting for all mankind," Thomas Jefferson had proclaimed, and Walt Whitman, poet of a self-confident republic, had written:

"Myself, I sing. A single, separate person, and praise the word, 'democracy.'"

Yes, when I was growing up, nearly everyone accepted our union as the wonder and envy of the world. Longfellow had earlier assured us, from his quiet study in Cambridge, that "humanity with all its fears, with all

the hopes of future years," hung breathless on our fate.

Few doubted it.

On such readings did my generation imbibe the humane and hopeful spirit of America. Zestfully they informed us that our free land represented a new beginning, a sanctuary of escape from the ancient oppressions of Europe.

Now I realize that some of my sophisticated friends would scoff at these recollections. They would brand them maudlin. They would say that such days of innocence, if ever they existed, are best put behind us. They would claim to be glad the country has grown up at last, and that the "now" generation is mature enough to "tell it like it is," having freed itself from the sentimental nonsense and mythology of the past.

These "sophisticates" may be partly right, but mostly they are wrong. They forget that any society, especially one composed of so many diverse cultures, races and creeds as our own, is mortared together by common sentiment, by a basic belief in the decency of its purposes, the virtue of its shared ideals and the soundness of its institutions.

When we turn scornful of these fundamentals; when we lose respect for each other and grow defiant of lawful authority; when the accepted standard of conduct sinks to a level no more demanding than "doing your own thing," then the country starts to come unstick.

That's what is happening to us today.

That's why we're in such deep trouble.

III

The trouble stems from no physical disability. Our economic system is a cornucopia of goods and services piled high. Adult Americans prize its monumental productivity. Our sights were set, after all, during sparse years of insecurity and depression. Small wonder that material abundance should have become the single-minded goal and unique achievement—for our generation.

So we tend to diagnose today's trauma in superficial and self-serving ways. We tell ourselves we have given our children too much. They are spoiled. They were raised permissively. It's all Dr. Spock's fault!

But, in moments of reflection, we grudgingly concede that our children do have a point. If they reject the shopping centers as the hallmark of American culture; if they resent the ubiquitous and deceitful advertisements of beer, cigarettes, cosmetics and deodorants that forever assault our eyes and ears; if they object to how we have cheapened our surroundings in an endless clutter of billboards and neon signs; if they want the air pure again, and the water running clean, and the land given a little more loving care, are they really so awfully wrong?

Don't mistake these for signs of sickness. These are the symptoms of persisting national health. A new generation of Americans, knowing that it cannot add to the quantity in our lives, seeks rather to improve the quality. In this they are right. We should pitch in and help them.

For the generation gap which matters involves no insuperable disagreement over goals, nor does it consist primarily of the different life style adopted by so many young people. Indeed, when it comes to their long-term beliefs, their aspirations for their country, or their concept of ultimate justice, the views of most young people are less different from those of their parents than is commonly supposed.

The dangerous generation gap, as I see it, has more to do with means than ends. Far too many bright and sensitive college students are "turned off." Whatever word is used for describing their negative mood, whether it be alienated, disaffected, or disillusioned, the fact is that alarming numbers of young Americans are losing faith in the American political process. They believe the system is rigged for war, not peace; they sus-

pect that representative government has lost its vitality, with only the pocketbook interests enjoying representation, not the people. Worst of all, they think that their entreaties, when voiced in the regular manner, go unheeded and unheard.

This pervasive skepticism about our established political order lies at the very heart of the malaise on campus. It makes the cop-out seem respectable; it accounts for the ease with which self-indulgent pursuits can be justified. If nothing can be done anyway, then why not "celebrate" life? Why not make beads, beards and flowing locks the apparel of defiance and dissent? Why not confront the establishment? If it won't yield, at least it can be discomfited. Why not?

These are the disturbing questions students asked. The malady is most apparent at our foremost universities, where the faculty itself is infected, but it is spreading rapidly through all our institutions of higher learning, undermining confidence still further, encouraging coercion and infusing contempt. If the affliction is to be cured, we must honestly probe for, and eradicate, the underlying causes. Nothing less will suffice.

IV

The charlatans hold that the remedy consists of a simple dose of discipline, a crack-down on campus. It is easy for them to point to any number of disorders which apparently called for sterner measures than those taken. Obviously, no academic institution—or society for that matter—can long tolerate or endure conditions of anarchy. Force unloosed must be met with sufficient counterforce to restore good order. All law-breakers must be held to account.

Nevertheless, while a gaping wound sometimes requires a compress to contain it, the wound is healed, not by the tape with which it is bound, but by the inner processes of the body. So, if we are to find the deep-rooted causes of our current affliction, we must re-examine our society, review our recent history, and reflect upon our charted course.

A startling place is to recognize that today's typical American parent and disaffected college student see the world abroad very differently. The new generation never perceived in Vietnam the demons their parents envisioned. Unlike our Presidents who overlearned the "lessons" of World War II, most perceptive young Americans never could swallow Ho Chi Minh as Adolph Hitler in disguise, or believe that our failure to fight for a government we propped up in Saigon would amount to another "Munich." They sensed that Vietnam really had nothing to do with American security, the safety of the United States or the well-being of our people. Inevitably, they came to view the conflict as an unwarranted intervention on our part in a civil war in Vietnam which wasn't our affair.

It does no good to tell these young people that "our will and character are being tested." That we shall not be humiliated or accept our first defeat. They do not believe a mistaken war should be won. They believe it should be stopped. That, for them, is the path of honor.

So it happened that Vietnam, now the longest war in our history, severed the line of communication between our generation of political leaders and the campus leaders of student thought. The two groups move on different plains; they speak in different tongues. Their paths would never have collided, but passed each other by like ships in the night, except for the war. For we oldsters insisted on drafting the youngsters to fight a war which great numbers of them couldn't approve.

Thus, the disillusionment of so many college students in their country and its institutions has its roots in Vietnam. When the power of the state is used to force young men to fight a war they believe to be unnecessary, at best, and wrongful, at worst (under

penalty of imprisonment if they refuse), the seeds of sedition are sown. From these roots, every limb of authority is eventually challenged. Whenever a tree trunk is shaken, all the leaves tremble. Once the legitimacy of the government is rejected on an issue so fundamental as an unacceptable war, every lesser institution of authority is placed in jeopardy. Every sacred principle, every traditional value, every settled policy becomes a target for ridicule and repudiation. Calendars of anarchy soon begin to boil.

Listen to what the President's Commission on Campus Unrest said about the war. Disaffected students see the war, the commission concluded, "as a symbol of moral crisis in the nation which, in their eyes, deprives even law of its legitimacy. . . . Nothing is more important than the end of the war in Indochina."

The war's fall-out has debased, on a far broader front, the confidence of young people in their government. The credibility of the government, including the Presidency itself, has been grievously impaired. Moreover, an awareness has developed—never known to my generation—that the U.S. Government has forfeited its claim to a morality above that of other governments. The napalming of defenseless Vietnamese villages, the devastation of large areas by free-dropping B-52's, the massacres at My Lai—facts like these prevent young Americans from sharing their elders' coveted belief in the superior morality of their country.

Finally, a recognition is forming that the United States can "lose." All American children learn from their schoolbooks that the United States has never lost a war. But the gargantuan image of brave men, unlimited money and massive modern technology bogged down in a medieval quagmire will not soon be forgotten. Shattered lies the myth of American omnipotence and all other premises on which we built our foreign policy in the years following the Second World War.

V

I should think that the lessons of Vietnam may have just as much impact on young peoples' conceptions of American foreign policy in the future as the lessons of the Second World War had upon the conceptions of their parents. Having witnessed the involvement of the United States in both great wars of this century, our contemporary leaders drew the conclusion that since we couldn't withdraw in isolation from the world, we must therefore take charge of it. Thus the United States, at the end of the Second World War, stepped into the vacuum created by the receding European empires. Tommy Adkins was replaced by G.I. Joe; American Marines occupied barracks once filled by the French Foreign Legion. Though we believed our motives to be pure—quite unrelated to the practice of neocolonialism with which we stand charged—the obligations we assumed soon came to exceed those of all the old western empires combined. The United States, without much forethought, pledged itself to oversee the vast regions once occupied by the bankrupt European nations. Overnight, we became the policeman, banker and judge of most of the world.

In place of the British fleet, the U.S. Navy took up the deep-water patrol. From the Mediterranean to the China Seas; American troops were garrisoned at outposts so far flung as to dwarf the reach of Imperial Rome. In our zeal as self-anointed protector of half a hundred foreign governments, we retained the draft to summon young Americans to battle in places they had never heard of before, a compulsory duty never imposed on French or British citizens, even at the height of their colonial power.

The obsessive fear which drove us to this extremity—the specter of a monolithic communism engulfing the globe—has long since been shown to be illusory. Communist coun-

tries are deeply divided. President Nixon is cheered in Bucharest and greeted with enthusiasm in Belgrade. The red titans, Russia and China, hurl invective at one another and engage in sporadic warfare along contested borders.

While these developments outmoded our old concepts, we kept on adhering to the same engrained habits of thought. We continued to see ourselves as the benevolent sentinel of what we still call the "free world," when in truth it is mainly composed, like the Communist world, of despotic governments that are the very antithesis of all we stand for as a nation.

So it happened that American foreign policy fell out of touch with traditional American ideals. In the name of "pragmatism," we embraced every form of government on our side of the tug-of-war. Their frontiers became ours to defend, for which purpose we stationed more than a million soldiers abroad; their internal stability became ours to promote, for which purpose we dispensed more than \$150-billion in foreign aid. To be sure, we told ourselves we were financing development, but we decreed that it must take place within the framework of the existing order. Our principal concern, like that of all presiding imperial powers, became the preservation of the status quo.

This objective cannot be reconciled with our historic conception of ourselves as an exemplary society. Americans who believe in freedom at home will not wed themselves for long to a foreign policy which supports despotism in other lands. When the United States keeps sending arms to the Greek colonels who strangled freedom in democracy's home, when we subsidize the Fascist Franco; when we lavish money on a dictatorship in Brazil which is known to countenance the torture of its own citizens, why in the name of decency are we surprised when idealistic young Americans question our purposes abroad and doubt our words?

VI

The remedy—the only remedy—is to bring America home again, not to a neoisolationism of which I am sometimes accused; not to an abandonment of the United Nations or those alliances, such as NATO, which really contribute to our security; not to a condition of military weakness which might tempt our enemies—but home again to the forgotten truth that the first mission of the federal government was never to decide which faction should govern some little country on the fringes of China, but to attend to the genuine needs of the American people!

For too long, our people's problems have gone unattended here at home. For too long, our presidents have been mesmerized by the quests of Caesar. For too long, our resources have been poured into distant lands, with which we have had no former link or economic interest, no strategic stake or post-colonial responsibility.

The time has come to put right our priorities, before we exhaust ourselves in futile foreign adventures, as other great powers have done before us. At song fests we raise our voices to sing: "This land is our land." Well, it cries out for more attention. American cities rot at their cores, the countryside empties of people, family farms disappear. Smog spreads its noxious mantle, water turns rancid, and the problems of waste disposal grow daily more severe. Race relations worsen, the streets are shamefully unsafe. Crime breeds on addictive drugs. And poverty persists amidst plenty.

This gathering crisis in our own land bears far more importantly on the future of the republic than anything we have now, or have ever had at stake, in Indochina. Attention to these festering problems on the home-front, reinforced by an ironclad resolve to solve them, would do more than anything

else to enlist the energies, quicken the interest, and restore the allegiance of the doubtful young.

Such a new direction requires a radical revision of American foreign policy. Massive intervention in other peoples' affairs must give way to priority attention for our own. Military adventurism—which has kept this country engaged in marathon warfare for the past 30 years—must be replaced with sufficient self-discipline to restore our armed forces to their legitimate role, the defense of the United States. Above all, the American foreign policy tail must stop wagging the American dog!

That accomplished, we could shift focus back upon those internal problems which so deeply concern young people, such as attaining racial justice, eliminating poverty, improving the quality of life and humanizing our institutions. With credibility, we could then beckon young people back into the mainstream of our political process. Let them vote at 18; they know more than we did at 21. Let them help us update our horse-and-buggy politics by abolishing the Electoral College, so that the people can directly elect the President. Let them assist in the reform of our unrepresentative convention system, so that the voters can have a larger voice in the selection of candidates. Let them plunge in with fresh ideas about changing our scandalous election laws, to curtail sky-rocketing campaign costs and impose realistic spending limits, so that victories at the polls are fairly won, not bought.

That's a start. And when we've made it, even the most cynical young people may begin listening again when we remind them that no society of men will ever be perfect, that every wrong can't be instantly righted, and that the best instrument yet devised for pursuing truth is freedom. But governments that tolerate freedom are rare. They are hard to get, in the first place; and they are hard to keep alive. That task, in a free land like ours, must be assumed by each succeeding generation. Its performance is not the prize of a short sprint, but the hard-earned harvest of an endurance contest.

Out of that understanding, we would come together again. The generation gap wouldn't vanish—and we should be glad for that—but it would no longer tear the country apart. Underlying confidence in the soundness of our institutions would be restored. And our horizons would brighten once more with the promise that American freedom will endure.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HONOLULU REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, as the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency celebrates its 20th anniversary this year, it has much to be proud of. Its record of accomplishment is a most impressive one.

In the last 20 years, HRA has acquired, improved, and resold for urban renewal purposes over 7 million square feet of land at a total acquisition cost of \$13,221,000; initiated or contracted for more than \$42,100,000 worth of construction; aided in relocating 3,028 families, 2,699 individuals, and hundreds of businesses. The estimated total cost of all HRA projects undertaken amounts to over \$112,500,000.

Two HRA projects deserving particular attention are the Kukui Gardens housing project which received the AIA Award of Excellence and the Kapahulu rehabilitation project which was cited by the Department of Housing and

Urban Development as a "Showcase of Excellence."

At this time, I am proud to salute the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency for its great contribution in lessening to a remarkable degree the problems associated with urban renewal in Honolulu. HRA's record has been one of excellence.

At this time, I should like to share a report of the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency's accomplishments with the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

BETTER LIVING IN A BETTER NEIGHBORHOOD THROUGH URBAN RENEWAL UNDER THE HONOLULU REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, HONOLULU, HAWAII, 1950-70

AGENCY MEMBERS

Five Member constituting a public corporate body provide programs for renewal of sium, blighted and deteriorating areas through clearance or conservation, or both; determine overall policies and take legal actions to execute such programs and policies.

Joseph Lunasco, Chairman, Sherman N. Dowsett, Vice-Chairman, Sunao Miyabara, Secretary, Hung Leong Ching, Member, and Paul M. Kurata, Member.

ADMINISTRATION

Plans, develops and administers urban renewal programs and related affairs as approved by Agency Members.

Melvin Y. Shinn, Manager.

INTRODUCTION

The Honolulu Redevelopment Agency has been actively functioning in its capacity of implementing the urban renewal program of the City and County of Honolulu since it was established in 1949. The existing projects in execution and the projects in planning are calculated to implement the overall goals and objectives of the Agency.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives of the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency are consistent with Federal aims and local community needs.

The overall goals and objectives of the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency on which its long-range program is based are the following:

(a) The elimination of urban blight where it exists, and the prevention of its further spread, by a selective use of both redevelopment and rehabilitation programs.

(b) The provision of diverse choice of housing for all income groups, with initial concern for those lower income groups not presently served by the normal housing market. Particular responsibility is assumed by HRA for relocating those persons displaced by the redevelopment process.

(c) The improvement and modernization of commercial areas where betterment has not come about through the efforts of individual owners.

(d) Assistance in development of the cultural life of the community by including cultural facilities in redevelopment project plans.

In the years ahead, these goals and objectives will determine the Agency's overall policy, its major programs, and its individual projects, as well.

The Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has clearly stated certain National Goals to be attained in the urban renewal, which will be prime factors in establishing project priorities. Summarized, these National Goals are:

1. Expansion of housing supply for low- and moderate-income groups. This applies

both to conserving and increasing such housing supply.

2. Development of areas of employment opportunity. This applies to development of centers of employment opportunity for jobless, underemployed, and low-income persons through commercial or industrial redevelopment.

3. Renewal of areas with critical and urgent need. Priority is given to areas of physical decay, high tension and great social need, where all available resources are to be used to improve conditions.

In addition, HUD has emphasized the need for balanced programs: e.g., programs directed toward eliminating blight and providing housing for all income levels, upgrading and modernizing commercial areas and providing for the civic and cultural life of the community.

Finally, HUD has pointed to the need for full employment of every urban renewal dollar, and evaluation of the responsible use being made of grant funds already committed.

The Honolulu Redevelopment Agency, in its present and its projected programs, such as the Model Cities program considers these National Goals, locally applied, to be a part of its own Goals and Objectives.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. The objective of prevention and elimination of urban blight is implemented through two different types of program:

a. Rehabilitation and Conservation—to eliminate and prevent deterioration within an area which is not yet beyond reclamation through: removing only those structures which cannot be salvaged; reorganizing and expanding the public facilities to provide the framework for a sound neighborhood; rehabilitating private property—that is, remodeling and renovating those existing structures which do not conform to standards prescribed for the area; and maintaining all property in accordance with those standards.

b. Clearance and Redevelopment—the program of redevelopment involves: the acquisition of all or most of the land within a designated area by a local public agency through purchase or condemnation; the demolition of structures on that land; the relocation of displaced persons and businesses; and the eventual conveyance of the cleared parcel to a private entrepreneur, who is obligated to redevelop it in accordance with a municipally approved plan.

2. The objective of providing housing to serve the needs of all income groups is implemented through the following programs:

a. Clearance and Redevelopment—where parcels of land are developed for multi-family uses to meet low-, moderate- and high-income groups.

b. Conservation and Rehabilitation—preserve and upgrade existing housing stock and eliminate environmental conditions causing blight.

c. Auxiliary Redevelopment Housing Program—where vacant land is acquired for relocation of displaced persons caused by public improvements.

d. Relocation program—where displacees are assisted in housing needs through referrals to public and private housing supplies.

3. The objective to improve blighted area's socio-cultural, commercial and employment opportunities is all inextricably conjoined with the programs as stated above. The proper mix and arrangement of various land uses are essential to maintain the organic balance of a community.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: (PROJECTS)

1. Rehabilitation and Conservation—Kakahulu General Neighborhood Renewal Area.

- a. Paki Project
- b. Hinano Project

- c. Honolulu Project
- d. Olu-Kikeke Project
- 2. Clearance and Redevelopment
 - a. Kukul Project
 - b. Kauluwela Project
 - c. Chinatown GNR Area, Pauahi Project
- 3. Auxiliary Redevelopment Housing Halawa Makalapa Manor by HCHA
- 4. Although Model City areas offer potential for projects, the type of treatments has been determined at this time.

PROJECTS COMPLETED

A. Mayor John H. Wilson Project in Kalihi Valley

Federally assisted clearance-redevelopment project, 29.7 acres.

This blighted residential area, predominantly open in nature and used for hog and poultry raising and truck farming, was cleared and transformed into a modern, well-designed residential neighborhood of 162 single family dwellings, zoned Class A residential of 5,000 square foot minimum lot areas.

The project, the first undertaken by the LPA, won distinction as the first federally-guided renewal project to be completed in the Western Region of the United States, was one of the few to realize an immediate profit, and most important, served to emphasize both the need and the feasibility of revitalizing other decayed and blighted neighborhoods.

Project execution began December 1953, completed June 1959.

Gross cost—\$1.2 million, net profit—\$176.0 thousand.

B. Kokea auxiliary redevelopment project in Palama

Non-federally assisted relocation housing project for moderate-income families with occupancy priority to families displaced from urban renewal projects or from any other governmental actions—3.7 acres.

Area was developed into 144 housing units of one- to four-bedroom dwellings with local funds under Act 101 of the 1957 Legislature, which authorized the Agency to acquire "undeveloped vacant land" for development by private enterprise into predominantly residential uses to provide dwelling units for families displaced from areas acquired by governmental agencies for public uses, at rents such families can afford.

The first increment of the project consisted of 108 one- to four-bedroom, all-electric units and was completed in 1961. The second increment of 36 one- to two-bedroom units was completed a year later.

This type of project is an excellent example of what can be accomplished when government and private enterprise work in solving housing problems. Project was developed through cooperative efforts of the property owner, developer and the Agency.

Project execution began March 1959, completed June 1962.

Gross cost—\$10.0 thousand to Agency for staff technical assistance.

C. Kalihi triangle project in Kalihi Valley

Non-federally assisted clearance-redevelopment project, 8.5 acres.

This blighted area, adjacent to the Mayor John H. Wilson Project across the highway and consisting of similar blight and deterioration as the Wilson Project, was the first renewal project in the nation to be completed by means of private owner redevelopment and rehabilitation.

Twelve of the 15 property owners of 22 multi-sized lots initiated and organized a private development group, and placed their properties in common trust. Area was cleared and redeveloped under an improvement district program into 40 residential parcels of 5,000 square foot minimum lot areas.

Gross cost—\$86.0 thousand, net cost—\$16.0 thousand.

No cost to Agency except for staff technical assistance.

D. Queen Emma project in downtown Honolulu

Federally-assisted clearance-redevelopment project, 73.8 acres.

First major undertaking of clearance and redevelopment of a slum area, one of the pockets of overcrowded and unsafe buildings and tenement dwellings, located in Downtown Honolulu within a few minutes walk from the Central Business District. The area was redeveloped into a major residential, commercial and institutional complex.

Some of the outstanding developments are the \$12.5 million Queen Emma Gardens of 587 apartments for middle-income families—(three high-rise buildings designed by the world famous architect, Minoru Yamasaki), Longs Drugs, Safeway Shopping Center, Harris Memorial Church, Hosoi Garden Mortuary, Kukul Mortuary, Borthwick Mortuary, See Dai Doo Society, Nuuanu YMCA, New Kamamalu Playground, and the Foster Gardens Extension.

Project execution began September 1958, completed June 1964.

Gross cost—\$11.6 million, net cost—\$4.0 million.

E. Aala Triangle Project in Downtown Honolulu

Another federally assisted clearance-redevelopment project in Downtown Honolulu urban renewal complex of five projects—4.1 acres.

One of the oldest and busiest slum sections in Downtown Honolulu, the project area was sold to the City and County Department of Parks and Recreation for development into a beautiful, open space park for use as a passive recreational facility, especially for the elderly.

Project execution began April 1962, completed December 1965.

Gross cost—\$2.4 million, net cost—\$2.0 million.

F. Kewalo-Lunalilo Auxiliary Redevelopment Project in Makiki

Non-federally assisted relocation housing project, 0.6 acre.

This vacant area was acquired by the Agency and sold to a private developer for construction of 38 two-bedroom apartments for moderate-income families.

Project is the second of this type to be developed, the first being the Kokea Project.

Project execution began March 1963; completed April 1967.

Gross cost—\$177.0 thousand, net cost—\$79.0 thousand.

PROJECTS IN EXECUTION

Projects in various stages of execution:

A. Kukui Project in Downtown Honolulu

The third of five federally-assisted clearance-redevelopment projects in Downtown Honolulu, 75.0 acres.

Another pocket of overcrowded, unsafe buildings, dilapidated single dwellings and tenement-type dwellings, mostly two-story structures, is being developed into a neighborhood harmoniously blended with residential dwellings and commercial, cultural, institutional, playground and educational facilities.

Completed are the York Building—professional and business offices; Kamalii Park—open space; the Izumo Taishakyo—Shinto Shrine; and the Hawaii Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association Health Center building; and Kalanihua—150 unit public housing for the elderly.

Construction has been completed on the 822-unit, \$16.0 million Kukul Gardens moderate-income, multi-family housing. Full occupancy was attained in mid-November, 1970. The project received National recognition by winning a National AIA Award of Excellence in National competition in November, 1970.

Under consideration are the Ginza Plaza, a commercial shopping center complex with Oriental motif; the Cultural Plaza, a planned

unit development including housing, institutions, schools, shopping center also with Oriental motif; and a low-rise commercial development.

Project execution began September 1960—to be completed December 1971.

Estimated gross cost—\$27.4 million, estimated net cost—\$17.2 million.

B. Kauluwela Project in Downtown Honolulu

The fourth of five federally-assisted clearance-redevelopment projects in the Downtown Honolulu urban renewal complex, this is another pocket of overcrowded, unsafe buildings, dilapidated single dwellings and tenement-type dwellings, mostly two-story wooden structures—29.9 acres.

The area is being developed into a planned neighborhood including multi-family apartments for the elderly and moderate-income "gap" group, a neighborhood shopping center, school, library, park and institutional facilities.

Completed in December 1966 is the Liliha Branch Library under the State Department of Education.

Now under construction are the Aloha United Fund Community Service Center scheduled for completion in January 1971, and the 126-unit high-rise cooperative housing to be completed in December 1970—the first in a series of high-rise and low-rise housing developments of 383 apartments for moderate-income families and the elderly under the sponsorship of the nonprofit Hawaii Council for Housing Action. Improvements to the Kauluwela School and Kauluwela Playground are also in progress.

Project execution began March 1966, to be completed December 1970.

Estimated gross cost—\$7.6 million, estimated net cost—\$5.8 million.

C. Paki project in Kapahulu

The first of four federally-assisted rehabilitation projects under the Kapahulu General Neighborhood Renewal Plan (GNRP)—43.3 acres.

The area is predominantly a neighborhood of neat, single family homes, and blighted only to the extent that rehabilitation treatment is required to restore the area to a sound, attractive and desirable neighborhood. As of August 31, 1970, of the 374 dwelling units in the project area, rehabilitation has been completed on 244 units, and another 100 on which rehabilitation has been started. Section 312 Loans and Grants, and Section 115 under the Housing Act of 1964, as amended, to 139 property owners thus far amount to \$713,050 and \$90,175 respectively.

Project execution began July 1966, to be completed January 1971.

Estimated gross cost—\$4.5 million, estimated net cost—\$4.0 million.

D. Hinano project in Kapahulu

The second of the four federally-assisted rehabilitation projects adjacent to the Paki Project under the Kapahulu GNRP with similar neighborhood characteristics as the Paki Project—107.5 acres.

As of August 31, 1970, of the 898 dwelling units in the project area, rehabilitation has been completed on 401 units and was started on another 273 units. Section 312 Loans and Grants and Section 115 grants under the Housing Act of 1964, as amended, to 259 property owners thus far amount to \$1,395,350 and \$118,435 respectively.

Project execution began July 1966, to be completed July 1971.

Estimated gross cost—\$11.4 million, estimated net cost—\$9.5 million.

E. Halawa auxiliary redevelopment project in Halawa

The third non-federally-assisted relocation housing project for moderate-income families with occupancy priority to families in Halawa displaced from the proposed Halawa Stadium, Federal highway, Hawaii Housing Authority, and others displaced by urban

renewal projects or from any other governmental actions—8.5 acres. Project is similar to the Kokea and Kewalo-Lunaillo Projects.

Called "Makalapa Manor," the 122-unit cooperative townhouse development is being jointly sponsored by the Pearl Harbor Memorial Church, Hawaii Methodist Union, and the Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers Local No. 1, AFL-CIO, on a nonprofit basis.

Project execution began March 1969. Groundbreaking ceremony was held on March 28, 1970. Construction completion schedule—June 30, 1971.

Estimated gross cost \$1.3 million, estimated net cost—\$926,000.

PROJECT IN PLANNING

A. Hoolulu project in Kapahulu

The Hoolulu Project is the third of four federally-assisted rehabilitation projects under the Kapahulu GNRP. This project is generally bounded by Kapahulu Avenue, Olu Street, Aloha Avenue and the North Boundary of the Paki and Hinano Projects and contains an area of 126.9 acres.

The land use is predominantly residential with over 80 acres zoned for residential use and 13 acres zoned for business use.

The Part I Loan and Grant Application was submitted to HUD on August 11, 1970. The estimated net project cost is \$21.05 million with a federal capital grant of \$15.28 million. Project execution is expected to begin in May 1971 and completed in April 1977.

B. Chinatown GNRP in downtown Honolulu

Federally-assisted preparation of a General Neighborhood Renewal Plan covering the western portion of the Central Business District in Downtown Honolulu known as "Chinatown"—36.0 acres. The Chinatown GNR Area is divided into four projects—Pauahi, Nuuanu, Kekaulike and Maunakea Projects.

Situated next to the waterfront and pier areas, the area is one of the first sections of Honolulu to be completely developed and contains sufficient evidence of deterioration, obsolescence and environmental deficiencies including inharmonious mixture of commercial and residential uses, primarily retail and service oriented on the ground floor with apartments and rooming houses above and at the rear, small, irregular lot sizes, and narrow alleys, to warrant some type of improvement and rebuilding program. The area also includes ethnic groups, social organizations and Oriental shops that give the area an atmosphere of the Orient.

The goal of the renewal program is to improve the area where people may work and live in a neighborhood that boasts a clean, safe and healthy environment, provides decent, safe and sanitary housing for single individuals, elderly and moderate-income families, and preserves the atmosphere of the present Oriental neighborhood including the ethnic groups and social organizations and fish and meat markets, Oriental goods stores, chop suey houses and restaurants, and other small shops and stores.

The Chinatown GNRP application was approved on June 30, 1970. The preparation of the GNRP is expected to be completed in June 1972. The estimated net cost of renewal in the Chinatown GNR Area is \$62.5 million.

C. Pauahi Project in Chinatown

The Pauahi Project is the first of four projects in the implementation of urban renewal in the Chinatown GNR Area.

The Pauahi Project consists of two blocks situated on the North corner of the Chinatown GNR Area, is bounded by Beretania, Maunakea, Hotel and River Streets and contains an area of 6.3 acres.

The general characteristics of the project area are similar to the general characteristics of the entire Chinatown GNR Area. The project area contains physical deterioration, obsolescence and environmental deficiencies to a degree to warrant urban renewal.

The Pauahi Project Survey and Planning Application was approved on June 30, 1970 with project execution expected to begin in September 1972. The estimated net project cost is \$11.52 million and the Federal capital grant is \$8.27 million.

PROJECTS IN PREPLANNING

A. Olu-Kikeke project in Kapahulu

The fourth and last increment of the federally-assisted rehabilitation projects under the Kapahulu GNRP—126.9 acres.

Survey and Planning Application, submitted to HUD in July 1968 is still pending with HUD in Washington, D.C.

Estimated gross cost—\$14.8 million, estimated net cost—\$12.8 million.

B. Koko drive auxiliary redevelopment project

The fourth non-federally-assisted relocation housing project for moderate-income families similar to the Kokea, Kewalo-Lunaillo, and Halawa Projects—27.9 acres.

Of the 27.9 acres, the proposed plan is to develop 19.7 acres for 200 apartment dwellings and 8.2 acres for a neighborhood playground under the City's Department of Parks and Recreation.

Gross estimated cost is \$459,300 to the Agency plus cost of construction to the developer.

C. Model cities program

Agency is participating in the Model Cities Program and will in due time be the operating agency for urban renewal in the Kalia-Palama (2,000 acres) and the Waianae (36,800 acres) Model Neighborhood Areas.

PRESIDENT SANFORD AND AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. President, former Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina, now the president of Duke University, and one of the Nation's most respected and thoughtful men, has written an excellent article on the state of our campuses and the present generation of young people. His observations are, in my view, wise and imaginative, and I should like to share them, Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that President Sanford's article, published in the New York Times of November 17, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A MEMO TO MR. AGNEW

(By Terry Sanford)

DURHAM, N.C.—They said he won the TV debate with the students. But he didn't. He lost it because he did not understand that a real leader sometimes must rise above the temptation to win a debate. And now it is obvious that over the past year he has lost much more than a TV debate. A national leader, especially when his people are troubled and disillusioned over the inadequacy of leadership, must contribute something more than the general disparagement of students and the degradation of colleges and universities.

It seems almost cruel to answer the Vice President now, after his political technique fared so badly at the polls. On the other hand, at every opportunity we need to assert a faith in young people, in the integrity of our colleges and universities, and in our own ability to conquer rather than succumb to our fears.

It is sad that the Vice President could not understand the fundamentals of leadership at a time when all our nation's people needed conciliation, trust and respect, creative ideas and constructive proposals. Instead he led a spirited charge to our people to choose up sides, and implanted suspicion,

distrust and alienation. As his intended beneficiary in the Georgia Governor's race said of him, "He's echoing many of the frustrations in American society."

His effort to stir up doubts about our institutions, particularly higher education, has hurt colleges and disillusioned students unjustly. The deep troubles of our society do not begin on college campuses, are not bred there, and are not centered there. Instead, our possibilities for resolving these troubles find their greatest hope on our college campuses, in the resources of faculty and research capacity, and in the hearts and minds of the students. To damage the support of colleges is to damage the very hopes of society.

This college generation needs no apologist. These students are more closely allied than we might realize with the remarkable group of men who rethought all prior concepts and precepts of government, and then produced our Constitution nearly two hundred years ago. Their instincts are humanitarian. They are convinced that the individual is the denominator that counts. They take their freedoms very seriously, although sometimes a little too self-consciously. In the students' rethinking of our institutions and society we may all be the beneficiaries.

It is true that there has been some unrest on all good campuses, disruption and destruction on a relatively few, and ineptness by college administrations. As one of that group lumped together as "driving idiots" by the Vice President and "stupid bastards" by the Attorney General, I would contend that college administrators have handled their radicals better than other community leaders—including mayors, governors and presidents.

We will not tolerate destruction on college campuses. College administrators are stopping the destructive minority, although it did take a couple of years to design adequate reaction to campus demonstrators. But in fairness it should be recalled that when street demonstrations against the abuse of civil rights were epidemic, it also took mayors and governors some while to recover from the initial shock. There were some dreadful official counteractions, and considerable official ineptness in those early days. It would be fair, in this context, to recall that the immediate past Governor of Maryland was himself caught by this kind of surprise, and many felt that he did not do very well in dealing with his demonstrators. And recall too that no one charged the Governor with "permissiveness" because in 1969 Baltimore ranked seventh in the country in the number of serious crimes, a hundredfold beyond the rate of college campuses.

In putting down destruction it is not appropriate to put down dissent. Suppression of dissent leads to destruction. Those who call for forcing students out of school, forcing peaceful pickets and protestors to disperse, forcing compliance with arbitrary rules, do not understand the problem. Almost all college administrators have dealt with their problems and protected their institutions without resort to force. Resolution of differences by the use of force is not a lesson we need in the world. Any bully can teach respect for force. It takes a much more sensitive touch to teach reliance on reason. Reason takes more patience, more love, and greater understanding. It is the burden of the university to illustrate by its conduct that survival of mankind depends on confidence in the rule of reason.

The most urgent lesson for this generation, young and old, to learn may very well be that force leads to escalated force, and that the way of peace abroad and harmony at home is the way of reason. It takes greater courage, greater intelligence, greater understanding to rely on the moral force of reason rather than on the physical force of power. Those institutions attempting to teach this lesson should not be smeared for their efforts.

PRISONERS OF WAR IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President at no time in the past has the tragic plight of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam been a more frustrating or more difficult problem than it is today. Frustrating, because so little has been achieved, despite the well-intentioned efforts of so many. Tragic because with each passing day our men in prison suffer while their families at home carry an increasingly heavy burden.

But perhaps, worst of all is the fact that today this difficult situation has become all the more dangerous and intractable with the abortive raid late last month by U.S. forces on the Son Tay Prison site near Hanoi. I say "dangerous," Mr. President, because I fear that with this raid a terrible precedent has been set which will lead us not toward securing humane treatment or the release of our men, but toward increased risks on their lives and welfare.

For the precedent of the Son Tay raid is that we can achieve the release and safety of our POW's by launching daring military operations—that we can somehow achieve humanitarian ends through military means. Yet the whole history of our involvement in Vietnam exposes the bankruptcy of that approach, for it is strewn with false optimism about daring and courageous military operations. Is it not time for us to set our policy toward the safety of our prisoners of war—and toward the war itself—on a path of negotiation rather than brave military maneuvers?

To those who say that "negotiations" have failed, I question whether they have ever really been tried. To those who, in their frustration, say "we must do something, anything to show concern for our men," I can only say that to show it through such daring ventures as the Son Tay raid, makes their ultimate fate all the more uncertain.

Mr. President, I feel I must repeat what I said in this Chamber several months ago: that the increasing politicization of the prisoners of war issue is only leading us to further frustration. It is time for us to remove the political pressure and military operations from this issue. Let us give credibility to our legitimate humanitarian concerns by foregoing the shouting and denunciations, and begin the quiet, private international initiatives necessary to accomplish the objectives we seek.

To further emphasize this point, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my earlier statement, as well as other relevant background information, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 25, 1970]

THE SON TAY MISSION

It was a daring mission, all right, and not enough can be said in appreciation of the courage and the competence of the band of volunteers who plunged into the camp at Son Tay in a futile effort to free an undetermined number of American prisoners of war. There can never be enough said, either, about the agony of the POW's and their relatives, for they live in a cruel limbo which touches

the sensitivities of decent and responsible people everywhere. The problem rightly torments the Nixon administration, as it tormented the Johnson administration, so that the impulse to try to do something to relieve this agony is understandable. Contrary to a statement by Secretary Laird, the raid at Son Tay may not even be the first attempt that failed. It is, however, the first attempt to turn a failure into an attribute, to argue that such a fiasco somehow demonstrates at last that the country cares about its prisoners, and to suggest that there is something unique about this administration's concern.

"Back in March of 1969, shortly after I became secretary of defense, this administration initiated a program of going public on the prisoner of war matter," Secretary Laird said in his Monday press conference and yesterday he argued before Congress that the Son Tay mission "shows that the people in this country do care about the prisoners of war . . ."

Well, there are several things to be said about this, and the first is, of course, that the Nixon administration, has nothing—and perhaps somewhat less than nothing—to show for its display of concern. "If there had been prisoners in the compound at Son Tay they would be free men today," Mr. Laird declares, but there were not even any prisoners in the compound on Nov. 20, by the administration's own acknowledgement, when the President gave his go-ahead for the raid. That being the quality of the intelligence upon which the President was acting, it is difficult to accept with any confidence the estimates of the administration about any other aspects of the operation. It was, by everyone's agreement, a high risk affair, to the credit of those who carried it out. But you have to ask yourself what sort of concern we are showing for our prisoners when we sweep them up in so chancy a mission, what sort of cure for dying in a prison camp you are offering, when you propose to involve enfeebled POW's in a shootout at close quarters and to pack them into helicopters and fly them out across enemy-occupied territory in the dark of night.

You have to wonder, then, not just what was gained by failure, in terms of a show of concern, but what would have been gained if the prisoners had been there and had been successfully freed. Any man freed, it can be argued, is a plus. But a military operation must be measured in terms of risk and while we do not know how many might have been freed at the most, because the administration won't answer that question, we do know that the lot of the great majority that would still be in captivity would hardly be improved. And now of course, we must confront the almost certain prospect that the lot of all our POW's is going, if anything, to deteriorate; some are sick and all are doubtless weak and underfed; six, we are told, have died in recent weeks. The chances of reprisals aside, they will surely be moved around more frequently, subjected to stricter security, perhaps treated even more harshly than they have been.

So the administration can make such arguments as it wishes about the odds, and the risks, and the rightness of the chances taken. They will be judged, as they have judged others, on results. And the result of the Son Tay affair does nothing for the prospects of liberating our captured men. It precludes, one would suppose, further rescue attempts. It can hardly enhance the prospects of a negotiated release, for what this says to Hanoi, less than two months after the President's much-touted offer to bargain for an exchange of prisoners, is that we have lost all faith in bargaining.

So what are we to make of it? It is easy to condemn the failure of a risky mission, or even to ask whether success would have justified the risk. For our part, it would not have. But in fairness, it seems to us quite conceivable that the prisoners and their wives, in their dreadful desperation, might

well see it otherwise. There is some evidence of this, not only in the support of the attempt which has been voiced already by some prisoners' wives, but in the state of mind of the prisoners as it has been described to government officials by the handful who have been released. It is not easy to put yourself in the place of men of action now cruelly confined to an open-ended imprisonment and to know how they would weigh a risk which other men might find unacceptable.

In any case, the mission failed. And so we are back at square one, or worse, and there is no convincing way for the President or Secretary of Defense to justify their judgment or rationalize the results. By "going public on the prisoner of war matter" they have dramatized a terrible dilemma—and left it more than ever unresolved.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 3, 1970]

"NET PLUS" OF POW RAID YET TO BE DISCERNED

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

As a public relations exercise—and this essentially is what it was—the recent commando raid on a North Vietnamese prisoner-of-war camp hardly adds up to the "net plus" that the administration claims for it.

Everything that has emerged since the raid confirms the impression that its purpose was primarily psychological. But the psychological results were not deeply explored ahead of time. And the piecemeal fashion in which the administration has disclosed details of the operation has increased doubts about the motivation of the planners.

In any event, it is hard to swallow the assertion that the fate of the 378 American flyers believed to be held in North Vietnam was the chief consideration. Only a few of them, at best, could have been expected to be rescued in the raid on Son Tay. For the rest, the psychological benefits would have been doubtful, to say the least.

What is evident is that the administration some time ago lost faith in the idea that the prisoners could be freed through diplomatic negotiation. And it also was concluded that, as a matter of policy, it wouldn't do to "stand idly by" and make no show or trying to rescue the men.

The gesture, rather than the result, apparently was of top importance. Last summer, a camp was selected for the rescue attempt. According to many witnesses, the determining factor in the selection was the accessibility of this particular site to a helicopter assault. Above all, the planners were confident of their ability to get into the compound at Son Tay and get out again without disastrous casualties.

This apparently was considered more important than the rescue of any prisoners. From the evidence, some of the top planners of the expedition had doubts that the camp was occupied at the time of the raid, and apparently no very serious effort was made to find out whether it was or not.

In other words, the decision was made that, with or without prisoners, the operation would be a "net plus." And it goes without saying that, in assaulting an abandoned compound, the risk to the rescue party was substantially reduced.

To say this is not to detract in any way from the bravery of the men who took part in the raid or that splendid precision with which it was planned and executed. To volunteer for any night-time operation deep in enemy territory takes courage and dedication of very high quality. The question here is what results could realistically have been expected from an inevitably hazardous venture.

What, in fact, have they turned out to be?

Perhaps for the families of the captured men there was momentary hope. But this surely was balanced by the risks involved

and the thought that this kind of rescue operation could not easily be repeated.

Perhaps it served to convince the prisoners that they have not been abandoned and that their government "still cares" about their fate. But this undoubtedly genuine concern has not increased their chance of freedom and may, on the contrary, have compromised it.

Perhaps it was upsetting to the North Vietnamese to discover the vulnerability of their defenses and to learn just how far we would go to free our men. But the discovery is not likely to make the authorities in Hanoi more tractable in negotiations for release of the prisoners. And it is certain to provoke the most strenuous efforts to prevent a repetition of the Son Tay episode.

In short, if there is a plus to the exercise, it is yet to come.

It might, as suggested earlier in this space, take the form of a sober realization that the great majority of the American prisoners cannot be rescued by spectacular and "unusual" methods. And, given the unlikelihood of any negotiated settlement of the war, the diplomatic efforts being made in Paris and elsewhere hold very little promise of success.

The best way—perhaps the only way of freeing the prisoners, it would seem, is to stop any further disengagement of American forces from Vietnam until an agreement on the men is reached with the North Vietnamese. They could not be expected to release them all at the same time, but gradually and in proportion to the rate of withdrawal.

The North Vietnamese themselves have suggested that such a deal could be made. And if they are as concerned over the fate of the prisoners as they say they are, the leaders of the administration would do well to explore this possibility.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 29, 1970]
POW PUBLICITY A CALCULATED CAMPAIGN

(By Haynes Johnson)

He didn't look like "the U.S. pirate, one of McNamara's strongmen," that August night of 1964 as he was paraded through the streets of Hon Gai, a coastal city 80 miles east of Hanoi. As Radio Hanoi described the scene, Everett Alvarez, a slight, dark-haired Californian, was "pale, weary and awe-stricken" while he staggered along in his dirty uniform surrounded by a Vietnamese People's Army escort. He was the first American prisoner of war taken by North Vietnam.

Alvarez was there in North Vietnam when American combat troops first moved out into the elephant grass on search-and-destroy missions in 1965; there when Ho Chi Minh threatened war crimes trials after intensive bombings of the north in '68; there when American officials began new peace initiatives through secret diplomatic channels throughout '67; there when the war issue led to the overthrow of a powerful President in '68; there when Richard Nixon became President in '69.

And now, 6½ years later, Alvarez is still there. He is both the symbol of a personal ordeal shared by all American prisoners of war and the center of a new political debate about the Vietnam war.

There was a time when American officials didn't say much in public about the 1,500 servicemen listed as missing in action or known to be held captive in Southeast Asia. Prisoners were a matter for private—and delicate—negotiations. All that changed after Mr. Nixon became President.

As Melvin Laird said last week, in speaking about the dramatic but futile attempt to rescue American POWs from a compound near Hanoi, "back in March of 1969, shortly after I became Secretary of Defense, the administration initiated a program of going public on the prisoner of war matter."

"Going public," as administration officials explain it, represents a humanitarian effort

to attempt to force the North Vietnamese, through the pressure of public opinion, to give the prisoners better treatment and eventually to release them. But it also means that the prisoners have become a major political issue, one of the key sticking points on any final resolution of the Vietnam conflict.

The administration has stated clearly that it "will not draw its troop strength down below an effective size as long as those prisoners are still in Vietnam"; the North Vietnamese have countered that the prisoners will never be released until the United States ceases "its war of aggression and withdraws its troops from Vietnam."

Such conflicting views have figured prominently at the Paris negotiations since Mr. Nixon became President. In a sense, the prisoners are thus pawns in a propaganda struggle.

It isn't an accident, for instance, that since the Nixon administration decided to take its POW case before American and world opinion, a number of interrelated moves have occurred. Wives and relatives of the prisoners have organized and lobbied. They have traveled in delegations around the world, talked to congressmen and senators, to the Pope and to the Paris peace talk delegates from Hanoi.

They have sought—successfully—to publicize their cause through the news media. They have mounted an intensive public relations campaign and are trying to raise \$100,000 with the help of a professional fundraiser.

Plans call for Americans to be saturated with radio and television public service commercials during the Christmas season reminding them not to forget their imprisoned fellow countrymen. One public relations man associated with the undertaking says: "I'd like to see an appeal that creates a sense of outrage on the part of Americans across the country."

REACTION FROM HANOI

Some 600,000 letters are being mailed to potential contributors. They bear the signature of Jimmy Stewart, the actor, and begin with the question, "Mommy, will Daddy be home for Christmas this year?" The appeal contains the paragraph:

"For example, last year when Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird brought the plight of our POWs before the public, the outraged reaction of our countrymen had a dramatic effect on Hanoi's previously unrelenting stand. Up to last fall, a mere 600 letters had been received from all our POWs during the last five years. Since then, however, 1,500 letters have been received. And there are other examples I could give to show that Hanoi is sensitive to public opinion."

Bumper stickers and slogans have been printed ("Have a Heart, Hanoi"). All the trappings of a familiar American mass media campaign are under way. The contributor who gives \$10 or more will receive a "POW Action Pak" detailing other ways to help the cause.

Other reminders of the POW issue are appearing daily. Just two days before Thanksgiving, 135 million POW/MIA (for missing in action) stamps went on sale at post offices throughout the country. Full-page newspaper ads bearing a picture of a forlorn prisoner have appeared in newspapers and magazines along with an appeal for citizens to write Hanoi urging release of the POWs.

Civic, fraternal and veterans' organizations have begun their own efforts. The Disabled American Veterans, for example, is planning to send messages to 50 million American homes telling people where they can write on behalf of the prisoners.

An "Operation 100 Tons" has been launched. It calls for the delivery of 100 tons of mail (with the help of the Teamsters and Longshoremen) to Paris during Christmas week.

"SHAMING" NORTH VIETNAM

All of this bears the blessings of the Nixon administration. It is all a part of the concerted effort to make the POWs such a formidable issue that North Vietnam will be able to ignore it only at the risk of alienating American and world opinion.

It is a way, as one U.S. official expressed it, to "shame" the North Vietnamese into releasing the prisoners after all other means have failed. In that way, he said, it "puts the monkey on Hanoi's back."

The administration has helped in other ways. It was encouraged congressmen and senators to join in public statements on behalf of the POWs; it has counseled and advised the families, sent top officials around the country to meet them and provided transportation for them; it has cut red tape and gained favorable tax rulings on behalf of the POWs. American servicemen had been limited to investing a maximum of \$10,000, drawing 10 percent interest, in foreign banks; that ceiling has been lifted for POWs.

A blue-ribbon and bipartisan group of eminent Americans—among them Clark Clifford, Averell Harriman and George Meany—serves voluntarily as advisers to the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, the nonprofit, tax-exempt, charitable organization formed to spearhead the public campaign.

Whatever the political considerations or the tactics employed, the main focus remains on the prisoners. The ordeal of the men in prison and the anguish of their families at home hardly needs to be stated.

Since North Vietnam consistently has not adhered to the Geneva convention, to which it is a subscriber, there has been no certain way to know the fate of any of the Americans; no way to know whether they are alive or dead, sick or wounded or even whether they are in prison at all. The North Vietnamese have taken the position that the men held are not prisoners of war but criminals or "air pirates" subject only to the laws of North Vietnam.

Treatment has been grim, if not always brutal. Prisoners are tied, beaten and dragged along the ground after they are captured. Some are known to have been tortured. The United States says it has documented evidence that 19 American prisoners were murdered or allowed to die.

Life in the prison compounds consists in many cases of total isolation, with no exercise except an occasional chance to sweep leaves. Two meals a day are served, one of rice and squash soup, and in the evening some pig fat.

In an attempt to stave off mental and emotional deterioration while sitting in their 10x11-foot rooms, surrounded by brick walls and covered by a tin roof, some of the Americans have resorted to mental gymnastics. One prisoner spent his time mentally constructing a logarithm table. Another saved bits of toilet paper and made himself a deck of cards. He played solitaire until he was discovered. The cards were destroyed.

As everyone knows, brutality is no stranger to the war in Southeast Asia, nor is it restricted to any side. The South Vietnamese have had their Con Son prisons with their tiger cages; the Americans have had their My Lai. In the past, it was considered unwise for an American administration to raise the POW question publicly, and particularly to make accusations about the treatment of Americans. An incident in September, 1969, gives an inkling of some of the reasons for the public switch as well as fresh insight into the official thinking that dictated it.

Three Americans had been released by the North Vietnamese a month before, making a total of only nine prisoners freed during the entire war. The other groups had refrained from speaking out in public about what they had endured. But in September, 1969, the

Pentagon produced the latest POWs for a widely publicized conference.

One of the prisoners, Navy Lt. Robert F. Frishman, told in detail of atrocities committed by his captors. His fingernails had been pulled out, he said, some men had been hung from ceilings and medical treatment was minimal or nonexistent.

Charles W. Havens III, then a key Pentagon official working on behalf of the prisoner problem and now counsel for the families' organization, says the Pentagon was aware of the risks in speaking out publicly at that conference, but believed it might help.

"We knew what they were doing, and they knew we knew it," Havens said. "But if we didn't say anything publicly, they might believe that we accepted that kind of treatment, and they'd keep on doing it. If we said nothing, they might interpret that as meaning we don't care. We do care. And we want them to know that we aren't going to sit back passively and tolerate that kind of treatment. We also had history in mind."

By that, Havens meant the experience of American POWs in the Korean War. Treatment of Americans improved after extensive publicity about inhumane conditions. The specter of Korea, with trials, germ warfare confessions and "brainwashed" Americans, has permeated official thinking about Vietnam POWs. Three years ago, a chill went through Washington when the North Vietnamese produced American prisoners in striped uniforms and showed how they bowed servilely before their captors, impassive looks on their faces.

By the end of the Johnson administration, when the search for peace was at its most intensive—and most hopeful—some officials believe that the North Vietnamese might have been willing to release the Americans as a goodwill gesture in return for a final negotiated settlement. That hope faded in the wrangling at Paris about such things as the shape of the bargaining table.

After Mr. Nixon became President, the POW issue was at a standstill, pessimism was growing about the entire Vietnam question and there had been no more prisoners released, no more flow of mail or information. As one senior American official summed up the situation, "By the spring of '69, the subject was fully valid and ripe for public exposure." He added: "The issue was ready for presentation."

Aside from the humanitarian aspects and a belief that everything else to help the prisoners had been tried and had failed, there was another obvious aspect to the administration decision: domestic considerations. Using the prisoners as a public issue shifted the burden to Hanoi; it also made it more difficult inside the United States to criticize what America was doing to wind down the war and bring the soldiers—especially the prisoners—home.

A POWERFUL SPOTLIGHT

In the midst of the campaign, news of the POW compound raid broke last week. Whatever else the raid did, it made the prisoners a matter of public discussion as never before. Many of the wives and relatives expressed jubilation, even though the effort had failed. Their general theme was that at least something had been tried, and something is better than nothing.

There was, though, at least one dissenter among the group. In Santa Clara, Calif., Mrs. Everett Alvarez Sr. said she was in the midst of getting a Christmas package ready for her son, who now has been a prisoner of war longer than any other American in our history. Her son will be 33 two days before Christmas, she said in a telephone interview, and she was afraid that the raid might affect the mail the prisoners are receiving and possibly lead to reprisals.

Of the raid itself, Mrs. Alvarez said simply: "I think some other type of negotiations would be better."

That's a personal view about the prisoners. A political one is even harder to gauge. One American who has been intimately involved with the POW question put it this way last week:

"We're in a box that has all four sides and a top and a bottom." Then, speaking about the raid and its meaning, he added: "You take that risk and pay that price consciously, but still the only justification is success, and when we got there, the cupboard was bare."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1970]

PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a great deal has been said and done in recent years regarding the young Americans being held as prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong. Our own Government and others, private groups and individuals, Members of Congress, and the relatives of the prisoners themselves, have gone to extraordinary lengths and pursued every channel in the hope of at least finding out the names of the prisoners held.

My personal efforts in this regard go back to the fall of 1965, and have continued until the present time. In addition to a number of visits to the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva, and conversations with representatives of various governments and the United Nations, on three separate occasions, I have addressed letters to the President of North Vietnam. My primary concern was merely information on the identity and condition of the prisoners, and arrangements for the free flow of mail between these men and their families in the United States. The first letter, sent in 1966, was never answered. The second letter, sent in 1967, was acknowledged through an aide to the President of North Vietnam. The third letter, sent last year, was answered by President Ho Chi Minh's successor, Ton Duc Thang.

The negative response to my personal efforts are a matter of record—so I share the deep frustration of all Americans, on the lack of any meaningful progress relating to the prisoners of war issue.

Our duty to these men, of course, and to their families, is basically humanitarian. And I strongly feel, that if we are to successfully obtain humane and fair treatment for them, we must stop tying their rights to unrelated political controversies, both foreign and domestic. We must stop exploiting their helpless plight to beat the war drums in Southeast Asia. We must stop using them as pawns in the Paris talks, thereby evading the real issues involved in reaching a political settlement—a negotiated settlement—that will end the violence and war in Indochina.

It is this increasing politicization of the prisoners of war issue that concerns me today. And so I say, as I have said in this Chamber before, let us remove the political pressures from the prisoner issue. Let us give credibility to our legitimate humanitarian concerns. Let us stop the shouting and denunciations, and begin the quiet, private international initiatives necessary, I feel, to accomplish the objectives all of us seek.

A few months ago—in February—the American National Red Cross began such an effort. Chairman E. Roland Harriman wrote letters appealing for the help of Red Cross societies throughout the world. On April 9 I reported to Senators some progress on responses to his letters. Today I can report additional progress, but I also want to urge those National Red Cross societies that have not responded positively to do so now.

It is my understanding that at least 45 of the societies have communicated with Mr. Harriman. At least 30 of these have responded positively. Only three societies have been negative so far—those in the Soviet Union, Mainland China, and East Germany.

I would certainly hope and urge that other societies—the Red Cross being perhaps the most universal of humanitarian agencies—would respond positively to the pleas for help from their counterpart in their country, and in turn work together to generate some program on an issue of vital concern to the American people and humanitarians throughout the world.

It is my hope that other American voluntary organizations, with essentially humanitarian concerns, will support and join this effort of the Red Cross. I appeal to these other organizations—in the religious community and elsewhere—to encourage their counterparts and related agencies overseas, to raise the prisoners of war issue in other countries.

The fact remains, Mr. President, that there are a number of international agencies which have shown themselves to be interested in humanitarian efforts and concerns involving disadvantaged peoples—in Nigeria and elsewhere. Some are concerned with such things as the past massacres in Indonesia or political prisoners in Brazil, for example. I do not feel that these organizations have been sufficiently activated to this issue of prisoners of war, and I would certainly be hopeful that all the information that we have, that is available to the Government, could be presented to these groups, religious groups and others, and that we could actively explore the use of their good offices in trying to reach a solution to this very compelling humanitarian issue of the American prisoners in North Vietnam.

Perhaps such an internationalization of the prisoners of war issue, within the humanitarian context of these private organizations, will persuade Hanoi that even modest steps to ease the anguish felt in the hearts of so many Americans would be gratefully welcomed by people throughout the world as a measure of respect for the dignity of man and a meaningful contribution toward peace.

Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished floor leader, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and a number of others for their statements this afternoon. I think they have reflected, as shown by their past efforts, a very true, deep, and passionate concern for the welfare and the well-being of these prisoners.

I think all of us feel the sense of frustration from the fact that even efforts made by well-intentioned people have failed to bring about the kind of solution to this problem which all of us in this body would like to see achieved.

The prisoner of war issue, in its real humanitarian aspects, has to be brought home even further throughout the world community. I think we have to be unrelenting in our efforts to achieve the aims which all of us would like to achieve. I think we can see that in the very recent months, there have been some very slight rays of light occasioned by the exchange of some mail and packages. Certainly this is not the whole story, but there have been certain kinds of indications which are a good deal more hopeful than we ever expected in the past.

So I would hope that if we can get international humanitarian agencies to make the necessary effort, we will have at least provided some additional and meaningful channels to meet what I know concerns every Member of this body.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

NATIONAL B'NAI B'RITH HUMANITARIAN AWARD TO JOSEPH L. HUDSON, JR.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, it was a personal pleasure last evening to have been present at the National B'nai B'rith

Humanitarian Award Dinner held in Detroit.

The award "for distinguished and enduring contributions of a humanitarian nature" was presented to Joseph L. Hudson, Jr., of Detroit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the dinner program concerning the life and service of Mr. Hudson be printed in the RECORD, and that the text of an address delivered by Mr. Hudson be printed thereafter in the RECORD.

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

JOSEPH L. HUDSON, JR.

Joseph L. Hudson Jr., is President of the J. L. Hudson Company, whose vision and leadership have brought even greater distinction to the heritage of a famous merchandising dynasty. Through his participation in the civic, cultural, social and industrial life of our nation, his keen sense of community responsibility for serving the needs of young people everywhere, exemplify the best in American tradition.

Growing out of a remarkable understanding of people and an ability to work with and inspire people, Mr. Hudson has a transcending sense of responsibility for the common good and for the individual's right to freedom and opportunity. The spiritual, moral and ethical values which have been foundations of American life are deeply rooted in his own life and philosophy.

The breadth of his activities testifies to his community wide perspective. His zeal and energies are manifest in a host of civic, welfare and social action causes. He demonstrates the committed citizen helping to get a community's work done.

Mr. Hudson is a Director of the National Bank of Detroit, Detroit Edison Company, past Chairman of The New Detroit Committee, Chairman Metropolitan Fund, Inc., Director Citizens Research Council, Associated Merchandising Corporation, National Retail Merchants Association, Michigan Retailers Association, Retail Merchants Association, Director and Vice President of United Foundation, Trustee and Vice Chairman of Harper Hospital and Trustee of Grosse Pointe University School, Founders Society Detroit Institute of Arts.

Mr. Hudson was named winner of the 1960 Detroit Junior Board of Commerce "Distinguished Service Award" as Outstanding Young Man of the Year. In 1968 he received the Laymen's Special Civic Leadership Award presented by the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches. He is a member and elder of Grosse Pointe Memorial Church. He is a graduate of Yale University and served in the U.S. Army from 1954 to 1956.

Behind this obviously impressive list of credentials, is an active sportsman, often taking in skiing with his wife, Jean, and children Joseph L. Hudson IV, Jeannie, Webber and Louise. He is a fisherman, enjoys hunting, or simply watching the pros play football, baseball and hockey. He is a man admired for his candor, easy wit and inquiring mind.

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr., by virtue of his extraordinary service to the community and his many achievements, well merits his selection as the recipient of the National B'nai B'rith Humanitarian Award.

HAVE FAITH IN THE YOUTH OF AMERICA

(By Joseph L. Hudson, Jr.)

I'm greatly appreciative of the honor you've given me. I accept it with some reluctance. Not reluctance regarding the tribute itself, nor the goals and work of B'nai B'rith. But

because none of us can point to enough results from our efforts when measured against the needs of our times. So little seems to be going right with society despite all our concern and effort. All of us in this room, in these elegant surroundings, with this fine food and good company, are aware that the world outside is in trouble. Most of us know, too, that we can't much longer separate ourselves from it by closed doors and closed minds.

Detroit today is certainly a city on the move. One need only quickly note New Detroit, Detroit Renaissance 1970s, our housing efforts through MDCDA, and the emergence of new inner city small business developments through the Economic Development Corporation. To support these activities the men and women in this room tonight are working like never before on the important issues of our society.

Despite our frenzied activity, we are still falling short. I classify our situation as a leadership crisis.

Most all of us agree as to the priority problems of our society. We're all attending more meetings than ever before and doing our homework, but still our local and national housing, education and community health and welfare services are underdeveloped and inadequate to meet the needs of today's population.

Our public bodies—our congress, our state legislature, our city councils, yes, even the Presidency of the United States—are not moving us ahead in these areas, and the reason is primarily inadequate leadership from us as citizens at large.

Our recent reading lists, those books currently piled on your bedside table such as "Future Shock" and "The Greening of America," show us some of the complexity and confusion of the challenges before us. We're filled with doubts and uncertainties. We're upset about law and order, but how about justice and progress?

The mood of the majority of the American people is obviously not one of commitment to expand our social programs, or to further share our good fortune. But it is leadership's responsibility and obligation—yours and mine—to point out that our housing, education and social programs are so inadequate today that they dampen enthusiasm for our capitalist system on the part of our younger generations, and therefore jeopardize our system's future.

Can we criticize the youth of America today for finding fault with our system when all about us we find such imperfect examples of the American dream?

There are, however, a few organizations who have been and are willing and able to take battle with these forces of destruction and through a truly dedicated effort strive to preserve and perpetuate those spiritual and moral elements of our society which have given our lives strength and meaning in the past. B'nai B'rith stands out singularly as a model of this type of dedicated and effective organization.

It may be a little trite to say that our future depends on our youth, because this has always been so. To paraphrase the slogan of our United Foundation—"Our youth are all we've got."

So, I think it very proper that we are here tonight not in honor one man, that just gives a reason for the gathering, but more importantly, to honor and support the B'nai B'rith organizations which have done and are doing so much to give youth a sense of direction and dedication and to preserve the rich traditions of the Jewish people. This is a monumental effort in frustrating times. But that they can listen effectively and give support to the desires of young people when too many are turning a deaf ear, makes B'nai B'rith an inspiration for more of us to listen

with an open mind to the problems of our fellow men.

We all must accept the challenge of the future, but in doing so we must take account of why we have the problems that we have today.

With our desire to build things bigger, better and faster and with the explosion in technical knowledge, we have grown further apart as individuals. As the demands on our personal time to even keep up, let alone stay ahead, are ever increasing, we've lost sight of, or perhaps just ignored, the consequences of our actions on our environment and on our fellow men. Most importantly, we have ignored the ultimate effect of all this on our youth.

Our young people are better informed and better educated than at anytime in our nation's history. With an increasing awareness of what is going on around them it is only natural that they question some of our values. Why has affluent society permitted the development of the ghettos in our larger cities? Why has it so cruelly ignored and so long assigned a second-class citizen's rank to the minority groups within our country, especially the black population? Why has it permitted the pollution of our air, our water and our land? These are tough questions to answer. But, if we don't even attempt an answer, then, are we not asking that all our values, even the ones we assume are sound, be questioned also?

I'm convinced that our youth intend to, and will, be heard. I am equally convinced that youth will listen to age—if age will only listen to youth in reasoned, compassionate and searching fashion. The old attitude so firmly entrenched in the minds of parents, of executives, of managers, or of any leadership group, that says, "I know what's best for you" just simply will not work now.

Our youth, whether black or white, Jew or Christian, want a voice in determining their future. If we shut them out, they will seek organizations that provide this opportunity.

It's not a sign of weakness to listen with an open mind. It's not a sign of weakness to change when conditions demand a different course of action. Our young people face a broader range of challenges and demands than any before in history, not the least of which is how to deal with us. Hopefully, we can be a part of the solution or we will surely become a part of the problem. This one is too important for us to sit out. Today's young people believe in themselves and their ability to make their world better. We've got to believe in them, too. Let's have faith in the youth of America.

THE RIGHT OF ASYLUM

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago today our Government very crudely denied the right of asylum to Soviet Seaman Simas Kudirka. It was a shameful and humiliating and sickening incident—an incident which rightfully registered shock and dismay among all Americans, and among people throughout the world who look to our country for comfort and hope.

This morning the White House issued documents relating to the incident. Initial reading of the documents and other commentary from the executive branch seems to confirm that the denial of asylum to Mr. Kudirka resulted from official lethargy and the unfortunate lack of sensitivity to humanitarian questions within our bureaucracy—all of which is surely against our best traditions and capabilities and interests.

As chairman of the Judiciary Sub-

committee on Refugees, I am sure I express the feeling of all Members of the Senate and of our fellow citizens and organizations in the private sector—including hundreds of thousands of former refugees, Lithuanian and other nationality groups, the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, the U.S. Committee for Refugees, and other organizations—in expressing the firm hope that this country will not again compromise its long history of granting asylum to those who so desperately seek refuge on our shores.

FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there is some misunderstanding and many valid questions are currently circulating about the family assistance plan which President Nixon proposed to Congress in August of last year. Recently, however, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Elliott Richardson presented a highly informative and timely discussion of the family assistance program before a meeting of Common Cause. Secretary Richardson was specifically responding to several points raised in a letter from the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF). I feel that the Secretary's statement might be of interest to many Senators who have followed the progress of the family assistance plan through the 91st Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Richardson's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, ELLIOTT L. RICHARDSON, TO A MEETING ON WELFARE REFORM, CONVENED BY COMMON CAUSE, DECEMBER 3, 1970

I greatly appreciate your attendance this morning because, with your help, the fight for meaningful welfare reform this year can be won. Never since the Social Security legislation was first enacted have so many people been able to agree on both the need for reform and the principles of change.

There has been so much dispute in recent weeks over possible amendments to the President's proposed Family Assistance Plan that the wide areas of consensus have often been obscured. Let me review for a moment what I think we do agree on and what this bill will accomplish.

First, the bill would establish a nationwide floor under assistance payments, and national eligibility standards for both the family and adult categories. This change alone involves a massive reform by eliminating the geographic inequities present under current law. Ten percent of present AFDC recipients and 36 percent of the aged, blind and disabled caseload would immediately receive higher benefits as a result of these changes.

Second, the bill provides for strong movement in the direction of Federal administration of all income assistance programs. The new working poor program would be Federally administered in every State and attractive options are created for the States to delegate to the Federal Government administration of the full range of associated programs, including State supplementation, food stamps, general assistance, and Medicaid eligibility determination.

Third, we would for the first time extend

assistance to the working poor—a group comprising over 40% of the poor which is now ineligible for Federally-supported welfare. This is the heart of the reform and combines an important work incentive with effective action against poverty.

Fourth, the plan would greatly expand quality child care and manpower training programs, with over \$600 million in new funds committed in the first full year of operation.

Fifth, Family Assistance improves the work incentive and work requirements provisions of current law. The several work disincentive notches now found in AFDC are eliminated, and mothers with preschool children are given the option to remain with their children—which is not the case under current law.

These are reforms that should not be permitted to die. We have calculated that almost 14.5 million people will be eligible for benefits that will make them better off than under current law. Anyone who contends that this bill is somehow worse than current law, or should be defeated if it is not further liberalized, must answer to these 14.5 million people.

This is not to say, of course, that there are no legitimate ways to improve the bill still further. Indeed, I believe that the bill has been much improved in the 13 months since it was introduced. The Administration has been discussing with a number of Senators a range of possible additions to the so-called "core bill" or October revision of Family Assistance for the purpose of attaching it by floor amendment to the Social Security Act.

In particular, you are probably familiar with the list of 10 possible amendments which Senator Ribicoff has suggested as a result of his conversations with a number of Senators. We have given most careful attention to these ideas in an honest effort to develop and acceptable compromise. It is in that spirit that I can now present the Administration's response to those proposals:

1. We accept the idea that the bill should state a national goal providing to every family, through work or assistance, an income adequate for their needs. This is a laudable goal which fully befits a Nation of our capacity.

2. We agree that the language of the President's original proposal, passed by the House of Representatives, should be restored providing for mandatory coverage of families headed by an unemployed father (AFDC-UF).

3. We agree that the effect of section 452 of the House-passed bill, maintaining current benefit levels for families with income, should be restored. (The October revision of Family Assistance had provided for a more limited provision "grandfathering in" persons now receiving payments at these higher levels for a period of two years.)

4. We cannot fully accept the proposal that no one be referred to a job under the work requirement that pays less than the Federal minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour. There are now, after all, about 7 million persons who are working for less than this wage, and to state that no welfare recipient had to take such a job would be most inequitable to these low wage workers. Nevertheless, there could be cases where referral to jobs paying substantially less than the minimum wage would be unconscionable. Therefore, we would propose instead an amendment which would provide that no person could be required to take a job paying less than \$1.20 per hour, which is 75% of the minimum wage. In any case, anyone working for between \$1.20 and \$1.60 per hour would be eligible for income supplementation under Family Assistance which would raise his total income from wages plus assistance to a level comparable to the Federal minimum wage.

5. We agree that public service jobs should be provided for welfare recipients, and will support an earmarking of \$150 million in Labor Department funds for this purpose. The Federal matching formula for these jobs should be consistent with whatever formula emerges from the Senate-House Conference Committee now considering the Comprehensive Manpower Act (the matching rate currently in that bill is 80%).

6. We agree that programs that are fully financed by the Federal Government should be administered by the Federal Government. This would apply to family assistance benefits for female-headed families in those States which have no State supplementation.

7. We agree that adequate protection should be provided to local and State welfare employees transferred to the Federal system as a result of the bill. We have been working with employee groups and the Civil Service Commission for some weeks to develop such a provision as an amendment to the bill.

8. Family Assistance makes a major change in current law regarding the impact of the work requirement on female heads of families. Under AFDC, women with preschool children may be required to take a job; under Family Assistance, that mandatory feature is applied in the case of mothers only to those with school age children. Moreover, priorities have been added to the bill governing the order of referral of persons to training and jobs which indicate that all male heads of families and all women who volunteer for employment are to be taken before the nonvolunteering mothers are reached. We feel, therefore, that the work requirement is humane and responsible, particularly in view of our latest proposals with regard to the minimum wage. However, there is a lack of clarity on the face of the bill as to whether the arrangement of child care is a precondition to requiring a mother to take a job, and we would accept an amendment clarifying that this precondition must be met.

9. We would accept an amendment which would continue the practice under AFDC in following State court decisions as to whether a step-parent has an obligation to support step-children.

10. Budgetary limitations preclude the Administration from accepting an increase in the basic \$1600 payment for a family of four. An increase equal to the rise in the cost of living between the date of enactment and the 1972 implementation date could cost as much as \$400 million in additional funds. In any case, the Administration's original proposal assumed an effective date of January 1972, so that no cost of living undating is relevant.

In short, we are able to accept 7 of 10 of the Senator's proposals, and to offer counter-proposals on two others. Beyond this I do not think we can go. I recognize that many Senators may wish to go further on some of these items, and we fully recognize their right to offer such proposals through amendments which are separate from this consolidated floor amendment which we can accept.

I know that Senators Ribicoff and Bennett are working earnestly to prepare a bipartisan amendment attaching Family Assistance to the Social Security bill on the Senate floor. I sincerely hope that these responses by the Administration will provide a basis for that amendment. I believe that these two Senators have been magnificent in their commitment to welfare reform and their continuing effort to seek a balanced bill acceptable to a wide group of Senators. I would also like particularly to note and welcome Senator Hartke's statement yesterday that he will support a coalition effort. I believe that this battle can be won; we cannot afford to lose it.

PERSONS BETTER OFF UNDER H.R. 16311 (OCTOBER VERSION) THAN UNDER CURRENT LAW

Client group	Number of families	Number of recipients	Percent of current cases	Client group	Number of families	Number of recipients	Percent of current cases
Family assistance:				Adult categories:			
(1) Working poor.....	1,861,300	10,840,000		(1) Adult cases in the States ¹ paying less than \$110 monthly per recipient.....	1,109,700		36.3
(2) AFDC cases with benefit increases in the 9 ¹ jurisdictions with the lowest payments.....	211,300	845,000	9.9	(2) New cases made eligible by the minimum payment standard.....	105,400		
(3) State supplemental cases not now eligible for AFDC.....	375,300	1,500,000		(3) New APTD cases made eligible by the national definition of disability.....	64,700		
(4) Current AFDC cases benefitting from simplified payment standard.....	(?)	(?)	(?)	Subtotal, adult categories.....	1,279,800		36.3
Subtotal, family assistance.....	2,447,900	13,185,000	9.9	Total, all programs.....	14,464,800		16.9

¹ Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Puerto Rico.

² Sec. 451 of the bill requires that States simplify need and payment standards in order to reduce the number and complexity of such standards. This simplification is likely to be resolved in such a way that benefits will be computed on the basis of a higher standard than that now used for many

current AFDC cases, but estimates of this impact cannot be made until such time as the Secretary develops definite guidelines for this simplification of standards.

³ For old age assistance recipients, 22 out of 54 jurisdictions now pay less than \$110 monthly to a single recipient, and 47 jurisdictions now pay less than \$220 to an aged couple.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is there any pending business?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read the bill by title, as follows:

A bill (H.R. 19830) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, officers, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

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.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the pending measure, H.R. 19830, replaces H.R. 17548, the first independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for 1971,

which was vetoed by the President on August 11, 1970. The vetoed measure had passed the House on May 12, was received and referred in the Senate on May 13, reported in the Senate on June 24, passed the Senate on July 7, and was sent to conference on July 8. The conference report was agreed to in the House on July 29, and finally agreed to in the Senate on August 4.

The vetoed message from the President, contained in House Document 91-377, indicated that he was opposed to H.R. 17548 because the total amount was excessive. The House vote to override failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds and, thus, it was necessary for the pending replacement measure to come into being.

The vetoed bill contained a total of \$18,009,525,300. The pending measure is \$300 million less than that amount—namely, \$17,709,525,300. This amount is \$241,301,400 above the President's estimate and compares with the vetoed measure which was \$541,301,400 over the budget estimate. The pending bill contains the identical sums and provisions that were included in the vetoed measure in every respect except for two items contained in title III of the bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. These items are the urban renewal programs and the grants for basic water and sewer facilities. Each of these has been reduced by \$150 million below the amounts carried in the vetoed bill.

I might add, Mr. President, while this bill exceeds the President's budget estimate by \$241 million, included in this \$241 million is \$105 million for veterans medical care. Thus, if the additional sum provided for medical care is excluded from the bill, the increase over the budget will aggregate \$136,301,400.

Some of the areas where the reductions below the budget estimate have been made include the budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which has been reduced by \$64,325,000 under the President's budget estimate.

Title II of the bill, which includes items for the Space Council, the Office of Emergency Preparedness, and Civil Defense, has been reduced by \$5,750,000; and interest adjustment payments in title IV for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board have been reduced by \$165 million

from a budget estimate of \$250 million to an allowance in this bill of \$85 million.

Mr. President, I feel that we have met the President more than halfway by reducing the amount provided in the vetoed measure by \$300 million, and I feel that we have a bill the President will be able to sign. While the bill still contains amounts that are above the President's budget estimate, the sums thus made available may help to alleviate some of the unemployment which has been rising steadily all over our country.

Since this is a replacement bill and since it is going through the congressional mill for a second time, and since the House has adopted the measure overwhelmingly by a vote of 375 to 10, I hope that we in the Senate would concur with the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee and adopt this bill without amendment, thereby getting this long delayed appropriation bill to the White House for signature as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I wish to make one point very clear to the Senate. The bill before us is exactly like the bill that was vetoed by the President except in two aspects under title III, urban development. The estimate sent to Congress by the President with reference to grants for water and sewerage in rural areas was \$150 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported out \$200 million. The Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) moved that that amount be increased to \$500 million. We voted with him, and his proposal carried by a very large vote. So the amount was made \$500 million instead of the budget estimate of \$150 million.

The urban renewal budget estimate was \$1 billion. A motion was made to increase that amount, and as I recall, the committee added \$700 million, which was short, even, of the total amount of the authorization, which was \$2,287 million. When we went to conference, we reduced the increase to \$350 million over the budget estimate of \$1 billion.

In this bill, we have added \$10 million to keep alive section 202 of Housing Act which provides housing for the elderly. That has been preserved in the bill.

We have also added, as I have already stated, \$105 million over the budget estimate for veterans' medical care.

In short, this is exactly the bill that was agreed upon in conference. It was voted by the Senate, and the conference

report was approved as to these two items, which total \$300 million.

I have been in conference with Representative MAHON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. This is not a question of rubber-stamping the action of the House. There were informal discussions back and forth as to what reasonable amount we should provide in order to meet with the approval of the President.

I have also talked with Representative EVANS, who is chairman of the House subcommittee, and with the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT). Then the Senate subcommittee, after consideration, presented our proposal to the full committee, the full committee agreed with the compromises that were reached, and that is what is before the Senate this afternoon.

In the course of our discussion today, several attempts will be made on the floor of the Senate to increase, to decrease, or to make some other variances in the bill. I give clear notice at this time that no matter what those amendments are, I do not think we ought to be going over the same ground again. Some proposals will be made that I myself have voted for previously; but under the circumstances, in order to send a bill to the President, we believe we now have a bill that, I think, has a reasonable chance of being approved by him. We certainly do not want to go through the exercise of going to conference again and returning at this late hour, just before Christmas, only to have the President veto the bill again.

More than that—and I want to make this very clear, and I shall say it all afternoon—we have provided in the bill \$105 million over the budget estimate for veterans' medical care as a result of the amendment that was proposed by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). This amount is to take care of paraplegics and the spinal injuries of veterans who have been wounded in Vietnam. We cannot do this unless we get a bill. That is the reason why we should approve a bill that the President will sign. Something needs to be done very quickly for these veterans, so I hope that when motions to lay on the table are made, the Senate will support the Committee on Appropriations by supporting those motions and that we can send the bill to the President.

I think this is a fair bill. It is the same bill we agreed to in conference with the two exceptions I have already enumerated. I would hope that we might move on with our business, get the job done, and send the bill to the President within a day or so.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, chairman of the subcommittee, has stated the case plainly and adequately. I should like to add two or three comments.

It is unfortunate that we find ourselves in two situations at this late hour—and it is late—in legislating in these very important areas. However, I assure the Senate that it was not the fault of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Is-

land, the chairman of the subcommittee, nor was it the fault of the Senator from Colorado that we did not have a bill earlier than we did this year. Compared with past years, we were, relatively in good time. But after the veto and the sustaining of the veto by the House, the situation developed that the House could not seem to get moving again. So we find ourselves in this position at this late date.

The Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out one area—the Veterans' Administration—in which funds are badly needed, because the Veterans' Administration can spend only those funds that are based on the continuing resolution pertaining to last year's appropriation.

By the same token, all the funds for the space administration have been held up.

I say to Senators who are interested in water and sewerage facilities that if they are genuinely interested in such facilities, they will do better to take this bill rather than to let the Department continue to operate in accordance with the continuing resolution, under which spending would be at a lower level, to wit, \$150 million a year.

I also want to be very explicit about my feelings with respect to the action which the chairman of the committee says he will take on any proposed amendment. It is one in which I concur wholeheartedly and in which the entire Committee on Appropriations concurred wholeheartedly. In fact, I believe the committee instructed the Senator from Rhode Island to take such action.

Mr. President, I have every reason to believe that the pending bill as it is now constituted, without any addition or any deduction, will be acceptable to the President and will be signed by him.

I must state the converse of that, that if there are additions or deductions, we will face the possibility of going through this exercise again. Our colleagues in the Senate ought to know that. The matter has been worked over at great length in the House of Representatives. We have studied the matter here. The chairman and I are of one mind on this matter.

I hope that we can proceed and get the bill passed. If it passes in its present form, it will not have to go to conference.

All of these various agencies could get their appropriation and we could avoid any further exacerbation of this situation which we experience each year where the various entities within the executive branch and these areas in which we are so interested, some of us—the field of housing and the field of veterans—will at last, in the 12th month of the calendar year and the sixth month of the fiscal year, know where they are, what they can budget for, and perhaps make some sensible plans for the last 6 months of the fiscal year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I would hope that the pages will inform the cloakroom that they should get in touch with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

\$10 MILLION IN FUNDING FOR SECTION 22

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 19830, the Independent Offices-HUD Appropriations Act for fiscal 1971.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging, I shall direct my remarks to funding for the section 202 housing for the elderly program.

First, however, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) for his outstanding leadership in bringing this well-balanced appropriations measure to the floor for a vote. Moreover, I wish to compliment him for his dedication and active role in providing funding for the continuation of the 202 program. This is another excellent example of his concern for our Nation's 20 million older Americans.

Last July I called for a bipartisan effort to rescue the section 202 program when the administration decided to abandon this approach and rely entirely on the section 236 interest subsidy program. The Senate approved my floor amendment—also sponsored by the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY)—to provide funding to continue the program.

In the conference committee the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) capably expressed the Senate's position, and noted that there was no money provided for section 202 in the original House-passed bill. As a result of his leadership, \$10 million was provided for 202 in the conference proposal. However, this measure was later vetoed.

In the proposal before us today, there is also \$10 million in funding for section 202—the same amount as provided in the second House-passed bill.

At this time when low-cost housing is such a critical problem for practically all Americans, it is usually out of the reach of the elderly who live on limited, fixed incomes.

Today substantial numbers of older people are being driven from their homes because of rapidly rising property taxes and maintenance costs. Yet, these persons are finding it increasingly difficult to locate suitable alternative units because present programs are inadequate for their needs.

Section 202 has literally been a lifesaver for thousands of these individuals.

Under this program, the Federal Government makes long-term, low-interest loans to nonprofit sponsors for the construction of pleasant apartment units at prices tenants can afford.

Section 202 has also been one of the most successful housing programs ever enacted. Since its enactment in 1959, there has never been a default under the program.

Today there are approximately 43,000 units either completed or under construction—33,000 finished units and 10,000 being built. It is estimated that 45,000 aged persons occupy the completed units.

In my own State of New Jersey, I per-

sonally have seen the outstanding achievements under the 202 program. Nearly 2,100 units are now completed or under construction—making New Jersey the sixth-ranking State in the number of section 202 units. Approximately 3,000 older persons live in these pleasant, reasonably priced apartments.

Construction costs for these projects are also very moderate, approximately \$12,000 per unit.

Moreover, 202 has its own architectural criteria, specifically tailored for the aged. Program regulations, for instance, take into account the proximity with regard to transportation, health facilities, and shopping centers.

The need for the 202 program is well documented in hearings held by the Committee on Aging and letters to its members.

At the committee's hearings in June on "Sources of Community Support for Federal Programs Serving the Elderly," we heard much compelling evidence for the continuation of the housing for the elderly program.

Mr. Stanley Axelrod, an executive director for a 202 project in Miami, Fla., told us:

Limited incomes that are in our inflationary society have made adequate housing for senior Americans a catastrophic problem. These people are prevented from getting decent, dignified housing, so they rot away in the hovels and slums without hope, without being found by their community to see what the community could do for them, without their knowing how they can meet these problems.

Obviously, senior housing could bring these people together, to be identified, to be made productive. Section 202 was a crown of achievement for creative Federalism. Red tape, though considerable, was much less than through other programs.

The 202 government agencies have the attitude of family, that they were not there to dictate but to help find answers.

The 202 programs turned out to be highly successful, strongly motivated by nonprofit sponsors. They continue to be highly successful, beating all laws of average. This type of nonprofit sponsorship guarantees more service, less cost for buildings and management, and great dedication.

Last year in the 1969 Housing Act, the Congress enthusiastically supported the extension of the 202 program by authorizing \$150 million for this purpose.

This clear expression of congressional intent to continue the program should, I believe, be fulfilled.

The \$10 million in the committee bill will be an important step forward. In addition, there is money in the 202 revolving fund which can be used to build housing for the aged.

With this approach, we can be more confident that urgently needed housing for the elderly will be built—not merely to store them—but to restore them to a more active life in their communities.

Mr. President, I urge favorable action on the Independent Offices-HUD appropriations proposal.

One of the reasons for appropriating only \$10 million for the 202 program is that there is already some money in the 202 revolving fund. For the record, could the Senator from Rhode Island tell us how much is in the revolving fund.

Mr. PASTORE. According to the most recent data available, it is estimated that there is approximately \$40.7 million in the 202 revolving fund. This money has resulted from the repayment of loans at 3 percent per year by nonprofit sponsors of housing for the aged. It is the view of the committee that the \$10 million appropriated should be considered as a supplement to the \$40.7 million in the section 202 revolving fund in order that the desperate need of the elderly for housing can be met to some extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This leads to my next questions. What are the administration's plans for spending the \$10 million appropriated for section 202 and the money in the revolving fund? Is it the intent of Congress that this money should be spent?

Mr. PASTORE. In an "in-house" memorandum at HUD issued around the first of July, the administration clearly indicated its intent to phase out the 202 program. This memorandum made three key points:

No new section 202 programs would be funded after June 30, 1970.

No section 236 money would be available for new elderly housing proposals submitted after June 30, 1970.

Section 236 would be available only for backlog proposals submitted prior to June 30, 1970.

However, it is the clear intent of the committee that the \$10 million for 202 be spent. Moreover, the committee urges that the money in the revolving fund be spent for additional housing units for the elderly, since there is a critical need.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I understand it, the conference language with regard to housing programs for the elderly in the first HUD appropriations bill was also incorporated in this funding measure. Moreover, I understand that it is the intent of Congress that a portion of the funding for the section 236 interest subsidy program be set aside for housing for the elderly—as well as for younger persons. Is my interpretation correct?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator's interpretation is correct. In the original conference report, the conferees stated:

The committee on conference directs that housing for the elderly or handicapped be given appropriate priority in allocating contract authorization provided pursuant to section 236 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, so an equitable portion will be utilized for such housing where needed in conjunction with the funds appropriated for this revolving fund.

An equitable allocation under 236, it seems to me, would be about 10 percent—since the elderly represent that percentage of our total population.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

BILL ORDERED TO BE HELD AT THE DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the House on H.R. 19436, to provide for the establishment of a national urban growth policy, and so forth, be held at the desk temporarily.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 19830) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Senate is being made to look ridiculous. Some Senators who have amendments cannot be found. I am going to put in a quorum call at this time, and it will either be a live quorum call and these Senators will show up or we will get to third reading.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I would also ask the attaches to call Senators to get to the floor. This is a \$17 billion bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 19830, the independent offices appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 22, line 10, strike "\$511,000,000" and insert "\$521,000,000";

On page 22, line 17, after "teachers," insert the following: "Provided further, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$10,000,000 shall be available for grants and contracts in connection with a program of planning, research, and applied research to facilitate the conversion of scientific, engineering, and technical manpower and resources from defense-related to civilian-related activities."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the appropriation for the National Science Foundation by \$10 mil-

lion. The additional \$10,000,000 will provide NSF with funds to undertake urgently needed planning, research, and development in methods of converting scientific manpower and resources from defense and space activities to civilian-oriented projects. It is imperative that NSF begin such a program immediately if it is to have a meaningful impact on the spiraling unemployment among the Nation's scientists, engineers, and technicians.

The sum requested in the amendment is modest, but the problem is critical, and it is becoming more critical each month. I believe that we must begin now, in the current fiscal year, to alleviate the crisis. The pending appropriations bill offers us a major opportunity to act.

There are many different aspects of our current economic crisis, but one of the serious is the urgent challenge we face to convert our scientific talents and resources from defense to civilian activities.

Today, the problem of severe unemployment in the economy as a whole is being compounded by rising unemployment among many of our best educated and best trained citizens—our scientists, engineers, and technicians. There is deep and growing unrest in the scientific community, and the unrest is becoming increasing ominous.

We are all aware of the cutbacks in defense and space spending which have occurred throughout the country in recent months and which are likely to continue for the foreseeable future. In States like California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Missouri, Washington, and Massachusetts, where the economy is especially oriented toward the defense and space industries, unemployment is soaring among our scientists, engineers, and technicians.

The extensive unemployment resulting from defense and space cutbacks has a severe impact on the scientific community, because of its special dependence on federally financed programs. Of the more than 2 million scientists, engineers, and technicians employed at the beginning of 1970, one in every four was engaged in work generated by the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the Atomic Energy Commission. Half of those employed directly by the Federal Government worked in DOD, NASA, or AEC. Sixty-two percent of all physicists and 88 percent of all scientists in the atmospheric and space sciences, have depended on Federal programs for employment. Inevitably, therefore, cuts in Government programs have had a severe impact on this highly skilled scientific work force.

By last May, there was seven times as much unemployment among the Nation's engineers as there had been the year before. Since that date the rate of unemployment among engineers has been increasing at an even more rapid pace. Employment in the space industry has fallen from a peak of 250,000 to 173,000, and thousands more scientists and engineers are expected to lose their jobs in the months ahead. The aerospace industry alone has laid off over 10,000 men

in the single specialty of electrical engineering.

Recent Labor Department figures indicate that more than 208,000 professional and technical personnel are unemployed across the Nation. It has become clear in recent months that the burden of rising unemployment is falling especially heavily on the the scientific community. Last week, in announcing that unemployment in the Nation had reached a new high of 5.8 percent, Mr. Harold Goldstein, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, emphasized that one of the most significant factors influencing the rise in unemployment in November was the continuously increasing unemployment in defense-related jobs.

Equally significant, the effect of defense and space cutbacks is highly concentrated in particular communities, where the human impact is much greater than the national statistics would indicate:

Of all scientists and engineers in the aerospace industry, 44 percent are located on the Pacific coast, and 24 percent are located in the New England and Middle Atlantic States. The remainder are highly concentrated in such States as Florida and Texas.

In Los Angeles County, as of September, there were more than 20,000 unemployed scientists and engineers.

In the Washington, D.C. metropolitan region, as of last month, the relative demand for scientific and engineering manpower was only 40 percent of what it had been a decade ago.

The work force at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida has dropped 40 percent over the past year.

In New York City, unemployment claims by professional personnel have doubled over what they were a year ago.

For the Nation as a whole, it is estimated that 500,000 defense workers have lost their jobs because of defense and space cutbacks since the peak of the Vietnam war effort in June of 1968. It is also estimated that another 500,000 jobs will be lost by next June. In addition, the job market has received an influx of nearly 400,000 servicemen over the past year, and another 200,000 will leave military service during the coming year.

In my own State of Massachusetts the problem is especially acute. Massachusetts ranks sixth in the Nation in the amount of defense contracts received. The unrivaled combination of universities, Government facilities, and the extensive research and development community centered along Route 128 have made Massachusetts one of the leading centers of the Nation's scientific effort.

Today, as in so many other parts of the country, this vital national resource is being jeopardized. The Arthur D. Little Co. has recently estimated that defense cutbacks will cause the loss of 25,000 jobs in Massachusetts over the next 3 years. Another 5,000 jobs will be lost by civilian employees on military reservations in the State. Similar projections have been made or are now being made in dozens of other States.

These lost jobs represent a serious hardship to the individuals and families involved. The loss has a multiplier effect

on entire neighborhoods and communities, as well as on the scientific community at large.

Even apart from the immense human suffering and personal tragedy that is involved, however, the loss of these jobs also represent a vast loss of technical manpower for the Nation. A sizable national investment has gone into the formal education and on-the-job training of this highly skilled workforce.

We cannot afford to let these valuable resources run to waste. The Nation should and could be receiving a constant stream of economic and social benefit from its investment in this scientific manpower.

Moreover, scientific activity requires a high level of continuity to achieve its maximum return. Resuming interrupted scientific projects after long delays often entails considerable additional expense. And, individual scientists who interrupt their careers—as many are now forced to do in seeking other employment—may find it impossible to reenter the scientific job market, in view of the rapidity with which new scientific knowledge is generated.

Thus, each unemployed scientist represents a major loss of the considerable investment the Nation has made in his education. Even more important is the loss of his potential contribution to the resolution of our urgent domestic social problems, especially in areas like pollution, transportation, housing, education, and medical care. Without the help of the scientific community, we cannot hope to make significant headway against these problems.

The scientists, engineers, and technicians of America have a crucial role to play in converting our national energies and imagination to these tasks. Scientists have always been held in high esteem in America, but it is only in recent years that they have moved to the center of our technological civilization.

As a nation, we must apply our finest resources and talents to the tasks which are facing us. We need the application of our best scientific and technical talent to cope with these problems. It is national folly for tens of thousands of highly trained individuals to lie idle, at a time when problems of enormous complexity demand the skills they have.

The solution to the problem of scientific and technical unemployment is not to stem the cutbacks in defense and space spending. As in the case of the rejection of the SST, these cutbacks are essential to redirect our national priorities and resources to meet the needs of our citizens. Nor is the solution to provide an updated WPA to provide make-work for scientific personnel. Rather, the solution to such unemployment lies in the conversion of our technical talent and resources from defense and space to civilian, socially useful programs—programs which can lead to a genuine improvement in the quality of our lives.

But such conversion of scientific talent cannot be accomplished merely by giving a scientist a new assignment. Considerable retraining is generally required. There is no doubt that, with adequate retraining, scientists skilled in the problems of defense could make valuable contributions to the resolution of civilian

problems. Seen in this light, conversion is not just an economic challenge. It is also a human and social opportunity.

To provide for such retraining, and to facilitate the conversion of our scientific talent and resources, I have already introduced S. 4241, the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1970. This bill would authorize the appropriation of \$450 million over a 3-year period for specific research and educational programs in national economic conversion. The bulk of these programs would be administered by the National Science Foundation.

In essence, the bill asks Congress to establish three national policies in the area of economic conversion:

First, scientists should have continuing opportunities for employment, in positions commensurate with their professional and technical skill.

Second, Federal spending for civilian research and development should be raised to a level equivalent to defense-related research and development.

Third, the total Federal investment in science and technology should continue to grow annually in proportion to increases in our gross national product.

Because of the limited time available in this post-election session, however, it will not be possible to complete action on such legislation before Congress adjourns. Early in the next Congress, I intend to push forward with legislation to establish the comprehensive conversion programs we need.

For the present, however, it is urgent that we make a beginning. As the experience of recent months demonstrates, the problems of conversion and unemployment are growing too rapidly for the timetable we now have. These problems require immediate action if we are to alleviate the human hardships inflicted by defense and space cutbacks, and maximize the potential contribution which scientific talent and resources can make to the resolution of the Nation's social problems.

The National Science Foundation is the ideal agency to make this beginning because the Foundation will undoubtedly play a major role in any future program of economic conversion. Already, despite its limited financial resources, the National Science Foundation has made a commendable beginning. It has launched a \$150,000 pilot project to retrain unemployed scientists and engineers, so that they can contribute to the resolution of contemporary social problems. But this project will retrain only 15 scientists and engineers. NSF simply does not now have the resources within its current recommended appropriation to launch more than a token project of this sort, however meritorious the project may be.

Under the amendment I have introduced, NSF would receive an additional \$10,000,000 to enable it to begin an immediate program of planning, research, and development, in economic conversion.

In this manner, NSF can begin now to develop policy guidelines for conversion in the difficult months ahead. At the same time, NSF will thereby become prepared to move rapidly and effectively in

mounting a major conversion program, as soon as appropriate legislation has been enacted in the next Congress.

We cannot afford to sit back and wait for the 92d Congress to begin the attack on these problems. We must act now, before the problem becomes even more acute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that my distinguished and illustrious colleague will not press his amendment at this time.

Last Thursday, the majority leader announced that this bill would be the pending business immediately after the morning hour on this date, Monday, December 7. I sat in this chair at a quarter past 12, and when the proper time came, I rose and made my preliminary statement; and I found myself talking to an empty Chamber, with the exception of two or three Senators who chanced to be present.

I explained at that time—and that is the reason why I am making this preliminary remark, because this is the argument I have against this amendment at this time—the situation that confronts us at this moment.

This is not a new matter. This is the follow-up of a bill that was vetoed by the President, and the veto was sustained by the House of Representatives. The President vetoed the bill because it was \$541 million more than the budget estimate. He said the fiscal situation was such that he could not tolerate that amount at this time. He sent it back, and the House sustained him. That meant that we had to begin our job all over again, more or less.

Here we are, 2 or 3 weeks before Christmas, with the end of the session almost in sight, and we need an appropriation bill for independent offices. This bill is \$105 million more than the budget estimate for medical care for the veterans of Vietnam who have received spinal injuries. Many of them cannot even light their own cigarette. Unless we pass this bill, those human beings are going to suffer more than some of these scientists.

This bill contains \$10 million that was never sent up as a budget estimate for housing for the elderly. We will not be able to help them unless we pass this bill. The bill is exactly like the bill we agreed to in conference and was approved by the Senate; with two exceptions, we knocked off \$150 million for water and sewage in rural areas and \$150 million under urban renewal, still leaving each of these items \$200 million over the budget estimate.

I am not questioning the merits of the amendment, nor am I questioning the need for the amendment, but I certainly am questioning its timing. If this amendment is going to be pursued at all it should be pursued in a supplemental bill. I think I would be amendable to it then.

Let us look at the facts. Last year, the National Science Foundation was given, I think, \$440 million. This year the budget request was \$513 million—\$511 million of new money and \$2 million in foreign currencies.

We agreed to the full amount in conference. We are up to the budget estimate. What is going to happen if we

change the bill now in any way? We will be confronted with another conference, which will take some time and, over above it all, we might end up with a pocket veto, and then where will we be with our veterans and with housing for the elderly?

I am pleading with the Senate to go along with the Appropriations Committee on this bill and leave it exactly the way it was reported by the committee so that we can get the bill signed by the President.

I plead with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts not to press the amendment at this time because if he does, it will open up the floodgates, and if we open up the floodgates, everyone else has a pet amendment and will wish to offer it.

We have agreed in committee that we would move to lay on the table any amendments. I do not want to get to that point with the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts that I would move to lay it on the table, just so that we can avoid a conference, so that we can get the bill signed by the President.

I again plead with my colleague from Massachusetts that I will give him every assistance possible at a later time, even on a supplemental bill, but please do not do it now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Rhode Island has made an eloquent statement. I understood him to say that the bill is identical with that which the Senate previously passed but which was vetoed, except that there are two reductions, one for \$150 million for community facilities, particularly water and sewer developments, and \$150 million for another category for—

Mr. PASTORE. Urban renewal.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is something upside down about the priorities of the administration because there is pending on the calendar a bill to commit the United States to \$1 billion for soft loans to communities in Latin America, and \$100 million for soft loans through the Asian Development Bank—or whatever it is; including the building of a power line in Cambodia.

What is wrong with the priorities of the Senate and the President, that we can commit ourselves to vast amounts for projects unknown, unseen, unidentified, far away, in other lands, but we must face a veto when communities in the United States, now unable to sell their own bonds, need some money to build water facilities and sewage disposal facilities to prevent the pollution of their communities?

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. GORE. What is wrong? It is all upside down.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, it is upside down, but the Senator from Tennessee is making his speech to the wrong man. I am not President Nixon.

When the time comes for these bills to be called up that the Senator is complaining about, I am going to join him, but I am not talking on that subject. There is no one in the Senate who is more concerned about priorities than

the senior Senator from Rhode Island; but I think I am giving you the facts of life, Mr. President and, somehow, we are old enough to understand the facts of life, that this is a bill vetoed by the President and sustained by the House of Representatives. So, what do we do? What are we going to say to the veterans in the Bronx, who cannot even light their own cigarettes, that they have to wait until we get through fussing around here, as to whether we are or are not going to give them \$105 million? They will not be able to spend this money until or unless we pass this bill.

What I am pleading for is to pass this bill. That is all. The time has come when either we will do it now or we will blow this whole thing into smithereens.

Does not the Senator think that I agree something needs to be done about the National Science Foundation? Of course I do. I fought for the full amount in committee and I fought for it in conference. I came back with the full estimate. I did my job.

All I am asking now is that we not interfere with the bill now, because our veterans and the elderly need this bill, and the longer we take to pass it, it will hurt them that much more. That is all I am saying.

I am not quarreling about the aid we want to give Cambodia. I am for a domestic desk down there in the State Department. I am for a domestic aid program. I am for all that. But I do not want to be chastized, or criticized, or pointed to, as though I like to take these things away from people. My heart is as big as anyone's in the Senate, as small as I am. [Laughter].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Boggs). The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand that the amendment I am proposing contains two parts. First, it increases the NSF appropriation by \$10 million. Second, it contains a proviso requiring that the additional \$10 million will be spent by the NSF for programs of economic conversion. Is that statement correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to address an inquiry to the manager of the bill. If we were to eliminate the first provision of the amendment, which would increase the NSF appropriation by \$10 million, and retain the second part, which would require \$10 million to be spent for economic conversion, would the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island change?

Mr. PASTORE. No. I could not change, for the simple reason that the House would have to act on it again and we would have to go to conference, and that is what I want to avoid.

I repeat, that last year we appropriated \$440 million for the National Science Foundation and this year they asked for \$513 million. We gave them \$513 million. Now they are operating under the old appropriation, under a continuing resolution, and therefore they will have some spillover. If the Senator wants to write a joint letter, I will sign it with him, so

that they can use the spillover money to do what they want it to do, and we can put it in separately later, but I do not want to have it in this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in light of the points made here by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, I would like to reserve action on disposition of my amendment until the Senate acts on other amendments to this bill. If there are no other amendments approved on the current legislation, I certainly would not press this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does not the Senator withdraw the amendment and I will ask unanimous consent that he can renew it in case anyone else later breaks the dike.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Boggs). The Senator from Massachusetts may withdraw his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. With the understanding that it can be brought up—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have to have any understanding on it.

The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not understand that this was to be presented as a take-it-or-leave-it bill, that no amendments of any kind would be given consideration, and that they would be tabled.

I have great respect for the Senator from Rhode Island. He handled the bill extremely well when it was before the Senate once before. I refer to the bill that was vetoed. I supported the bill, and I think that the Senator from Rhode Island did. I do not question for a moment that his views on the priorities concerning what is important in this country are just as sound or perhaps sounder than mine.

Mr. President, there is another aspect of the matter that is very difficult for me to accept. We have already allowed the Chief Executive in other areas to appropriate to himself the constitutional rights and responsibilities of the Senate in the field of war making and the deployment of troops and so forth. We come now into the area concerning the domestic needs of our people. Through this device of the veto we have to come back with a bill in which we have adapted to the views of the Executive.

We are about to give up what little power and independence of view we have with regard to domestic affairs.

It is said that we will allow the chairman of the committee to move to table the amendments. That is his privilege. I am, however, bound to offer the amendment as a matter of good practice with regard to supplying a decent amount of money for sewers and water. If my vote is the only vote, I will still have to do it.

Mr. President, when the Senate considered this bill last July, the junior Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) was the principal sponsor of an amendment to fund the basic water and sewer grant program at its authorization level of \$500 million. This amendment passed by a vote of 55 to 17. I am delighted to have the Senator from New York, who has worked so diligently in this matter, join me as a cosponsor. I know of his deep interest in this issue.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I cannot stop the Senator from offering the

amendment. I will not do that. I am not trying to threaten anyone.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not quarreling with the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the budget amount was \$150 million. It is now \$350 million. We just knocked off the \$150 million. We are now \$200 million over the budget estimate. I insisted upon that. And that was no small struggle, I say to my friend the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope that my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, understands that nothing I have to say is meant in criticism of the Senator from Rhode Island. He played a most valiant part in the endeavor. I approve of everything that he said and did when this matter was considered on the floor.

The matter of the budget estimate is not impressive to me. This is one further example of how we abdicate to the Budget Bureau one of the principal elements of government. The budget becomes nothing but the fiscal hand of the President. It is the Executive again telling the Congress that we have nothing but a ceremonial duty to approve of what the Executive wishes.

This is becoming so clear now that even the dullest people can understand it. This is an example of giving to the executive a dictatorship in a democracy. The influence of our legislative body in the Government has been reduced to a very pitiful state indeed when we cannot even get adequate amounts of money for sewers.

I know just as much or more about the need for sewers in Arkansas than does the Budget Bureau. Mr. Shultz and the Bureau of the Budget do not have any understanding of the matter. They do not associate with people who need sewer systems. The people they consult with already have sewers. The people in the Pentagon and the Shoreham Hotel have not the slightest ideas concerning people in a small town who need sewers.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the unfortunate thing about it is that the House supported the President. If the House had overridden the veto, there is no question that the Senate would have overridden the veto.

The bill that was reported out after the veto was passed by a vote of 375 to 10. So when the Senator says that the Congress of the United States sustained the President of the United States, that refers to the House. The House did.

I regretted that, and I said that on the floor of the Senate. I repeat it again. I am not trying to shackle anyone. I am not trying to put handcuffs on anyone.

I am saying what we should do if we expect to come up with a bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me say again that I am not criticizing the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not take it as a criticism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island takes his duty very seriously, and properly so. However, I still think that we are gradually allowing the remnants of the influence that Congress should have pass to the Executive. I always hesitate to say anything

about the House. Under the rules, we are not supposed to say anything derogatory about the other body. However, the other body, I regret, is so complacent, that it accepts whatever the Executive recommends.

This is not the first matter on which this has occurred. This is done with all matters dealing with the military and the AEC, matters that involve most of the money. The small items are lost in the shuffle.

Mr. President, I am bound to send to the desk the same amendment we voted on before. In effect, it would simply increase the amount of money for sewers and water by \$150 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) for himself and Mr. GOOD-ELL, proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 38, lines 6 and 7, strike out "\$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000,000".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is not very much new to be said about this matter. I said it when we dealt with this some 3 or 4 months ago. In the State of Arkansas, which I know very well, there are 16 unfunded projects with a total request of \$4,408,000. There are many more which are waiting to be supplied.

I give this type of activity the highest priority. This is not only for the convenience and the help of the individuals in our smaller communities. It is also an opportunity to try to control the pollution of our waters, in this case the underground waters. It is essential if we are going to enable people to continue to live in the small towns and to give them a reasonable opportunity to have a decent life so that they will not go to the big cities and get on relief and live under ghetto conditions.

I do not think there is much more to be said. It comes down to a matter of priorities. I am sympathetic with the ideas of the Senator from Rhode Island. The President sees this matter differently. However, at some stage the Senate is under a very heavy obligation to consider what is necessary to improve the lives of our constituents.

There is great difference about the space programs—which have been talked about—and going to the moon. I was very impressed 10 days ago that one single shot of a missile carrying a telescope to go to the outer spaces fell into the ocean. It cost well over 50 percent, about 75 percent, of the amount of money contained in the amendment. It did not cause a ripple. It did not cause any question. Everyone said, "In big, expensive programs, we can expect such things to happen." I suppose that it could happen once a week for the next year and that no one would take it seriously any more than they did when the new submarine sank at the dock. I think that cost about \$75 or \$100 million. No one thought very much of that. It was dismissed by saying, "What do you expect with a big program?" However, when they get into matters of this kind, they are extremely parsimonious. We have to be most careful about creating a water and sewer system.

Much has been said recently in the debate about the supersonic transport. Someone characterized it as a WPA project for the west coast. The principal sponsor of that measure, after it was defeated in the Senate, emphasized the number of jobs it would have given. Yet we would have created a large number of jobs for the dollars invested in a water and sewer system. And we would be doing something useful. The whole problem of jobs would seem to be of eminent importance with regard to the SST matter but of little importance in a bill to create water and sewer systems which do not contaminate the water supply, but contribute to the betterment of our environment.

So it comes back to a simple matter. What do we think is important? Is it important to travel at a speed of 2,000 miles an hour and is it more important to send up telescopes to look at outer space than to have pure water and sewer systems on the earth? This is a simple proposition that has been debated at great length. I do not wish to delay the Senate. Let the Senate vote on the matter up or down. I merely wish to present the Senate with the opportunity to express its desire in this matter.

Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is correct in saying that there are innumerable small communities in the United States badly in need of water and sewer systems. But one thing that we overlook and one thing that has been overlooked for some months is that pending in the Committee on Finance is H.R. 15979, which passed the House unanimously and which would authorize the Farmers Home Administration to insure loans to public bodies, which they cannot do at present.

I would suggest that the way to meet the need of the small communities, all those with populations under 5,500, would be to get that bill out of the Committee on Finance and onto the floor of the Senate where I think it would be passed unanimously. As far as I know there is no opposition to the bill. That bill would take care—not of the big cities, and I agree they should be taken care of under another heading—but of the rural communities that are badly in need of water and sewer systems at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. I voted for the \$500 million when the bill came before us. I repeat again that the President saw fit to veto the bill. Unfortunately, the House sustained that veto. Now, we are confronted with a pragmatic situation.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not correct that as contained in this bill the item for this very worthwhile objective is more than twice as big as the budget estimate, the budget estimate having been for \$150 million and the item in this bill now having been stated at \$350 million?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. I would like to have seen it at \$500 million but I repeat again that this is a new ball game, a different situation, another day. Here we are nearly ready to adjourn, with all this money being held

up and all these projects being held up, projects for the elderly, veterans, and so forth. I do not think we should chance another veto at this time. I do think we made a reasonable compromise. We cut the difference in two and I think we are satisfying the President and I think we should be satisfied, as well. Even if \$500 million were appropriated at this time, I doubt the money could be used in a businesslike fashion. I hope this matter will be pursued later. They will have my support, but not today.

Mr. HOLLAND. As a matter of fact, \$200 million of the \$350 million in this bill for this worthy objective represents the view of Congress, contrasted with the view of the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. As a result of informal conversations back and forth we reached this figure. With respect to water and sewer facilities and urban renewal programs the committee recommendation in each instance is \$200 million over the budget estimate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was especially appreciative of the Senator mentioning that \$105 million in this bill is for a peculiarly disastrously affected group of veterans, which is correct. I also call to the attention of Senators the fact that the total amount in this bill for veterans is \$9,065,528,000. On this day, Pearl Harbor Day, it seems to me that the veterans are entitled to the very great attention that is given them by this bill, this being by far the largest item in the bill. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. PASTORE. I do agree. It is the largest appropriation bill for that department in the history of the department.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that one of the great needs for the rural areas and the cities and towns of this country is adequate water and sewer facilities. The junior Senator from Alabama believes that the water and sewerage grant program in the HUD appropriation bill is one of the most popular Federal programs that Congress has ever enacted. We have dozens of applications by cities and towns and other public bodies in Alabama for water and sewerage grants.

I realize and recognize that even the amount proposed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is not adequate to meet the need. However, taking into account the fact that the appropriation bill for the last fiscal year was only \$135 million, and the amount embraced in the bill as it comes to us from the committee is \$350 million, it seems to the junior Senator from Alabama that it would be the better part of wisdom to accept the \$350 million that seems to be relatively assured, than to run the risk of operating under a continuing appropriation which would leave us at the \$135 million figure.

The junior Senator from Alabama also takes note of the fact that we have been operating under a continuing appropriation at the \$135 million level, which would have caused us to expend up to

this time somewhat less than \$70 million. Subtracting that from the \$350 million provided in the bill as it comes to us from committee would leave approximately \$280 million unexpended, so that we would be able to expend for the remainder of this fiscal year at the rate of more than a half billion dollars per year. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Alabama that it is in the best interest of the cities and towns that need water and sewerage programs to accept the committee bill and to get the \$215 million annual increase rather than to run the risk of losing that increase.

The junior Senator from Alabama does not feel that any Senator in this Chamber is more interested in seeing this program fully, completely, and adequately financed, but he will accept the \$350 million proposed by the committee. He would rather take that than run the risk of having to go back to \$135 million.

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

Mr. ALLEN, I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I might add that if we put back exactly what was in the bill when the President vetoed the bill, we will end up winning the battle but losing the war. That is about the size of it.

Mr. ALLEN, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to inquire of the able Senator if he has not noticed a change in administration fiscal policy or attitude toward fiscal matters since the exercise of the right of veto. It seems to me I had noticed, from a speech that President Nixon made last week and indications in articles and public statements of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and other administration officials, that the administration now sees the error of its ways and that they now seek ways to provide jobs for millions of the unemployed, that they now seek to rectify the mistakes they have made.

Would not approval of funds for community facilities which have already been authorized, on which loan applications are pending and ready, be the most appropriate way to provide employment for unemployed Americans?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely right. There has been an almost complete turnaround in the attitude of the administration toward inflation and the control of inflation. At the time the President vetoed the bill, the administration was pursuing a hard money policy, with high interest rates and restrictions on the supply of money, and all that goes with that. That having failed, they have now reversed the field and, as the Senator knows, there has been a dramatic decline in interest rates. The price of bonds has been booming, reflecting lower interest rates, and bond prices have been going up since the election, in the last month.

I think it is very likely that the President would not bring himself to veto the bill because of the emphasis on jobs, as the Senator has said.

I was struck by the reaction to the SST defeat. It was the only time I can think of since I have been here when I have seen the Congress, or the Senate at least, succeed in winning a battle on one of these exotic gimmicks which we are presented with either in the field of weaponry, such as the ABM, or the SST both of them highly questionable projects.

The reaction, as I have already said, was that this defeat would have a terrific impact on jobs—as if justification for continuing the SST was to give jobs, like leaf raking. I think leaf raking was about as justifiable as the SST would be. I heard on the radio the allegation that 30,000 jobs would be lost as a result. I am only submitting that the application of those jobs to water and sewer systems would be much more useful than some of these other activities.

I agree with the Senator that if there were any consistency at all in the President's present policy, he would not veto this bill; that the infusion of more money into these activities would be entirely consistent with the turnaround attitude toward our economy that has taken place as between the attitude before the election and presently.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT, I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I would like to get into this debate. My suggestion is, why not do it on the supplemental bill when it comes up? Why take a chance on veterans and housing? If there has been a change in attitude because of the fiscal situation and there may be a policy for creating more jobs through some public works projects, I am amenable to that, but I think it should be done on a supplemental bill, and not on this one, by compelling the President to backtrack or retreat or admit at this juncture that perhaps he was wrong when he vetoed the bill. I would not expect the President to do that any more than I would expect the Senator from Tennessee to do that. I think we are fooling around with danger on a bill involving \$17 billion, or almost \$18 billion.

If there is a necessity to add \$150 million, which would be \$350 million over the budget estimate—and I have no objection to that, because I voted for it—the supplemental bill would be the better place to do that. I suggest that that amount be put in that bill, but do not put it in this bill, which provides benefits for veterans and housing, and which has been delayed for 6 months. That is my argument. I am in favor of the \$500 million. I voted for it. But I think we ought to be realistic and practical if we are going to have a bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's feeling. Having charge of the bill, he naturally feels a great responsibility for it because that is his immediate duty, but, after all, I remind him the delay of 6 months was not the Senate's fault. It was the President's fault. The Senate did not delay the bill. We passed it 3 or 4 months ago. I believe the veto was in August, certainly a substantial time ago. So the responsibility for the delay affecting veterans and all these other items is at the White House.

The Senator says it is dangerous to continue this. I say it is dangerous for

the Senate to give way on every matter of consequence. When we have matters involving the making of war, we are told that the President is the Commander in Chief and we should give way on it. When matters have to do with any phase of foreign relations, even the making of a treaty with Spain, and even though it is unconstitutional and clearly against the Constitution to make such arrangements with Spain without consulting this body, we are told, well, he is the Commander in Chief and in matters of war and defense we should leave it to him. Now we come down to purely domestic legislation, and again we are told it is dangerous for the Senate to say, no, we do not agree with you on priorities as between sewer systems and the space agency.

Actually, in this bill what they have really done is put in \$300 million, as I recall, for space and then had it taken out of urban renewal and sewer and water. So, in effect, they are saying that space expenditures or going to the Moon or going to Mars or some place else is more important.

Mention was made of the Budget Bureau. The Budget Bureau has allowed over \$300 million for these fantastic operations that have not the slightest relation to the welfare of our own people. The space program was started at a time when we were a nation that thought it had everything. It is like the man who has everything; you cannot find anything to give him for Christmas. So you find a toothbrush with a mink handle and give it to him for Christmas. It makes a good conversation piece for the man who had everything. This space program came about after sputnik. We got excited about keeping up with the Joneses and we got into the space program. Now it is out of hand.

I have great sympathy for the Senator from Rhode Island, who is managing the bill, but I think it is the Senate's responsibility to try to have the Senate function as a legislative body, and not have it become merely a ceremonial body, like the House of Lords and nearly every other Senate in the world, and gradually be eliminated from having anything except ceremonial functions.

That is about where we are now. If we accept the idea that, on a matter involving the wisdom of giving sewer and water systems to our people, the executive and the Budget Bureau know more about it than we do, I do not know what there is left for the Senate to do other than create or provide a facade for an executive dictatorship posing as a democracy. If the Senate is not to have any more influence than that, I think it is about time for us to recognize it, and we should proceed on toward becoming an obsolete House of Lords.

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator wishes to speak, I withhold that.

Mr. ALLOTT, I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. President, I have just a few words to say. The proponent of this amendment has covered the full gamut of everything from foreign rela-

tions to the space program and fiscal responsibility. Very little has been said about sewers and water systems, which is the meat of the issue. But one of the main points the Senator has made—and I rise only to make this clear—is the constant attempt—of course, this is the Senator's belief, and he has a right to it—to make Senators think that the Chief Executive is trying to usurp all the powers of Congress.

I did not, during the last administration, except in the latter days of the Vietnam war, hear the Senator from Arkansas making any such allegations. I do not recall, during the first formative years when we decided to go to the moon, that he voted against any of those appropriations. I do not recall his ever taking the floor and speaking vociferously against it.

But I want to help the Senator out. I seriously want to help him out, because I am sure, in his mind, he finds himself in a deep quandary. If the Senator will refer to title 31 of the United States Code, he will find a title called "Money and Finance," chapter 1 of which covers the national budget and audit system.

Under section 11 of that chapter, he will see that it says:

The President shall transmit to Congress during the first fifteen days of each regular session, the Budget, which shall set forth his Budget message, summary data and text, and supporting detail. The Budget shall set forth in such form and detail as the President may determine—

And then it lists some 11 different items.

Now, as I said, I want to help the Senator. If he really thinks that the Congress of this Nation is under the lash and choke of the President because of the budget and budget policy, he has the easiest way in the world to seek to make the Senate and Congress absolutely pre-eminent in this field. He can simply offer an amendment to strike section 11 of the first chapter of title 31 of the United States Code. I do not say that I would join him in that. I would not. But if he is really concerned about executive coercion he has a very easy way to attempt to correct it.

Mr. President, I wish to make the RECORD clear, too. The budget figure on sewers was \$150 million. It was the Senator from Colorado who made the motion, in committee, to raise that amount \$50 million over the budget, and make it \$200 million; and that, I believe, is the form in which the bill came to the Senate.

It was then that the junior Senator from New York offered the amendment raising the amount to \$500 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What happened was that we made it \$500 million, exactly the House figure. Therefore, it was not an item in conference.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is quite correct. But I wanted to make the point that it was the Senator from Colorado who raised the amount from \$150 to \$200 million in committee in the first instance.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. No State has any mo-

nopoly on the need for these things. I think it is interesting that it was the junior Senator from Alabama who saw the real point at issue here so clearly: at the rate that we are spending now, we have spent in this past half year less than \$70 million on this program. If we pass this measure now, we can spend in the water and sewer arena, during the last half of this fiscal year, at a rate in excess of the amount contained in the vetoed bill. The \$280 million will be available for use, which is an annual rate of \$560 million.

We can get this bill through. It is not a matter, alone, of getting these moneys into the pipeline. It is not a matter alone of spending money for veterans. It is not a matter alone of saving the overall money in the budget which we are wasting by the billions of dollars, simply because this Congress has not gotten its appropriations bills out in time for the departments of the Government to start their planning and to get their money at the beginning of the fiscal year.

I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the committee will agree with me that we did as well as we could on the bill this year. We were held up by lack of some authorizations. The bill, I believe, went through the Senate in August. It has not been the President who has held the matter up. If this bill has been held up, it must be charged to one branch of Congress or the other; and I will say, as for the part of the chairman and this particular Senator, that we have done everything we could to expedite these appropriations and get them passed as quickly as possible.

I think that is about all that need be said, Mr. President. The issues are very clear: Do we want a bill or not? Do we want to make this a ruptured duck session, not just a lame duck session? We can make it either one here this afternoon. I think the time has come to act upon this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. 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. FULBRIGHT. 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. GOODELL. Mr. President, during the consideration of the original appropriation measure, H.R. 17548, I offered an amendment to increase the funds for this purpose by \$300 million, raising the appropriation to the level passed by the House of Representatives. The amendment passed this body overwhelmingly by a vote of 55 to 17.

Today we are debating the second fiscal 1971 appropriation bill for HUD and the various independent agencies, H.R. 19830. The time is late, and there is an urgent need to approve funds for HUD and the other agencies without delay.

I recognize fully what has been referred to here in the debate: The practi-

cal implications of a potential Presidential veto, and the limitations that places on the actions of the Senate today.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I think each of us recognizes that the reductions made by the House of Representatives and the Senate committees in the HUD basic water and sewer grant program are extremely serious in terms of the commitment we have made to reverse the deterioration of our environment.

As my colleagues will recall, the budget request for this program was \$150 million. That is a ridiculously low figure in terms of the need. The House Appropriations Committee approved that request, but the funding level was raised to \$500 million by an amendment agreed to on the House floor. The Senate committee recommended \$200 million, but we raised it to \$500 million in the Senate.

We do not have to belabor the fact that there is a grave crisis in terms of water and sewer facilities in the communities of this Nation. Because of serious underfunding, thousands of localities have been deterred from providing adequate water and sewer facilities for the people of the community. In some cases—I am sure each Senator is familiar with specific cases of this nature; I could name a number in New York State—they have been forced to rely on old, out-of-date systems, or, worse, no system at all. Each city, town, or village without adequate water and sewer treatment facilities creates an environmental hazard in its vicinity and for those communities that are located on the same waterways.

And it is not a local problem. Water that is polluted in a local community moves to other communities polluted, and then there is an accumulation from community to community.

In addition, the lack of treatment facilities presents serious impediments to the economic development of a community. Without adequate systems, these communities are unable to attract industry so that they might grow; are unable to persuade their young people to look forward to a bright future by coming back or remaining in their communities.

For the information of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that a list of backlogged applications, compiled State by State, be printed in the RECORD.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR WATER AND SEWER ASSISTANCE NOT FUNDED BY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

State	Number of grant applications	Grant applications amount (in millions)	Total project cost (in millions)
Alabama	51	\$15.68	\$33.66
Alaska	15	7.27	17.15
Arizona	31	11.85	26.30
Arkansas	52	20.97	45.57
California	271	158.17	365.25
Colorado	73	19.71	48.62
Connecticut	95	59.82	155.36
Delaware	8	3.30	6.99
Florida	135	69.12	164.03
Georgia	43	19.64	46.39
Hawaii	19	5.78	14.12
Idaho	3	.69	1.39
Illinois	191	89.58	201.96
Indiana	77	48.57	131.00
Iowa	67	20.58	44.89
Kansas	60	13.60	28.89

State	Number of grant applications	Grant applications amount (in millions)	Total project cost (in millions)
Kentucky	28	55.89	\$136.54
Louisiana	107	70.17	158.16
Maine	48	8.31	18.58
Maryland	47	22.44	51.12
Massachusetts	225	93.33	227.23
Michigan	308	331.20	722.95
Minnesota	63	\$42.49	68.76
Mississippi	29	10.88	28.48
Missouri	104	34.06	80.56
Montana	14	2.47	4.89
Nebraska	45	16.80	48.64
Nevada	16	4.30	11.27
New Hampshire	27	11.84	27.00
New Jersey	163	92.55	209.20
New Mexico	13	2.61	6.83
New York	426	441.50	887.13
North Carolina	48	19.12	51.30
North Dakota	7	2.01	3.51
Ohio	255	204.45	420.62
Oklahoma	51	15.31	36.68
Oregon	47	26.18	65.68
Pennsylvania	317	158.68	343.72
Rhode Island	26	16.93	39.08
South Carolina	44	16.63	48.40
South Dakota	17	3.76	8.07
Tennessee	47	16.33	38.91
Texas	224	55.39	130.52
Utah	60	14.01	33.41
Vermont	33	7.41	16.89
Virginia	55	47.10	101.47
Washington	63	17.06	40.51
West Virginia	36	25.13	35.54
Wisconsin	85	37.79	84.74
Wyoming	5	.37	.79
Puerto Rico	25	5.78	13.81
Virgin Islands	1	.14	.29
National total	4,308	2,496.75	5,538.22

Mr. GOODELL. Congress did respond to this need by approving the full authorization of \$500 million. Unfortunately, the President felt that this item was one of two—the other being funds for the urban renewal program—that made it impossible to sign the bill. Responding to the President's requests, the appropriations for the basic water and sewer program have been cut. The House approved a funding level of \$350 million, and we have before the Senate today the identical figure.

Mr. President, I understand the pressures to which the chairman has referred—to which the committee members responded—to report a bill that met the objections of the administration. I firmly believe, however, that the initial action of Congress committing the full authorization to the program was and is the proper course to take.

I do not know how long we are going to go on talking about problems of great immensity and great proportion and then appropriating money at 5 or 10 percent of the level needed to cope adequately with those problems; appropriating money at a level that inevitably mandates that we are going to be further behind next year than we are now. It is not a question of catching up gradually, moving a little faster. The truth is that funding at this level means that we are going to be in worse shape next year than we are now. We are not even going to hold even in this critical problem.

I commend the Senator from Rhode Island, who is very committed to solving this problem. I recognize the practical considerations in bringing these appropriations to the floor at this level. But I would hope that the Senate would not be satisfied with the superficial arguments—they are real in the parliamentary situation; they are superficial in

terms of the people's need—that this is the highest level that we can get through. I think the Senate should assert itself in this instance.

I do not believe the President would veto this measure with an additional \$150 million. I believe that other ways will be presented to us in which we can cut at least that amount of money out of the appropriations before the Senate.

When we are talking about a need of \$2 to \$3 billion in appropriations, is it not rather a sad commentary that the budget request is \$150 million and that we have an argument here about increasing this appropriation to a level that is clearly only one-fifth of the amount needed? No one in this country is arguing for polluted water. But, a great many people are unwilling to pay the price to clean up that water.

I offered the original amendment, which was agreed to overwhelmingly in the Senate, to increase the amount to \$500 million, and I commend the Senator from Arkansas for seeking this higher level—I believe a reasonable increase—which can be supported. I believe it is a reasonable level of increase over what came out of the committee and I believe it is reasonable to push the administration as far as we can push it. We all want to see this bill passed. We want the money appropriated for a variety of other purposes. But I would hope that the Senate today would make the determination that we are going to push the administration at least to the point where they will be exerting one-fifth of the effort necessary to begin to cope with this problem. That is about all we will be doing if we add this \$150 million.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New York was not in the Chamber a short time ago when I pointed out that there is a bill which has rested in our Finance Committee for some months now, H.R. 15979. I believe it has a Senate counterpart. This bill passed the House unanimously. It would authorize the Farmers Home Administration to insure loans made to public bodies for water and sewage programs in rural communities up to 5,500 in population.

At the present time, I believe the Farmers Home Administration has approximately \$40 million which can be given as grants. They can make loans up to a certain hopelessly inadequate amount. Because of the technicality of the law, they cannot insure loans as is done for other Government projects on the part of the Federal Government.

If we could get this bill out of the Finance Committee onto the floor of the Senate, where I am sure there would be no opposition to it, I think the \$150 million lag which is worrying the Senator from New York—and I think rightly so—could be taken care of that way, without adding it to the appropriation bill.

So I think that instead of pressuring the President at this time, we should—I do not know what word to use—beg, tease. I certainly would not pressure our Finance Committee under any circum-

stances. But if they would only report this bill, to which there is absolutely no opposition, to the best of my knowledge, it would take care of the situation for all communities of not over 5,500 population.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the comments of my esteemed colleague from Vermont, but I must say, I do not think the bill would take care of the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. It would not take care of it in Albany or Schenectady.

Mr. GOODELL. No, it would not take care of the problem in Albany or Schenectady and it would not take care of a great many other communities.

I must say that insured loans are good and I am for that program. I hope that we can bring that forward as a supplemental approach. But we are dealing here with a situation where many communities just do not have the tax base to support a loan. They do not have the tax base to borrow the money unless the Federal Government can make grants available in sufficient quantity. Thus, I do not think it is an either/or proposition. We need grant programs at a far higher level, actually four or five times the level we are talking about today, in addition to the loan programs, so that the local community can provide its share.

Mr. AIKEN. The Farmers Home Administration assures me that if the bill now in the Finance Committee is enacted they have water and sewer applications enough on hand so that they can double or triple their program. This would bring the present level of \$86 million in insured loans up to \$350 million. I do not recall exactly, but I think the agriculture appropriations bill carries \$100 million in grants. Would the Senator from Florida know that? Is not the Farmers Home Administration, under the appropriations bill, authorized to grant up to \$100 million for water and sewage programs?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not recall exactly the amount, but it has a large authorization. Besides, it has a large revolving fund. It is always preferable to have the Federal Government insure. The Farmers Home Administration insurance program has been a successful one. It has not had to pay out any appreciable portion of the amount of the loans insured.

Mr. AIKEN. My understanding, according to the Treasury, is that they cannot insure loans for sewage or water programs to public bodies—that is, the Farmers Home Administration; because under a quirk of the law, I believe that the income from such loans would be exempt from taxation, and, of course, that is not the thing to do these days.

I believe that the pending bill in the Finance Committee, which passed the House, would provide that income from the bonds would be subject to taxation. I may be mistaken about that, but I do not believe so.

Mr. GOODELL. My understanding is the same as the Senator's.

Mr. AIKEN. The Farmers Home Administration feels they are handicapped until the bill which is now pending in the Finance Committee is brought out and passed. There was no opposition in the House. To the best of my knowledge, there is no opposition in the Senate. It

has simply been put to rest, gone to sleep, or something has happened to it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Vermont in desiring to have this legislation come to a vote from the Finance Committee but not as an alternative to this program. I do not think it is a substitute, by any means. It is a program which the Senator from Vermont says is limited to communities of 5,500 population or less. I did introduce an amendment last summer, which passed the Senate, to increase the funds for that program.

We are dealing here with a situation across the country where many communities literally are facing bankruptcy. They may not be able to meet their bills. The local governments, businesses, and individuals, are facing bankruptcy, the Senator is absolutely right. But the local communities cannot meet this problem alone. They cannot raise their taxes, in many cases, because they do not have the tax base to do it. I think the time has come when we must recognize the Federal Government is the only one that can provide the substantial part of the wherewithal necessary to do this job. It is not enough any more to say to the local communities, "Raise your own money, your own revenue, for this kind of problem."

It would be one thing if we were talking about a projected need of \$500 million a year from the Federal Government and compromising out at \$350 million. The truth of the matter is, if we put this in perspective, we are talking about a projected need from the Federal Government of about \$2 billion and we are coming forth with a program at \$350 million this fiscal year. That is not enough.

Mr. President, I have no wish to detain the Senate longer. The record is clear from the debate last summer and the debate here today. I know there is not a Senator in this Chamber today who does not wish we could put more money in the bill. I know that is particularly true of the senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). He, too, wishes that we had more money in the bill—a bill that would be signed by the President. But I would hope, recognizing the proportions of the need, that Senators will not back away from what I would call a minor confrontation with the President on this issue. I do not believe that \$150 million represents a major confrontation when we are talking about an area of critical need. The longer we neglect it, the more difficult it will be to solve.

I know that the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island and Colorado will be seeking as much money as possible next year in this appropriation. The authorization for the program for fiscal 1972 is \$1 billion. That figure is inadequate. It represents only about one-third of the funds needed to meet the present backlog of more than \$2.5 billion. Nevertheless, I think it represents a good beginning in the fight to fund the water and sewer grant program at more realistic levels.

Now, however, I think that we should take the first step; adopt this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if no one else desires to speak on this amendment, let me say that we have already had a confrontation and the veto by the President which the House sustained.

For those reasons now, and for the reasons already given, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

There was not a sufficient second.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 412) of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT).

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) would each vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senators from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the

Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) is paired with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 412 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Aiken	Fong	Pell
Allen	Griffin	Prouty
Allott	Gurney	Randolph
Anderson	Hansen	Saxbe
Baker	Holland	Schweiker
Bellmon	Hruska	Scott
Bennett	Inouye	Smith
Bible	Jackson	Spong
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Long	Stevens
Byrd, W. Va.	Mansfield	Symington
Cannon	McClellan	Talmadge
Cooper	McIntyre	Thurmond
Cotton	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dole	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Eagleton	Murphy	Young, Ohio
Ellender	Pastore	
Ervin	Pearson	

NAYS—25

Brooke	Hartke	Moss
Burdick	Hollings	Muskie
Church	Hughes	Nelson
Cranston	Javits	Packwood
Fulbright	Kennedy	Proxmire
Goodell	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Gore	McGovern	Yarborough
Gravel	Metcalf	
Harris	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—23

Bayh	Goldwater	Percy
Case	Hart	Russell
Cook	Hatfield	Sparkman
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Stevenson
Dodd	Magnuson	Tower
Dominick	Mathias	Tydings
Eastland	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	Mundt	

So Mr. PASTORE's motion to lay Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 19, line 19, strike out "\$2,565,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,455,000,000".

On page 19, line 20, insert before the period a colon and the following: "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available for the design or definition of any space shuttle or space station".

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to each side, under the usual rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection,

and it is so ordered. The agreement will be in the usual form, with time to be controlled by the mover of the amendment and the manager of the bill.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until we have order. The Senate will be in order. Senators will please be seated.

The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have called up my amendment to strike \$110 million found in this appropriation bill for hardening the design, as it is called, of the space shuttle station program.

This amendment, jointly sponsored by Senators CASE, JAVITS, PROXMIRE, and myself, would reduce the NASA fiscal year 1971 appropriation for research and development by \$110 million—the amount requested by NASA for design and definition of the space shuttle station. The amendment also would prohibit the use of any part of the NASA appropriation for that purpose.

The space shuttle station represents what NASA itself calls "a new epoch in manned space flight." It is the beginning of a new phase of the manned space program—a phase as large or larger in scope than the Apollo program.

The first aspect of this project is to develop a chemically fueled, two-stage reusable shuttle, which will operate between the surface of the earth and low earth orbit. The second is to develop a space station as a permanent structure in orbit designed initially for the support of 6 to 12 occupants; ultimately, NASA hopes to erect a space base by joining together these space stations, and this base will be capable of supporting between 50 and 100 men in earth orbit.

The \$110 million requested for the coming fiscal year is only a small part of the project's ultimate cost. NASA's preliminary cost estimates for development of the space shuttle station total almost \$14 billion. The original \$6 billion estimates for the shuttle alone has now risen to \$10 billion, and NASA officials readily concede that these preliminary estimates are unreliable. Indeed, preliminary cost estimates in the space field are uniformly low, often only a fraction of ultimate cost. It is quite likely, therefore, that the ultimate cost of this project will greatly exceed \$14 billion.

The shuttle station is intimately related to an even more ambitious effort. NASA proposes to embark this year upon a new space program based upon new hardware, almost entirely in support of manned missions, with a manned Mars landing as the ultimate objective. The shuttle station is the first step toward this objective.

Without the shuttle and without the 100-man space station to assemble the various spacecraft and other paraphernalia to get men to Mars, no manned Mars program is possible. NASA has testified that as soon as the shuttle and station have been developed, it plans to spend for a manned Mars exploration program \$100 million in fiscal year 1977, \$300 million in fiscal 1978, and \$1 billion in fiscal 1979.

If this is so, the shuttle station will be the initial phase of a program with an

estimated cost of \$50 to \$100 billion over the next 15 years.

Proponents of this project strongly deny that its approval in any way amounts to approval of a manned flight to Mars. But they concede that the shuttle and station are essential first steps for such a flight.

We might be reminded that a year ago the Vice President announced we should begin a manned program to Mars.

To make the case for our amendment, however, it is not necessary to demonstrate the relationship between the shuttle station and a planned manned landing on Mars. For no one denies that the shuttle station is the beginning of a new and expanded manned space program. Thus, our approval of this appropriation must be considered as initial congressional approval of this "new epoch in manned space flight."

Our amendment is a bipartisan effort to prevent Congress from sliding into such a commitment—a commitment which eventually will cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars.

The amendment would strike from this program one of the most wasteful and indefensible items in the budget; one that bears no relation to our many compelling domestic and human needs in our society; one which has little scientific yield; one which would take enormous amounts of money from that part of the program which does have great scientific yield; and one which has little or no military significance, as demonstrated by the abandonment of the MOL program by the Air Force.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Arkansas be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Minnesota mentioned that part of the space program has yielded great scientific results. Which part did he have in mind?

Mr. MONDALE. The unmanned space effort. That part of the space program—which has admittedly contributed to our knowledge in the fields of international communication, navigation, astronomy, discovery of the Van Allen Belt—has all been the result of unmanned instrumented flights, which has been done at a much cheaper cost than the manned space program. That is exactly the area where the Russians are outdoing us, and at a cost of what is said to be one-twentieth of the cost of our manned effort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That kind of program does not make as good a television program as a manned space program does. Is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. It makes a very poor television show, but if one is a scientist, it is of great significance. That is why Dr. Van Allen, Dr. Gold, and others favor a change in orientation. That is why so many top scientists have quit the space program—because it is a great show, with very little scientific yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. The proponents of the shuttle station insist that the \$110 million requested for design and definition does not commit us to its development. They contend that this money is for further study, not development, and that the crucial decision whether to proceed with this project will be made next year by NASA and the Congress.

Implicit in this argument is the notion that \$110 million is a minor expenditure. It is not—\$110 million is more than the administration has budgeted in fiscal year 1971 to combat air pollution; it is more than the \$84 million special milk program, which the President wanted to terminate as an "economy measure"; and it is twice what we spend for one of our most effective antipoverty efforts, OEO's legal services programs.

Bear in mind that we just decided against giving grants for water and sewage systems that would be of great assistance to our communities. We decided to cut out several hundred million dollars for urban renewal. But we decided to add the full amount of \$110 million for design and definition of the space shuttle station program.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the context of that program, \$110 million is not very much.

Mr. MONDALE. No; it is not very much.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A few days ago we saw the failure of the \$98.5 million stargazer telescope experiment. They say, "Oh, well, in a program like this, we have to expect that." They get accustomed to thinking that \$110 million is not much to talk about, so long as it is in the space program.

Mr. MONDALE. One wonders what the reaction would be if \$95 million were lost in the Headstart program or any of the other education programs, but a loss of \$95 million involving a space telescope is insignificant when measured against the total cost of the space program. More than that, if we go ahead with the space shuttle station, it really will be peanuts. The \$110 million is just a downpayment. As we have often seen here, the way we back into multimillion-dollar programs is not really facing up to issues at the appropriate time; but we add a bit here and there, and then when Congress sees the tremendous obligations to which we have committed ourselves, we say, "It is too late. We have already spent \$200 or \$300 million. It would be a waste to stop now."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly what was said about the SST, when we were asked to spend another \$1 billion. Somewhat the same argument was made with respect to the ABM.

Mr. MONDALE. The main argument made during the carrier debate was that we had already spent \$140 million on an aircraft carrier and that we would be wasting that money by stopping the carrier. It that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MONDALE. Furthermore, it is clear that the requested funding for design and definition of this project is for more than basic research—conducted in

NASA's own laboratories. Design and definition is what NASA calls phase B of a planned project. In fiscal year 1970, NASA spent \$18.5 million to complete phase A, that is, to determine the feasibility of the shuttle and station. NASA now wants to move to phase B, and it has already awarded contracts for this purpose to several aerospace companies.

An \$18.5 million expenditure has thus escalated into a request to spend an additional \$110 million. Private contractors are involved. Industry is eagerly anticipating large contracts in the future.

And if the past is any guide, NASA will ask Congress next year for several hundred million more for this project, and return again and again for hundreds of millions to continue its development. Congress will then be told that it is too late to stop the project—too late because of the enormous funds already invested.

It does not make a great deal of difference, then, whether you characterize the \$110 million in this bill as "development" or a "study." In either case, the approval of these funds will put us on the road toward another multibillion dollar manned space program.

So we will find ourselves in this position: to save a few hundred million dollars, we will proceed to spend some \$20 billion.

The budgetary implications of such a commitment are staggering. If development of the shuttle/station proceeds, NASA projects a space budget of approximately \$7 billion in fiscal year 1979—more than double this year's budget.

The President's successful veto of the HUD—Independent Offices appropriation bill in August—on the grounds that Congress had added approximately \$700 million to his budget for urban renewal and water and sewer grants—dramatically raises an issue of national priorities.

It is tragic enough that we cannot find the resources for urgent domestic needs when we are spending \$3.2 billion on space. What will happen when that budget rises to \$7 billion? The Congress should answer this question before approving these funds.

While maintaining that no commitment is involved in approving this appropriation, the project's proponents also argue that the shuttle will actually save the taxpayer's money. They contend that the shuttle, unlike present boosters, will be reuseable, and could thereby reduce the cost per pound of payload in orbit by a factor of 10.

But this reasoning overlooks the fact that it will cost billions of dollars to develop the space shuttle. Once developed, it has been estimated that the shuttle will cost hundreds of millions to procure, whereas the launch vehicles to be replaced by the shuttle—Delta through Titan—cost from \$3.5 million to \$20 million for each vehicle. Given these extremely high development and procurement costs, the alleged savings from use of the shuttle will occur only if the scope of U.S. space activities is greatly expanded in future years.

NASA officials are relying on such expansion. They anticipate a minimum of 30 flights per year by NASA and an

equivalent number in support of DOD programs.

The leading House opponent of the shuttle/station—Congressman JOSEPH KARTH of Minnesota, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications and a strong supporter of the space program—made the following observation about NASA's calculations:

During the entire decade of the sixties, NASA exceeded 30 launches per year only once—36 in 1966—including Scouts and Saturn V's which are not to be replaced by the space shuttle. Assuming the space shuttle's payload capacity (of placing 50,000 pounds in orbit) would be fully utilized on each of the projected 60 yearly flights, this adds up to 3 million pounds of payload launched into orbit each year.

How do 3 million pounds of payload in orbit compare with the space program of the past? In terms of cumulative payload launched, 1969 was NASA's biggest year with 442,358 pounds, over 97 percent of which was attributed to the four Apollo flights.

Congressman KARTH notes that the NASA budget—which has declined annually since 1965—must increase dramatically during the next few years to support this project if the space shuttle is to fly by 1977; and their budget would have to increase even more after the shuttle becomes operational in order to support the kind of ambitious program it is designed to serve.

The United States cannot afford such an ambitious space program and the American taxpayer should not have to bear the burden. Rather than testing the taxpayer's endurance, we should follow the course recommended by seven members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics—that is, cost effectiveness studies should be conducted comparing the operation of the space shuttle with the continued use of existing expendable launch vehicles before sizable amounts of money are applied to the project.

It is clear that if we appropriate the funds requested here, we will be committing this Nation to a vastly more expensive and ambitious effort than the project's proponents would have us believe. But aside from the potential cost of both the shuttle and station, there are other basic reasons for opposing this project.

To begin with, the shuttle/station will insure the continued dominance of manned flights over unmanned flights—despite the fact that many of our most prominent space scientists strongly favor an unmanned, instrumented program. The recent success of the Soviet unmanned flights to the moon—Luna 16 and Luna 17—has reinforced the increasing objections in the scientific community to another massive U.S. commitment to manned space flight.

To these scientists, unmanned flights are far more economical than manned flights and produce more advantageous applications of space technology.

For example, Dr. Thomas Gold, chairman of the ad hoc Space Science Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, made the following observation about the relative value of manned and unmanned space flight:

The unmanned space program is more economical by far and can be more effective than a manned program in both scientific exploration and the economically advanta-

geous applications of space technology. We have recently seen that sample return from the moon can be done unmanned. There is little question that the sample return from Mars and the other planets will be achieved by unmanned means long before there is any serious question of manned flights to these bodies. Very important consequences for our understanding of the solar system and possibly of the origin of life will come from such sample return missions.

Similarly, in the applications program there is no case for the expense of manned flight. All tasks now contemplated can be done by remotely controlled instruments much more economically.

Dr. James A. Van Allen, one of our most prominent space scientists, has often advocated a reorientation of our space program toward unmanned flights. In a recent statement supporting our amendment, Dr. Van Allen said:

I am totally unpersuaded that men in spacecraft are important or even useful in any way that is commensurate with the effort required to maintain them there. In fact, their presence degrades almost all of the objectives in space that I consider important. And I hold this view despite the fact that I am a devoted admirer of astronauts at the level of personal courage and professional competence. I favor the indefinite deferral of major engineering studies of space shuttle and other space transportation systems which contemplate the establishment of manned space stations and other facilities of this nature.

Brian O'Leary, a former scientist astronaut and now an astronomy professor at Cornell, recently wrote that:

We should encourage science looking for a mission rather than a mission looking for science; we should ask how we can best perform a mission manned or unmanned, not what we can do with the man.

In these times of conflicting, uncertain goals both inside and outside NASA, I think the unmanned planetary program provides a good example of what can be done. The Mariner 6 and 7 flyby missions gave us remarkable pictures and valuable scientific information, yet each cost less than 15 percent of the price of sending two test pilots to the moon.

And Max Born, a distinguished physicist and Nobel prize winner, has commented that the manned space program was a "triumph of intellect but a failure of reason." To him, the manned missions are senseless, because their cost so far outweighs their scientific value and the money is so badly needed elsewhere.

NASA has ignored this type of criticism and is making no effort to redress the present imbalance between manned and unmanned flights. While NASA's projected budgets go from \$4 billion in fiscal year 1972 to \$6.8 billion in fiscal year 1979, the unmanned effort will remain at a constant level. In fiscal year 1979, it is estimated that 68 percent of NASA's total budget will be spent on manned flight missions—including the shuttle/station and the planning for a manned Mars landing.

It is clear that a meaningful and scientifically productive unmanned space program would place much less of a strain on national resources than the manned program envisioned by advocates of the shuttle/station. The Russians claim that an unmanned flight costs one-twentieth as much as a manned flight designed for the same task—and our own experts agree that

unmanned flights are far cheaper than manned operations.

Dr. Van Allen has estimated that a fully adequate unmanned space program would cost more than \$2 billion a year. This should be compared with NASA's projected space budget of almost \$7 billion in fiscal year 1979 if development of the shuttle/station proceeds. Such an increase in our annual space budget will further limit the availability of funds for vital domestic programs.

Dr. Van Allen recently observed:

Space exploration is experimental. There is ample room for imaginative effort. But responsible public policy does not, at this stage of history, permit all-out, money-is-no-object attack.

However, even if a new, ambitious manned space effort could be justified, it is premature to begin development of the shuttle/station now. For this project is based on the assumption that man can function effectively in a space environment for long periods of time. But at this point, we simply do not know the feasibility of long-duration operations in such an environment.

A 1969 report by the House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications stated that:

If there is an ultimate limiting factor (to exploring space), it may well be the length of time through which man can endure the influences of the hostile environments encountered beyond the earth. The extent and limits of human frailty or endurance have not yet been established.

Weightlessness and other special effects of the space environment may be extremely deleterious and even fatal to man after extended space flight. The Biosatellite III mission resulted in the death of a monkey after 8½ days of a scheduled 30-day flight. Medical experts believe that the monkey died of an excessive loss of body fluids due to weightlessness.

According to news accounts, the Soviet cosmonauts aboard Soyuz 9 have been troubled with instability of the cardiovascular system and difficulty in sleeping after their record space flight of nearly 18 days. A number of American scientists feel that the medical results of this flight reinforce their view that many unanswered questions remain about the biomedical effects of long-duration space flight.

NASA, of course, is most concerned about these important medical problems. The Sky Lab project, scheduled to begin in 1972, will be an earth orbiting manned station designed to determine the feasibility of manned operations in a space environment over extended periods of time. This project will utilize modified hardware already developed in the Apollo program.

The Sky Lab will be placed into earth orbit and each of three manned missions will rendezvous and dock with the workshop. The first of these missions will last for 28 days, and the second and third will each last for 56 days. According to the report of the House Space Committee, these missions "are a prelude to the operation of a space station and space shuttle" and their "greatest importance will be to demonstrate during long-duration manned flights the inter-association of man and his experiments."

These Sky Lab missions are crucial to the future of long-duration manned space flight. For after hearing the testimony of a series of medical experts, the House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications found that "the warning flags are already flying" with respect to the possible deleterious effects on men exposed to the hazards of long-duration flight. The subcommittee's report came to the following conclusion:

The ability to predict man's enduring tolerance to the environment of space, particularly prolonged weightlessness, is limited. The consensus is that current knowledge based on flights up to 14 days is adequate to proceed with planning the proposed 28-day Sky Lab mission. But it is illogical to conclude from the results of successful short flights that long duration flights can be scheduled without risk of unacceptable consequences. Accordingly, present knowledge is considered inadequate to safely proceed with the proposed 56-day flight, or longer flights to the planets, without adequate testing and satisfactory monitoring of astronauts on the 28-day flights, in carefully planned scientific experiments beyond any yet undertaken in manned flight.

In short, until this sky lab experiment is completed in 1973, we will not know whether or not man will be able to use the shuttle/station. If the sky lab missions demonstrate that man cannot operate effectively in space for long periods of time, then the enormous funds allocated for the space shuttle/station will have been wasted—regardless of whether the expenditure is labeled as a "study" or as development.

And even if it is demonstrated that man can survive in such an environment, the station will undoubtedly have to be tailored to solve various biomedical problems. It is, therefore, senseless to spend millions of dollars on design and definition before we know the answers to these problems.

As one Congressman noted, it is strange, indeed, to begin funding for a giant space station before we have even flown the small one which is supposed to test the concept of space station flight.

In addition to the unknowns about man's adaptability to long-duration space flight, extremely complex technical problems are posed by the shuttle and station. NASA acknowledges that design and development of the shuttle represents a new and formidable technical challenge, which will require maximum innovation on the part of the aerospace industry. Congressman KARTH pointed out that, before the shuttle can become a reality, many difficult technological advances must occur in such areas as configuration and aerodynamics, heat protection, guidance and control, and propulsion. As a result of these technical complexities, a recent issue of *Aviation Week and Space Technology* notes that—

There has developed within NASA a schism in approach to design-in size, configuration and operational requirements.

NASA originally planned to complete design and definition of the shuttle in 11 months. But, according to recent news stories, this phase of the shuttle has been extended by another 6 months or perhaps longer in order to solve any persistent problems.

If it is true, as NASA claims, that the shuttle/station is not a "crash project," then the results of the sky lab experiments should be considered and these technical problems should be resolved before moving to design and definition.

It should be emphasized that the decision to delete funds for design and definition of the space shuttle/station will not kill the project. NASA officials have testified that approximately \$80 million will be spent during fiscal year 1971 in direct support of this project by NASA's Office of Advanced Research and Technology. This research is aimed at solving the difficult technical problems presented by the shuttle/station.

For all of these reasons, then, we should prohibit the use of any funds for design and definition of the space shuttle/station—pending the completion of the sky lab missions, the solution of technical problems, and a complete examination of the proper balance between manned and unmanned flights in the space program of the future.

In the final analysis, I would hope that the decision will be made to cancel this project.

Let us be very clear about the implications of voting against the shuttle/station.

This is not a matter of sacrificing real scientific advantage. Our best space scientists have told us this program is an unnecessary luxury.

It is a matter of beginning the work of reordering our national priorities.

The Congress and the country simply cannot afford a new manned space extravaganza while the desperate needs of millions of Americans are still unmet.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four letters and two statements from distinguished scientists—Dr. Van Allen, Dr. Adey, and Dr. Gold, as well as another letter from Dr. Brian O'Leary, a former scientist-astronaut, who resigned from the space program because of his objections to the lack of scientific direction in the space program.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
Iowa City, Iowa, June 29, 1970.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to give you my views on the proposed space shuttle program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as outlined in testimony before the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the United States Senate on 20 and 27 February 1970.

During over 24 years of professional experience in space research, I have come to the considered view that automated, commandable space equipment provides a much more economical method than do manned systems for the conduct of both utilitarian and scientific missions. Nothing within the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs has changed my mind. On the contrary they have reinforced my stand in a massive way.

The current and proposed space shuttle studies are being conducted on a competent engineering basis and may very well demonstrate the technical feasibility of developing such a system for \$6,000,000,000 or thereabouts.

The real questions are, however, the following:

(a) Do manned systems possess any unique, useful capabilities in space that an unmanned system cannot be built to possess?

(b) Are manned systems at present or in the foreseeable future economically competitive for any specific purpose with automated, commandable systems?

(c) Can men operate alertly, intelligently, and healthfully for long periods of space flight?

I believe that the answers to Questions (a) and (b) are almost certainly "No". The answer to Question (c) is still unclear.

On these grounds I hold that large scale engineering studies looking toward the development of a space shuttle are not sufficiently well grounded in purpose or significance to justify a substantial commitment of national resources at this time.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. VAN ALLEN,
Head of Department.

STATEMENT BY DR. JAMES A. VAN ALLEN CONCERNING THE SPACE PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Within a period of some 15 years, space exploration has enriched human life immensely and has yielded technical advances of far-reaching importance. The United States and indeed the whole of civilization would be much the poorer without it.

Yet at this date, the temper of the times is such that the scope and character of the entire effort are under critical review. Thoughtful and sincere persons have widely different views on how we should go forward from this point.

I am a durable and devoted advocate of the space program of the United States. As such, I consider it of the utmost importance to devise a national program that is (a) soundly based in its purposes and (b) at such a level of effort as will be generally regarded as a stable and appropriate element of public policy. To be more specific, I am suggesting that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be placed in roughly the same context as the Atomic Energy Commission as a durable agency of the federal government.

NATURE OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

Isolated, spectacular achievements in space, inspiring as they have been during the past several years, are difficult if not impossible to sustain and form, at best, a fragile and elusive basis for long term effort.

There is ample room for imagination and brilliance in our future program, but solid competence and integrity of effort must be counted as the most vital ingredients.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge for the next decade:

(a) that we cease regarding the space flight of men as an objective for its own sake and

(b) that we organize and focus our efforts toward two, and, only two, objectives.

Both objectives are central to the post-industrial revolution in which modern civilization finds itself.

First. There are many applications of space technology which have immense utilitarian potential. Rapid and efficient radio communication with all of its ramifications is perhaps the most important. Satellite relay systems already have a significant role in routine transoceanic communications—both civil and military. It is reasonable to expect that within the next decade they can be expanded to convey basic education, as well as current information and cultural advancement, to hundreds of millions of persons, young and old, throughout the world. Aircraft traffic control and the processing of data by centralized computers are other significant applications of satellite relays.

Comprehensive and continuous study of the earth from orbiting observatories is a second major application of space tech-

nology. Meteorological satellites already have a vital role in weather forecast and in advancing our understanding of the dynamics of the earth's atmosphere. Broad-scale satellite surveys of the surface of the earth in analytical detail and from many different points of view are now getting underway. Within the next few years the power of these techniques will be assessed in an imaginative and critical way. There is ample reason to expect that they will be of great value for studying the surface and sub-surface flow of water, the health of forests and crops, the existence of mineral deposits, the nature of ocean currents, the presence of icebergs in sea lanes, and other matters of economic importance.

There is no visible alternative to an agency of the federal government for undertaking the basic development of all of the above mentioned applications of space technology.

Second. Space exploration has already produced a new era in the advancement of scientific knowledge. Through its own laboratories and through its diverse alliances with university and industrial laboratories, NASA has created a national scientific establishment that is the envy of every other nation. It is powerful and productive, yet flexible and diverse. My own belief is that the enlargement of man's perception of the physical universe and of his role therein should be and can be one of the solid components of the post-industrial revolution, as it was at a primitive level during the renaissance.

Science is sophisticated and subtle in its workings but its substance is deeply pervasive and it provides the solid footings for an infinite diversity of useful applications. Indeed, science is one of the central objectives of our vast national commitment to higher education.

Space science ranges over the entire universe from the earth as a scientific object, to the moon, to the sun, to the planets and the other components of our solar system, and outward to the most remote astronomical entities.

There is no doubt in my mind that from the perspective of a hundred years hence, our civilization will be, or at least can be, known as an era of unprecedented advancement of scientific knowledge.

I urge that space science be adopted explicitly and forthrightly as a national goal.

PRACTICALITIES

Even if one accepts everything that I have written above, there remain the practical questions of the appropriate scale and pace of the effort.

Here, I adopt an altogether pragmatic stand.

Space exploration is *experimental*. There is ample room for imaginative effort. But responsible public policy does not, at this stage of history, permit an all-out, money-is-no-object attack.

Every fresh result must be thoroughly assessed as a foundation for the next major step.

As a specific example, I am unable to envision the soundness of planning on the delivery into space of even as much as one ton of spacecraft per week during the next decade. In the context of my earlier discussion, my own assessment is considerably less.

Secondly, I am totally unpersuaded that men in spacecraft are important or even useful in any way that is commensurate with the effort required to maintain them there. In fact, their presence degrades almost all of the objectives in space that I consider important. And I hold this view despite the fact that I am a devoted admirer of astronauts at the level of personal courage and professional competence.

With these assessments in mind I come to several specific conclusions that are pertinent to the current season of congressional consideration:

(a) I fully support the on-going and proposed NASA program of space science and applications, in the spirit of my introductory remarks.

(b) I favor the phasing out of manned space flight during the next three years, after completion of the currently planned Apollo and Skylab A missions.

(c) I favor the indefinite deferral of major engineering studies of space shuttle and other space transportation systems which contemplate the establishment of manned space stations and other facilities of this nature.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 29, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: With Senate action now pending on the Space Shuttle, I submit for your consideration the following viewpoints as important in the determination of priorities in the space program in the coming decade. I write as a concerned biomedical scientist who has participated in the space program for the past ten years, both as an investigator in manned and unmanned flights, and as a member of committees and review bodies with an advisory role to both government and NASA.

Priorities in the space program since its inception have placed major emphasis on manned programs, with particular emphasis on the engineering aspects of needed hardware for reliable mission accomplishment. Although there can be no quarrel with the development of spacecraft engineering with reliability assured for manned flight, the price paid has been very high, so high that it appears to have been markedly detrimental to a balance between manned and unmanned space developments. Moreover, emphasis within the manned program has been on man as a test pilot in evaluation of engineering goals, rather than as a biological system himself, requiring the same careful long-term and detailed evaluation if the goal of long-term space flight is to be accomplished.

Biomedical information currently available is not adequate in critically important areas for the design or construction of space stations or interplanetary spacecraft. Specifically, we do not know whether it will be necessary to provide artificial gravity by some form of rotation of part or all of the spacecraft. Biomedical evidence from the U.S. manned program, and particularly from the recent U.S. monkey biosatellite flight, and from the Soviet Soyuz-9 manned flight, all indicate that there are significant problems of cardiovascular instability, body weight loss, and associated disturbances in daily body rhythms and certain nervous functions.

Yet to build spacecraft with a full artificial gravity as on earth, provided by rotation, predicates systems of very large dimensions for acceptable human comfort. Moreover, levels of gravity much less than 1 G may be adequate to prevent medical deterioration, and it is possible that drug and hormone therapy, properly developed, may greatly assist on long missions.

No adequate biomedical basis for these engineering systems is now available, either in the NASA or in the biomedical community. Therefore, it is imperative that NASA collect comprehensive biomedical data as an engineering baseline for design of future spacecraft for prolonged human occupancy.

It is here that there are grounds for concern. NASA has a long history of making commitments to biomedical investigations, which have been repeatedly reduced or even shelved in favor of mission goals of a primarily engineering character. The proposed medical studies in the Skylab missions were initially designed to overcome many deficiencies in the current status of space medicine and physiology. Every effort should be

made to safeguard the prime importance of the biomedical aspects of these missions.

In this context, development of a Space Shuttle should be reviewed in terms of its potential contribution to acquisition of needed biomedical information. Its use as an adjunct to physical and life science investigations should be evaluated against likely progress of biomedical research in the Skylab program in the absence of such a vehicle. Medical and psychological studies planned for Skylab will provide much needed information relevant to design of spacecraft for prolonged human occupancy. They are expected to settle many basic issues concerning needs for artificial gravity.

Therefore, it is submitted that the program for a Space Shuttle might well remain in the phase of fundamental research and feasibility studies, pending the outcome of medical investigations in the Skylab program. At the same time, avoiding commitment to heavy expenditure in this area would afford an excellent opportunity to redress the traditional imbalance between manned spaceflight programs and other more modest but highly important developments. These include fundamental space biology related to medical problems of man in space, and studies in the physical sciences in planetary programs, as well as in areas of the NASA Space Applications program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

W. ROSS ADEY, M.D.,
Director, Space Biology Laboratory.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N.Y., July 3, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This is to present briefly my views as to the future importance to exploration, science, and technological development of manned and unmanned, instrumented space flight.

1. The exploration and science of the planets is, in the foreseeable future, wholly in the hands of the unmanned instrumented space program.

The reason for this is that space flight by means of the presently known technology to the planet Mars will involve a round trip of more than 1½ years. This is so far removed from present day capabilities, and the uncertainties of prolonged manned space flight are so great, that no space program at the present time should be based on such a prospect. The suggestion that this prospect is a driving force behind the present space program has been made, but it is, in my view, irresponsible.

Planets other than Mars have circumstances that make a manned visit quite impracticable, and for the most part much longer travel times still would be involved. Asteroids and the satellites of the major planets are, it is true, no more inhospitable than the moon, but both because of their distance and the smaller intrinsic interest they have for us, the prospect for a manned visit is even smaller than for Mars.

On the other hand, complex remotely controlled instrumentation can be devised and is indeed being devised to perform almost all the actions in a remote location that a man could perform working under the constraints of space or Martian environment. One foresees a very successful period of instrumented discoveries in space, perhaps in the long run of great value to mankind.

2. Manned earth orbital flight is of very doubtful value for either science or applications. The prestige value, once no doubt very great, is by now very low also and will not be heightened very much by merely increasing the number of men or the size of the ship.

Many attempts have been made to find real uses for a group of men in earth orbital flight, but these have largely failed. Man in a spaceship is capable only of a rather limited and well-defined set of actions, and almost

in all cases remote control mechanisms can be provided whereby all the information that would be available to him is equally available to the man on the ground, and whereby the actions that he could have taken can equally be initiated by the man on the ground. The man on the ground has, so to speak, remote eyes and hands in the space vehicle.

It is my opinion that all scientific experiments proposed for earth orbit can be done both more cheaply and better with suitable instruments. Repair and updating of expensive instruments is the one area where the methods of remote control would have to be advanced the most before they would be superior to the presence of a man in the remote location. Economically this will not make a case for a large manned space flight program. In any case, the remote control can be improved to take over this activity also.

3. The Apollo program was devised firstly as a great demonstration of capability and secondly for the exploration of the moon. Once this decision was taken, there was no point in competing in the lunar exploration with remotely controlled instrumentation. There will be good reasons, however, in continuing the exploration of the moon by unmanned devices at the end of the Apollo program.

When the success of the first Apollo landing had been achieved and when the end of the program was in sight, the whole question of the justification for a large manned operation should have been reviewed. The inertia of a large organization is a poor reason for the continuation of a program. I am sure this view is shared by most of the scientific community and even by many people within NASA. The argument only has been that the availability of funds is so dependent on the popular appeal of manned flight that the alternatives were to do a job that is worth doing by uneconomical means or not at all. That of course is a situation which the Congress could rectify.

4. Money spent on manned and on unmanned space flight has totally different consequences for general technological evolution and the economy. A large fraction of the money spent on manned flight goes into devising very large vehicles and the environment required by man. Comparatively little of this technology is applicable in other fields.

Sophisticated instrumentation, complex electronics, computers and remote control devices appear now to be the major line of evolution of technology, an evolution that promises to improve greatly all of industry. The economic value of these advances will be immense, and the leadership of the United States in these areas is essential if the country is to remain the major economic and military power in the world. The space program has significantly contributed in the last ten years to this technological evolution, and a large instrumented space program would be a decisive factor in the future.

In the field of economically valuable applications no case has been made for manned flight. Communication satellites and, before very long, direct broadcasting and TV to the individual consumer would provide a very large political and economic stimulus for instrumented space technology. Meteorological satellites and other sensing systems from orbit will of course also improve, but almost certainly without any need for the presence of a man in orbit.

5. The biomedical problems of prolonged space flight are almost certainly severe. The fact that short duration flights have not incapacitated men seriously must not be taken to mean that very long duration flights will be safe. The indications are indeed that major problems do arise, and medical science cannot at the present time foresee their solution. From this point of view also it would be foolish to commit large sums to the development of space technology for long dura-

tion manned flights, which it may then not be possible to undertake.

I hope these remarks are helpful to you, and I would of course be happy to give you and your colleagues in Congress more details and substantially for them if this were desired.

Yours sincerely,
T. GOLD,
Director, Center for Radiophysics and
Space Research.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N.Y., September 29, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The development of science and technology is in deep trouble in this country as a result of the devastating cutbacks in Federal funding for such programs. The pre-eminence of our country in these fields is being challenged, and I believe that this will have serious consequences on our position in world affairs as well as on our economic and military strength. It is in this background that I think one should evaluate the present space program so see whether the very limited funds available will do the most to correct the situation.

There is no question that the space program in the past has done a lot to accelerate technology. The benefits from space mentioned in the report "For the benefit of all mankind" (Union Calendar Number 699) are for the major part quite genuine; the long and impressive list reflects the fact that money spent on advancing technology generally produces many benefits to industry, medical science, and indeed also to the proper control of the environment. There are, I think, unanswerable arguments that the country should spend a much larger proportion of its growing wealth on gaining new scientific and technological competence.

If, however, we are working with budgets in these areas which are quite inadequate, then we must at least direct the funds in the best possible way. It is here that the difference between manned and unmanned space activities is very great. Funds spent for manned flight have been spent for the construction of very large rockets, very large launch facilities, and on solving many of the problems of life support for man in the space circumstances. This part of the program is of little assistance to other space activities or to the general advancement of science and technology. There are of course some areas where the manned program has had important technological spinoffs, such as in the extreme quality control which was demanded there. However, in the field of unmanned spacecraft a much larger proportion of funds goes into the actual design of complex, sophisticated modern instruments. Less is spent on the mere extension of known techniques, like building very large concrete structures, very large machine shops, etc. More engineers are trained to do a modern type of engineering, and this has important benefits to industrial efficiency. New products are created that become economically important—the computer industry, for example, has benefited immensely from such developments.

The unmanned space program is more economical by far and can be more effective than a manned program in both scientific exploration and the economically advantageous applications of space technology. We have recently seen that sample return from the moon can be done unmanned. There is little question that the sample return from Mars and other planets will be achieved by unmanned means long before there is any serious question of manned flights to these bodies. Very important consequences for our understanding of the solar system and possibly of the origin of life will come from such sample return missions.

Similarly, in the applications program there is no case for the expense of manned flight. All tasks now contemplated can be done by

remotely controlled instruments much more economically.

The cancellation by NASA of two of the remaining Apollo missions is seen by many as a further case against embarking now on new manned programs. Here one seems to be unwilling to shoulder even the incremental expense of applying the expensively devised system to the task of exploration and discovery for which it was built; why then build yet another expensive system?

Now, after Apollo, NASA is anxious to develop a new institutional program for which it judges the country will be willing to find the funds. Large manned earth orbital enterprises were selected, not because of their merit, but because only manned exercises were thought to have the necessary popular appeal, and because nothing further than earth orbit can at the present time be seriously contemplated for manned missions.

No doubt man will one day fly to other planets, but when he does it will be by means of a technology much superior to the present. The earth orbital flights now being planned are insignificant in preparing for manned flights to other planets.

If a massive manned earth orbital program comes into being, I fear that the large costs will make it a focal point of antagonism to space, and indeed to all of science and technology. Unlike the case of the Apollo program, there will now be no scientific opinion standing behind it, no case will be made for the epoch-making advances, no sense of history will grip the imagination of the public. Instead the scientists will complain that the program is empty and meaningless and that it diverts funds from more significant work. No one can then maintain even a pretense of high purpose.

It is my principal concern that in that situation not only the ill-conceived manned program will suffer but that the result would be such an opposition to all that NASA stands for that the value of the programs that serve science, applications, national prestige and national self-esteem will all be abandoned. For all these reasons I think we should now make the decision to pursue the instrumented programs in space with great vigor and diligence, but not divert resources to further exercises and displays of manned flights. Such displays are no longer desired by the public, and there is no real purpose for them that can now be seen. If at a later date a case for manned space flight arises, it can be started up again with whatever improvements in the technology have by then taken place. Meanwhile, let us make progress along the lines that we can now clearly see, and let us not have our technology diverted by what are probably false estimates of the public's preoccupation with manned flight.

The proposed space shuttle may of course be a perfectly sensible approach if it is the cheapest way of putting the desired instrumentation into orbit. The case for the shuttle has, however, been argued largely on its being an instrument for large manned space stations. If it turns out that the shuttle is economically advantageous even without the manned stations, then the case for it should be made on those terms; if without the space stations the transportation requirements into orbit are very much too small to make the shuttle a viable concept, then it should be abandoned.

Yours sincerely,

T. GOLD,
Director.

STATEMENT OF DR. T. GOLD

I am enthusiastic about space—what it has to offer in knowledge—understanding the world we live in—and in applications such as improving communications, welding the world more closely together, and observations of the earth that inform us better of what nature has in store for us and of any

damage we may be doing to our earth. These matters ought, in my view, be pursued at high priority and with larger funds that are now available for them. The rewards in terms of knowledge, new capabilities and economically valuable technical advances will be great, and amply justify the expense.

Space, however, is no longer a showplace for mere demonstrations. The world has seen those and progressed to the next step—real performance.

Manned flights to the moon had a real purpose—voyages of great discovery. A return now to mere earth orbital flights with men, even in larger ships and longer flight times, cannot be justified. Manned flight to Mars is too far off yet—it will not be done with the means that we would now know how to develop. Testing whether man can endure long duration flight has no urgency.

At a time when science and technology is being damaged severely by the drastic curtailment of federal funding in these fields generally, we cannot afford to waste funds on manned flight exercises and demonstrations. It is clear that for all the science and applications unmanned, instrumented and remotely controlled flight is much cheaper and more effective. It also has by far the greater impact on the advancement of technology, dollar for dollar, spent in the two areas.

We are now not even willing to complete the remaining Apollo flights to the moon, for which the equipment is largely built. The extra expense of launching them is too great. Here there would be real purpose and the great prestige of understanding the nature of the solar system. If we cannot even fly out the remaining Apollo missions, what business have we to stay in manned flight at all? Why spend money on the development of another manned system, much less purposeful, namely the space station?

If the proposed Space Shuttle can be justified for the transportation to and from space of the many useful instrumented craft that will be flown, then, in my view, it should be pursued. This is a trucking system and should be justified as that. At present the NASA justification for it links it however with the Space Station proposal, and an expansion of the manned flight program. NASA needs a large program to support a large organization, and thinks that manned flight is the only area where it can get the required degree of support. I think they are wrong. The country is intelligent enough and anxious to see results, and manned flight excitement is no longer a driving force. For results there is no question that the instrumented route is far superior.

The Soviets have a large space program. While we clearly should not copy them, we must nevertheless see that we are not left behind in discovery and applications. If we fritter away our limited resources on unwanted further demonstrations of manned flights they may, with much smaller means, get way ahead in all the areas that really count.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,

Ithaca, N.Y., October 16, 1970.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: As a former scientist-astronaut with NASA, I would like to add my concurrence with your doubts about the usefulness of manned space flight. I agree that the space station and shuttle system are far too costly to start at this time.

An unmanned space program emphasizing applications satellites and the exploration of the planets would be both economical and fundamental in our quest for knowledge.

As you undoubtedly know, there are very strong vested interests in manned space flight in NASA which have effectively cut off debate on future priorities in space.

I am happy to see you speak out on the issue and would be glad to assist you in your efforts at any time.

Sincerely,

BRIAN O'LEARY,
Assistant Professor of Astronomy and
Space Sciences.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, all of these scientists—and they represent the independent scientists not under the control of NASA or space-related industry—strongly and clearly argue for a rapid reorientation of the space program, away from space extravaganzas, to sophisticated, highly scientific, instrumental experiments returning high scientific yields.

The significance of that decision for us, in reordering our priorities for better scientific return, are enormous; and all of the arguments are on the side of rejecting this space shuttle station before it gets out of hand.

Dr. Van Allen of the University of Iowa, who I think everyone will concede is one of the Nation's most eminent space scientists, estimates that a full-fledged, sophisticated unmanned instrumented space effort could be undertaken for \$2 billion a year; but if we move off into the manned space flight program now endorsed by NASA, the space budget will rise to almost \$7 billion a year by the end of this decade—according to NASA's own estimates—and we will receive less by way of scientific yield than we would receive for the \$2 billion.

What is happening, in my opinion, is that the space industry and NASA has withheld this project until completion of the Apollo program; now it wants something else to do, and all it will cost is \$20 billion, and that is all they are asking.

I can understand their problem, but the people of this country have problems, too. Congress has a problem, and we had better start dealing with the people's problems pretty soon. We had better start letting these scientists and engineers use their genius to start helping us solve those problems before our problems overwhelm us.

There is no area that I know of where we can reorient our priorities and obtain a higher yield for science than this; and I hope the Senate will agree to our amendment to strike this \$110 million.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. As the Senator knows, I am a cosponsor of this proposal. I do not pretend to understand as much about the space satellite program as the Senator from Minnesota, but I do know about the need for reordering our national priorities, and reassessing the value of the space program with a seemingly regard for our other national requirements. Because of that, I join with the Senator in believing that this effort needs to be slowed down.

There is no rush about it. We will get to Mars a little bit later. Indeed, we may be able to do it in cooperation with the Soviet Union. There is no need to duplicate this expensive and meaningless race. Competition for what? We can share the joy of reaching outer space together.

I hope Senators will have clearly in mind, in voting on the proposed motion to table, that this is an amendment to

save money, not to spend it. I hope the Senate may see its way clear to endorse a philosophy which says, "Sure, we want space, we want the SST, we want lots of things, but they must be done with a seemly regard for the deep troubles this country is facing now, and that means phasing them in more slowly than the amount of steam involved in an appropriation of this size would indicate."

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from New York for those most useful and helpful comments.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York commending the Senator from Minnesota on his fine speech and on this amendment. The Senator from Minnesota has served on the Space Committee, and knows this subject thoroughly.

I am particularly enthusiastic about the pending amendment, Mr. President, because I think it goes right to the heart of the principal problem before Congress, which is the reordering of our priorities. The Senator particularly emphasized the ultimate cost of this shuttle-lab program. As I understand, it would be \$14 billion, \$14 thousand million, is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. That is what NASA suggests. Their original estimate on the shuttle alone has already gone up almost 70 percent. And if the average overrun costs that we have seen elsewhere in the space program occurs here, it could well be \$20 or \$30 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think it is important to reconsider what that money would buy in terms of being able to combat pollution, being able to overcome poverty, helping with housing which is so desperately and urgently needed in our cities, education, and manpower training, and in so many other areas in which the need is so desperate.

We all must be aware of the terrific plight of our cities, and the fact that, for example, in New York City the other day several hundred city employees were laid off, and in city after city the most basic needs and services are not being provided for the people, because taxes are so high and because the Federal Government obviously has not sufficient money to provide the kind of assistance that is needed.

Mr. President, if this were a program that had some other benefit, such as a military benefit, a national prestige competitive benefit, or otherwise, it might be different. But after putting a man on the moon, how impressed are people going to be by the fact that we have some kind of platform going around the earth, with two or three, four or five, six or eight, or 100 people on it? What is the point?

Mr. MONDALE. As Dr. Gold has characterized it as a bigger tin can. Where we are being challenged and where the space agency is not responding, and where the scientists have been most critical, is in the unmanned space field. The Russians have been on the moon with some highly sophisticated, unmanned instrumented mobile units. They are moving ahead in that field because

our space agency, though spending far more money, has been so preoccupied with these space extravaganzas that the scientific implications of their decisions have taken a back seat. That is why so many scientists have quit the space program, and why so many independent scientists like Van Allen, Gold, and Adey have been so critical.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator from Minnesota tell me how much has been spent by the space agency in the past on this particular program? Does he have figures on that?

Mr. MONDALE. Approximately \$18.5 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They are asking for what?

Mr. MONDALE. They are asking for \$110 million to harden the design. There is another \$80 million—even if we strike out the \$110 million—in the bill for basic research.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not know how to get the attention of the Senate and of our colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I simply cannot believe Senators would vote to spend this huge sum if they understood it. This is the time to act on this program. This is the time when we must decide whether or not we are going to go ahead with manned exploration of space.

The Senator from Minnesota has said this several times, but I do not know how we can get the attention of Senators focused upon it. If we go ahead with manned exploration of space, it will mean we are going to have to spend \$6 to \$9 billion a year within 4 to 6 years.

Mr. MONDALE. They are projecting—

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the other hand, if we remain with instrumented exploration of space, then the expenditures will be from \$2 to \$2.5 billion a year. The saving is between \$5 and \$6 billion a year. This is the kind of decision we are making here today.

If we go ahead today and appropriate \$110 million on top of the \$18 or \$20 million already spent, it will be argued, "You have already started this program; you have the money in the poker pot; if you do not go ahead, you will lose it all"—exactly the same argument made on the SST, and exactly the argument we have heard over and over again on these projects.

This is the time to make the decision. The Senator from Minnesota has made this point extremely clear: That it is hard to find a scientist, except those working directly for the Space Agency, who will argue that we will be able to get more in terms of scientific knowledge by manned exploration than we can obtain by unmanned exploration; and of course, we should also be very much aware of what almost happened to Apollo 13. If we were to confine ourselves for the next few years, at least, to unmanned instrumented exploration, it would mean that we would not have the risk of the terrible tragedy of the loss of life. It would mean we would save billions of dollars a year, and could take the necessary action with respect to providing

basic services to the American people that they deserve and should have.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, could I make two points to the Senator? First, the ironic fact about this project is that we are designing a space station to undertake a mission which we do not know is physically possible—that is, long duration manned flight. Every experience we have had—for example, with the monkey in the biosatellites program—and that which the Russians had with Soyuz-9, where they had a long duration flight, has underlined the expressions of concern by doctors that there are biological problems in long-term manned space flight that could be fatal. The monkey died.

We have in line a projected skylab experiment—which will be completed in 1973—to determine whether long-term manned flight is possible. So why are we running ahead now with hundreds of millions of dollars to design a program to do something that may not be possible? What is the rush? I cannot understand it. If ever there was a good place to save money and not hurt anybody, this is it.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was struck by something the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said earlier. I think all Senators need to recognize that the same kind of shortfall in Federal revenue, because of the slowdown in the Federal economy, is being felt increasingly severely by the cities. I believe that Senators and Congress can expect that America's cities this coming spring are going to come to Congress, in emergency tones, talking to us about the need for massive help to bail them out.

The city of Newark, for example, has projected a budget deficit which approximates 40 percent of their entire operating budget for next year. The city of New York, for example, already has laid off personnel and has put into effect personnel freezes. We are going to be called upon to help bail out these cities.

The Senator from Minnesota is again making a courageous fight to try to help get these priorities in line so that on those and other pressing problems we can be in a better position to try to respond.

If the Senator will yield further, I want to relate one instance to the Senate from my own personal experience which I think is very much involved here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. The other day, my wife and I were in the little town of Sallisaw, Okla. We went to visit in the home of a young couple approximately 25 years of age. They have one small son who I believe is 4 or 5 years old. He is a beautiful child and appears to be in the best of health.

In the course of our conversation with that young couple, the wife said to us that she had become involved in an organization called Human Growth, Inc. We asked, "What is Human Growth, Inc.?" It is a private foundation which seeks to

do something about people who have a defect in the pituitary gland, which governs human growth.

I said, "How did you get involved in that?"

She said, "This boy of ours"—who was in the kitchen of the home—"has a defect in the pituitary gland. He has no chance to live to adulthood and be fully free from mental retardation unless some breakthrough can be made in the field of research in the pituitary gland. Last year, for the first time, we had some help, because the Government, under the National Institutes of Health, began a research program which spent \$40,000, that is all, for the entire United States, for research in this subject."

She said, "All last year, we drove every so often"—I think she said once every 2 weeks—"to Dallas, Tex., about 250 miles. This year the entire research project is cut out."

There is no research at all. That \$40,000 project is ended.

Talk to that young couple about priorities—and that is what is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, included within the independent offices-HUD appropriations bill are funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We live in a much too fast moving era when accomplishments of yesterday are almost overwhelmed in the problems of today and almost lost in the promises of tomorrow. I do not think it is necessary for me to recount the achievements made by our civilian space agency during the past 20 years—achievements which all of us here and throughout the entire Nation recount with pride. From the successful launching of Explorer I to manned exploration of the moon, the tremendous economic and social growth of the United States have paralleled the accomplishments of our space pioneers.

Mr. President, neither is it necessary for me to point out the gains to our way of life because of our space program. These reach all the way from instant video and audio communications from any point on this earth because of our satellites, to teflon-coated cooking utensils in our homes and resources exploration and pollution detection of our planet.

We have now gone through the initial period of exploration and discovery in space and are on the brink of great returns.

The argument has been made that if this amendment is not adopted, it will lead to a fast escalating space program, but the very reverse of that is true.

I call attention to the committee report, on page 9, which shows that the 1970 appropriation to NASA was \$3.749 billion, that the budget request for the present fiscal year, 1971, was \$3.333 billion, a reduction of more than \$400 million, and that the bill as it comes to us from the committee is only for \$3.268 billion.

Mr. President, just as I supported the committee in voting to lay on the table the amendment offered by the distin-

guished Senator from Arkansas, so do I oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

During the 5 months since the NASA budget first came before the Senate, significant additional information has been obtained about the benefits to be derived from the reusable space shuttle, which is the matter under consideration at this time. Program planners have known for some time that the use of this vehicle 100 times or more will lead to substantial reductions in the cost of space transportation. The cost of placing a pound in orbit and returning it back to earth will be reduced by more than a factor of 10—from \$1,000 a pound for the present one-way trip to about \$100 a pound to orbit and back to earth.

Now, economic studies have determined that even greater savings will result in the cost of producing and testing the spacecraft themselves, which will be the shuttle's cargo.

The greatest savings will be in unmanned satellites, which now cost generally between \$12,000 and \$20,000 a pound. Some are even more expensive. The high present costs result from the need for extensive miniaturization and testing. The machinery within a satellite is much more delicate than that in a fine watch. It must be tested and retested to be sure that nothing will fail to operate properly after it is in orbit.

With the reusable space shuttle, both of these problems will be solved. The shuttle will have as much space and weight-carrying capacity as a large cargo airplane. Thus it will be able to carry less expensive equipment, like that used on earth. Standard, low-cost parts and components will be in general use.

The shuttle will be able to bring satellites back to earth as easily as it puts them into orbit. Thus the costs will be reduced by planning on the reuse of satellites and space flight equipment. Should anything malfunction in space, it will be returned to earth for adjustment, repair, refurbishment, or replacement. And in many cases, scientists or technicians will be able to go into space via the shuttle to adjust and operate the instruments, just as they now do in aircraft.

The space shuttle will be the only capability for manned space flight after 1973 when the earth-orbital skylab experimental space station program will be completed. Without a shuttle, there will be no more U.S. manned space flights after 1973. Even with a shuttle, there will be a gap in manned space flights from 1974 through at least 1977.

Termination of U.S. manned space flight activities by a conscious decision or by failure to provide adequate support to continue a balanced total program would mean—besides the loss of the benefits to science, technology, exploration and practical applications—that for the indefinite future the Soviets would have manned operations in space as their exclusive domain. There is no doubt that the U.S.S.R. is pursuing manned space flight as a continuing major objective to which they are applying very substantial resources.

NASA studies of shuttle benefits are quite conservative. For example, they do not assume the great expansion of space flight applications that can be predicted

from these sharply reduced costs. They do not anticipate the growth envisioned by many scientists in communications, weather and earth observation satellites, or scientific studies of the earth and its environment. Nor do they presume any expansion to meet the needs of other agencies of the U.S. Government, commercial interests, or foreign agencies.

The space shuttle program is now in its second phase of definition studies. The schedule calls for completion of these studies next spring. Thus we will have the opportunity at that time to review the matter of proceeding into the third phase of detailed design.

The definition studies will provide firm estimates as to the cost of developing the space shuttle. This is a program with great promise. But until the studies are completed, no commitments are being requested and none need be made by Congress.

Mr. President, I have been an advocate of leveling off our space activities from the crash programs of the past to a more stable program accommodating the national budget and national priorities.

The NASA appropriations contained in the independent offices-HUD appropriations bill will give us this stability and will enable us to build our future space program on the solid foundations of past discovery and technological achievement.

I believe that it is in the best interests of our country that the NASA appropriations be approved without further reduction.

Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island offers a motion to table, the junior Senator from Alabama will be pleased to support it.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I once again rise in support of the proposed fiscal year 1971 NASA appropriations and to oppose strongly the attempt to delete money for the space shuttle, or any other segment of the space program from the already austere NASA portion of this independent offices appropriations bill.

It is my view that the space program is a tremendous national resource, which we must continue to use to full advantage. The committee recommendation of \$3,268,675,000 is the absolute minimum amount necessary to retain the technical team and facilities we must have for an admittedly low key, but viable space program in the next decade. Any further reduction of funds would be to put a crippling stranglehold on the program for the 1970's.

The new space program currently under consideration is modest, but forward looking in scope, and conservative in its funding. One item which promises great economies is the development of the reusable earth-to-orbit space shuttle.

The space shuttle is the first element of the future integrated space program that will significantly slash the cost of putting payloads into earth orbit and the key to the major economy of the space

shuttle is that it can be flown over and over again. It is fully reusable and unexpedient.

With successful shuttle operations, our inventory of rocket and spacecraft models would be significantly reduced. That is to say, the need for most existing launch vehicles would be eliminated.

Designed for 100 or more missions, the space shuttle will be an integral system of other space programs. It will provide logistic support for the space station and will transport passengers back and forth to the station in addition to providing a viable space rescue system. It will be available on short notice for Department of Defense use, should the need ever arise. With the shuttle for transport, technicians will be able to reach automated satellites and probes to repair, maintain, refuel, and refurbish them, or to reposition or retrieve them for return to earth. The shuttle will effectively bring together manned and unmanned programs on a rational basis.

The space shuttle will capitalize on available technology developed during the past decade. Rocket fuel development and production knowhow, spacecraft experience and Department of Defense research efforts will provide the basic building blocks of shuttle development.

In addition, since the space shuttle mates the airplane and the rocket, development of the shuttle will take advantage of the best features of both. It becomes apparent that a high level of technology transfer will occur since the shuttle will stimulate aeronautics research and vice versa.

Because of its universal applicability, the shuttle may very well provide the first real opportunity for international cooperation in manned flight. Other nations might utilize a United States shuttle to carry their payloads or transport their personnel to a space station. Ultimately, commercial uses will be found for the shuttle. Nations may desire to operate their own shuttles just as foreign airlines own and operate U.S. developed commercial aircraft.

I believe that there is one point that every Member of the Congress is in agreement on—both the development costs and the operational costs of space transportation must be minimized. It seems apparent to me that the fully reusable space shuttle is the system that will provide significant reductions in the cost of space operations.

Mr. President, we sometimes lose sight of the fact that our decision today can have a profound effect on whole sectors of the economy. The major reductions in the space program during the past 5 years have contributed to the serious problems now faced by the entire aerospace industry. Total aerospace employment at the end of this year will be more than 300,000 less than it was in 1968. As a consequence of this drastic cutback, thousands of highly trained professional and blue collar workers are now unemployed—many of them without any prospects for productive employment except at the most menial kinds of jobs. The Wall Street Journal several months ago told the story of a space scientist in California who is now reduced to peddling Eskimo pies and popsicles.

It is ironic that the campaign to reorder the Nation's priorities—ostensibly for the purpose of bringing about a more productive allocation of our resources to urgent national needs—is instead resulting in the gross underutilization of some of our most creative talent. Prolonged periods of unemployment and underemployment represent a substantial hardship for the families of such unemployed workers, of course, they bear the real burden of our shortsighted policies. But we as a nation are all losers when the labor services of highly trained workers are irretrievably lost through involuntary unemployment.

We stand to lose even more in the future if the current underutilization of our technical manpower is allowed to continue. There is a very real danger that in the future a new shortage of scientists, engineers, and technicians may arise, based upon growing disenchantment with the unstable nature of the labor market for such skills. Certainly the incentives for pursuing advanced training in technical subjects are being weakened by the knowledge of the current exceptionally high level of unemployment among scientists and engineers. If, as we may reasonably expect, the long-term supply of technical manpower begins to decline in response to the downgrading of high technology activities in the United States, the Nation will find it more difficult to react to the demands of a future military crisis, or to the need for major technical achievements.

From this perspective, some short-term manpower projections are especially alarming: A recent study of the aerospace industry shows that there are currently 35,000 unemployed scientists and engineers in the United States. More significant and more alarming is the outlook for increasing unemployment among this skill group. Projections show that this number could easily double by the end of fiscal year 1972 if positive corrective measures are not taken. If this is not done, the resulting unemployment of 70,000 scientists and engineers would represent a tragic underutilization of our technical resources—and these resources, I suggest, are an essential ingredient of the long-term strategic and economic position of the United States.

It would also mean that the costs of the current economic transition are falling to a disproportionate degree upon a particular segment of the population. Such a high unemployment level would result in an incidence of unemployment for scientists and engineers twice that of the experienced wage-earning population. This situation cannot help but have a depressing effect on the long-range supply of technically trained manpower in the United States. How can we urge youngsters to pursue a scientific career in the face of such statistics?

We must consider also, the long-term consequences of our actions. During the past 5 years, total NASA expenditures have been reduced by more than 50 percent. In real terms, total employment on NASA programs has declined from 420,000 in early 1966 to a current level of less than 160,000. The drastic nature of this cutback is widely known. A more important point in terms of present economic

conditions is that while the early reductions in NASA programs were diffused throughout the economy, recent reductions have been concentrated in terms of companies, localities, and industries.

As these employment reductions have become more sharply focused, the problems of absorbing workers displaced by the cutback have become increasingly more difficult. The absorption problem has been compounded by the concurrent cutbacks in Defense programs and the slowing down of the general economy. During the past fiscal year, very few NASA contractors have been able to compensate for NASA cutbacks by shifting displaced workers to other company business. During this period, 97 layoffs resulted from every 100 reductions in NASA-related employment at the most seriously impacted NASA contractor plants.

We must address this issue squarely. Further reductions in NASA appropriations can only serve to aggravate an already serious unemployment problem. Whatever short-term savings may appear to be gained from further reductions in space program funding are surely outweighed by the creation of greater unemployment in the aerospace industry.

It is a false economy to deliberately idle productively employed workers at a time when they have no real opportunities for alternative employment. Nothing positive can result from such an action.

Mr. President, over the past years opponents of the space program have urged in support of their efforts to cut the program to the need to solve our problems here on earth. We were told that all of our social needs have been neglected because the United States is spending too much on the space program. "Put space dollars into antipoverty programs," their argument goes, "and poverty will be eliminated; cut back on the exploration of our universe and low-cost housing will spring up all across America."

Mr. President, this simply does not make sense. The facts do not support the rhetoric, and I agree wholeheartedly that it is our duty and responsibility in Congress to reorder our national priorities. And I think we are on that road, and it is good that we are. But let us look at the facts.

First of all, the space program is a productive program and the investment we have made has multiplied and benefited the whole national economy. In a country whose gross national product is more than \$900 billion, the space program has, over the last decade, cost us, in dollar investments, less than one-half of 1 percent of our GNP. But that investment has directly resulted in increasing the gross national product. Economists estimate that approximately 50 percent of the real growth in the gross national product in the last decade can be attributed to the stimulus of new technological knowledge from research and development investments. Twenty-five percent of the Nation's total expenditures on research and development was carried out under our space program.

Second, the facts show that as the national budget has risen, NASA's budget has gone down—and gone down

severely. In the past 6 fiscal years, the total budgetary outlays of the Federal Government have increased by nearly 50 percent. In the same period, NASA outlays have decreased by nearly 43 percent.

To put it in dollars, total Federal Government outlays rose from \$134,652,000,000 in fiscal year 1966 to an estimated

\$200,771,000,000 in fiscal year 1971, an increase of 49 percent. In the same period, NASA's outlays declined from \$5,933,000,000 in fiscal year 1966 to an estimated \$3,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1971, a decrease of 42.7 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the analysis—the facts—to which I refer,

entitled "Analysis of Federal Government Outlays by Selected Functional Groupings," prepared from information on pages 66-68 in the Budget Bureau document, "The Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year 1971."

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

ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OUTLAYS BY SELECTED FUNCTIONAL GROUPINGS

[In millions of dollars]

Functional groupings	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	Difference 1966 to 1971	
							Dollars	Percent
National defense (DOD, AEC).....	56,785	70,081	80,517	81,240	79,432	73,583	+16,798	+29.6
Space research and technology (NASA).....	5,933	5,423	4,721	4,247	3,750	3,400	-2,533	-42.7
Social actions (Community developments and housing, education and manpower, health, income security).....	38,461	46,353	54,495	57,881	67,681	77,251	+38,790	+100.9
All other (International affairs, agriculture, commerce, veterans benefits, interests, etc.).....	33,473	36,397	39,000	41,188	47,022	46,537	+13,064	+39.0
Total, Federal Government.....	134,652	158,254	178,833	184,556	197,885	200,771	+66,119	+49.1

Source: The Budget in Brief—Fiscal year 1971, pp. 66-68.

BUDGET OUTLAYS BY SUBFUNCTION, 1960-71

[In millions of dollars]

Function and subfunction	Actual										Estimate	
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
National defense:												
Department of Defense—Military:												
Military personnel (including retired personnel).....	11,738	12,085	13,032	13,000	14,195	14,771	16,753	19,787	21,954	23,818	25,158	24,104
Operation and maintenance.....	10,223	10,611	11,594	11,874	11,932	12,349	14,710	19,000	20,578	22,227	21,500	19,650
Procurement.....	13,334	13,095	14,532	16,632	15,351	11,839	14,339	19,012	23,233	23,988	21,550	18,799
Research and development.....	4,710	6,131	6,319	6,376	7,021	6,236	6,299	7,160	7,747	7,457	7,300	7,382
Military construction and other.....	1,750	1,606	1,602	513	1,236	928	2,279	2,636	3,975	525	1,139	1,421
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-275	-236	-163	-251	-159	-150	-160	-138	-154	-135	-140	-163
Subtotal, Department of Defense—Military ¹	41,479	43,292	46,916	48,143	49,577	45,973	54,178	67,457	77,373	77,877	76,505	71,191
Atomic energy ¹	2,623	2,713	2,806	2,758	2,764	2,625	2,403	2,264	2,456	2,450	2,461	2,411
Military assistance ¹	1,631	1,351	1,337	1,406	1,209	1,125	1,003	858	554	789	495	600
Defense-related activities.....	244	104	92	24	172	136	-62	-17	139	250	119	-51
Deductions for offsetting receipts ²	-69	-80	-53	-74	-130	-281	-738	-481	-116	-138	-150	-572
Total national defense.....	45,908	47,381	51,097	52,257	53,591	49,578	56,785	70,081	80,517	81,240	79,432	73,583
International affairs and financing:												
Economic and financial assistance.....	1,391	1,877	2,325	1,968	1,756	2,041	2,329	3,057	3,053	2,420	2,746	2,357
Food for peace.....	1,458	1,823	1,947	2,040	2,049	1,852	1,784	1,452	1,204	975	971	852
Conduct of foreign affairs.....	214	216	248	346	296	347	315	336	354	371	396	412
Foreign information and exchange activities.....	137	158	197	201	207	223	227	245	253	237	237	241
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-146	-716	-226	-441	-191	-123	-165	-542	-245	-217	-237	-273
Total international affairs and finance.....	3,054	3,357	4,492	4,115	4,117	4,340	4,490	4,547	4,619	3,785	4,113	3,589
Space research and technology:												
Manned space flight.....	113	279	565	1,516	2,768	3,538	4,210	3,649	3,095	2,781	2,335	1,937
Space science and application.....	133	249	420	576	754	751	778	795	700	569	634	612
Space technology.....	52	87	159	303	432	484	435	440	410	344	337	306
Aircraft technology.....	72	51	31	36	40	58	75	89	128	168	180	184
Supporting space activities.....	30	79	82	122	178	262	435	452	390	390	387	375
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-*	-*	-*	-*	-1	-2	-1	-2	-3	-6	-5	-15
Total space research and technology.....	401	744	1,257	2,552	4,170	5,091	5,933	5,423	4,721	4,247	3,885	3,400
Agriculture and rural development:												
Farm income stabilization.....	2,383	2,343	3,143	4,060	4,134	3,667	2,536	3,167	4,542	5,000	4,485	4,457
Agricultural land and water resources.....	324	347	368	324	325	342	347	353	351	343	344	317
Rural housing and public facilities.....	333	335	291	375	326	354	309	330	474	318	830	-176
Research and other agricultural services.....	312	344	363	415	441	485	531	570	618	645	725	799
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-29	-30	-42	-36	-42	-42	-44	-44	-42	-85	-43	-41
Total agriculture and rural development.....	3,322	3,340	4,123	5,139	5,185	4,807	3,579	4,375	5,943	6,221	6,343	5,354
Natural resources:												
Water resources and power.....	1,241	1,395	1,578	1,718	1,798	1,867	2,061	2,158	2,251	2,256	2,325	2,943
Land management.....	305	428	382	422	459	509	556	618	639	643	746	771
Recreational resources.....	125	146	151	180	202	215	241	285	331	372	447	546
Mineral resources.....	30	28	30	25	46	59	62	73	71	71	116	110
Other natural resources programs.....	66	71	84	94	104	119	131	136	154	160	178	183
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-748	-501	-539	-934	-637	-706	-1,016	-1,412	-1,758	-1,373	-1,325	-2,048
Total natural resources.....	1,019	1,568	1,686	1,505	1,972	2,063	2,035	1,860	1,702	2,129	2,485	2,503
Commerce and transportation:												
Ground transportation.....	2,984	2,656	2,817	3,057	3,686	4,092	4,043	4,093	4,367	4,413	4,810	4,881
Air transportation.....	568	716	781	808	835	875	879	945	951	1,042	1,290	1,668
Water transportation.....	509	569	654	672	658	728	708	765	844	864	919	938
Area and regional development.....	120	188	132	242	538	557	315	318	472	584	717	710
Postal service.....	525	914	797	770	578	805	888	1,141	1,080	920	1,247	382
Advancement and regulation of business.....	193	194	350	294	309	463	409	407	493	206	597	425
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-125	-189	-123	-99	-123	-156	-107	-115	-159	-157	-144	-217
Total commerce and transportation.....	4,774	5,048	5,408	5,743	6,482	7,364	7,135	7,554	8,047	7,873	9,436	8,785
Community development and housing:												
Low- and moderate-income housing aids.....	145	155	170	198	37	81	391	478	948	871	1,153	1,499
Community environment.....	105	145	227	173	240	331	385	465	486	632	1,122	1,173
Community facilities.....	18	15	27	36	51	46	38	74	106	146	200	237
Concentrated community development.....						51	302	452	648	684	960	1,242

BUDGET OUTLAYS BY SUBFUNCTION, 1960-71—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Function and subfunction	Actual										Estimate	
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Community planning and administration.....	-72	-79	11	24	29	32	16	33	37	47	82	95
Maintenance of the housing mortgage market.....	787	-36	169	-1,289	-511	-237	1,545	1,133	1,863	-406	-469	-454
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-11	-9	-16	-22	-31	-16	-13	-19	-12	-13	*	*
Total community development and housing.....	971	191	589	-880	-185	288	2,544	2,616	4,076	1,961	3,046	3,781
Education and manpower:												
Elementary and secondary education.....	397	417	429	527	566	645	1,804	2,439	2,595	2,480	2,668	2,710
Higher education.....	272	291	357	419	383	414	705	1,159	1,393	1,230	1,395	1,449
Science education and basic research.....	120	143	183	206	310	309	368	415	449	490	490	490
Vocational education.....	39	40	40	41	41	132	136	250	265	262	266	329
Other education aids.....	58	76	98	98	110	158	155	264	334	373	434	411
Manpower training.....	4	4	12	64	122	342	731	940	1,263	1,193	1,368	1,720
Other manpower aids.....	399	530	617	380	501	541	634	678	729	810	929	1,034
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-3	-4	-4	-5	-5	-9	-11	-11	-16	-13	-13	-14
Total education and manpower.....	1,286	1,499	1,732	1,732	2,028	2,533	4,523	6,135	7,012	6,825	7,533	8,129
Health:												
Providing or financing medical services.....	146	157	264	318	386	476	1,094	4,866	7,455	9,315	10,582	12,106
Development of health resources.....	554	642	786	949	1,170	1,039	1,212	1,556	1,826	1,918	2,142	2,235
Prevention and control of health problems.....	58	77	91	128	182	215	238	301	394	465	542	618
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-2	-2	-3	-3	-1	-1	-1	-2	-3	-2	-1	-1
Total health.....	756	873	1,139	1,393	1,737	1,730	2,543	6,721	9,672	11,696	13,265	14,957
Income security:												
Retirement and social insurance.....	15,597	18,467	19,474	21,249	21,958	22,282	25,298	27,068	29,293	32,240	37,106	41,895
Public assistance.....	2,293	2,385	2,604	2,909	3,085	3,119	3,151	3,180	3,296	4,272	5,381	7,035
Social and individual services.....	88	104	133	176	199	249	410	692	231	888	1,347	1,454
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-1	-2	-7	-479	-409	-196	-109	-59	-16	-1	-1	-1
Total income security.....	17,977	20,956	22,205	23,854	24,833	25,453	28,751	30,881	33,835	37,399	43,832	50,334
Veterans benefits and services:												
Income security.....	4,054	4,439	4,476	4,706	4,646	4,710	4,700	5,209	4,597	5,588	5,950	6,018
Hospital and medical care.....	963	1,032	1,085	1,147	1,231	1,271	1,320	1,393	1,472	1,586	1,787	1,796
Education, training, and rehabilitation.....	531	415	159	101	77	58	54	305	478	701	1,000	1,206
Housing.....	206	152	236	-109	44	*	169	304	210	102	162	-315
Other veterans benefits and services.....	187	187	180	176	185	179	196	195	218	237	266	269
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-514	-537	-511	-501	-502	-497	-518	-509	-492	-493	-484	-498
Total veterans benefits and services.....	5,426	5,688	5,625	5,520	5,681	5,722	5,920	6,897	6,882	7,640	8,681	8,475
General government:												
Central fiscal operations.....	573	622	668	733	808	844	886	968	1,024	1,094	1,257	1,345
Law enforcement and justice.....	263	289	300	323	335	366	385	426	452	534	772	1,027
General property and records management.....	351	356	355	416	553	565	550	617	569	567	631	632
Legislative and judicial functions.....	158	170	192	194	192	218	238	254	274	302	364	377
National Capital region.....	30	50	73	70	58	61	73	84	104	162	256	414
Central personnel management.....	82	92	106	110	110	107	107	116	140	146	166	184
Executive direction and other general government.....	108	131	158	160	211	213	216	243	270	299	426	360
Deductions for offsetting receipts.....	-238	-220	-204	-196	-226	-165	-162	-199	-272	-238	-253	-255
Total general government.....	1,327	1,491	1,650	1,810	2,040	2,210	2,292	2,510	2,561	2,866	3,620	4,084
Interest.....	8,299	8,108	8,321	9,215	9,810	10,357	11,285	12,588	13,744	15,791	17,821	17,799
Allowances.....											475	2,575
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions.....	-2,297	-2,449	-2,513	-2,644	-2,877	-3,109	-3,364	-3,936	-4,499	-5,117	-6,088	-6,639
Total outlays.....	92,223	97,795	106,813	111,311	118,584	118,430	134,652	158,254	171,833	184,556	197,885	200,771

* Entries net of offsetting receipts.

* Less than \$500,000.

* Excludes offsetting receipts which have been distributed by subfunction above.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, It is worth noting that in this same 6-year period outlays for national defense—Department of Defense and Atomic Energy Commission—went up 29.6 percent. Expenditures for the "all other" category likewise showed an increase—of 39 percent. This category includes international affairs, agriculture, commerce, veterans benefits, interest, and so forth. But the most interesting revelation of all is the trend of social action programs of the Government, which include community development and housing, education and manpower, health, and income security. In the 6-year period, outlays for these social action programs increased 100.9 percent. Does a 101-percent increase reflect neglect of social programs? If so, what can we say of a 43-percent decrease in a program that is already returning practical benefits to mankind and has the potential of many, many more?

Mr. President, let us examine some more of the rhetoric used by those who would dismantle the space program. Let us take their premise that space dollars

turned into antipoverty dollars, or housing dollars, or health dollars, or welfare dollars will constitute a real shot in the arm to these programs.

Again, let us turn to analysis instead of emotion. First, there is no guarantee that if you take money away from NASA it will automatically find its way into the budget of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or the Office of Economic Opportunity, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; or the Department of the Interior or Agriculture, or whatever.

But assume the NASA's estimated outlays of \$3,400,000,000 were taken away and divided equally among the three other main functional groupings of agencies. Social action programs would get an increase of 1.5 percent over their projected outlays of \$77 billion for fiscal year 1971; national defense an increase of 1.5 percent, and "all others" an increase of 2.4 percent. If you want to assume that all of NASA's \$3.4 billion were applied to social action programs, that projected outlay of \$77 billion would rise by an

"overwhelming" 4.4 percent. But again, there is no guarantee that money taken from NASA will go for social action.

Mr. President, the increase in social action programs in the last 6 years—just the increase—totals \$38,790,000,000. That is roughly equivalent to the total cost of NASA in its entire history.

Last April the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences held important hearings on the benefits of the space program. It is inconceivable to me that anyone who has read the record of these hearings—and reflected on the solid, tangible benefits here on earth which have resulted from our investment in "Space"—would seriously contend that we would have been better off as a nation if we had turned our back on space and "first solved our problems here on earth."

Mr. President, those who argue in favor of cuts in space funding fail, in my view, to recognize a fundamental distinction: between social programs whose principal purpose is to distribute this Nation's wealth and programs such as the space program which ultimately

create national wealth and capabilities. These latter programs are investments in the future; they lead to advances in science and technology—the keystones to our basic strength as a nation.

The single target of the last decade in space was the manned lunar landing. The accomplishment of this feat demonstrated what Americans, as a people, can accomplish when they have the will—when the national leadership and the public are united to achieve a desirable goal.

The space program of the seventies will, however, have no single climactic goal. If we permit it to continue, it will be a balanced and viable program composed of a reasonable schedule of space priorities. It will be a program responsive to opportunities presented by the remarkable new technology developed in the last decade. And equally important, it will be a program responsive to the limitation imposed by our Nation's many competing needs.

I daresay that very few Government programs are based on the type of long-range planning that characterize NASA's future space program. As we are all aware, we Americans are prone to react rather than act. Sputnik jolted us into the space age and we scrambled to get the first man to the moon. But now is the time for advance planning if we are to insure that our space endeavors do not stagnate—and that we do not waste the investments already made or that we do not deprive ourselves of the important knowledge we seek.

The "giant leap" into space was the beginning of an age of exploration that 50 years from now could make the solar system as accessible to our scientists as the earth is to us today. All that is needed is the courage and conviction to forge ahead.

The ability to set and achieve challenging goals is a prerequisite for the public confidence that is the cornerstone of any Government-sponsored program. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has amply demonstrated this ability in the past; and I am confident, will continue to demonstrate this ability in the future if we give NASA the wherewithal.

In summary, I suggest that in reordering priorities, we should not throw the baby out with the bath water. We must remain in the forefront of technological development; that is an obvious and necessary priority, one that we can abandon only at our peril.

Since the beginning of the industrial revolution, our Nation has used its competitive advantage developed through technology to maintain its world position in the marketplace. Our technology has not been narrow or parochial; it has also benefited mankind. Both in aeronautics and space flight development, NASA has contributed enormously to this advance of technology. This is one of the most important reasons for continuing to support an aggressive national space program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following material: A statement beginning, "Many of our most prominent space scientists argue that we should now reorient our space program toward un-

manned flights"; a list of scientists urging NASA to continue to fly Apollo missions to the moon; a statement beginning, "Dr. James Van Allen has estimated that a fully adequate unmanned space program would cost no more than \$2 billion a year"; a letter from Director Kinsey A. Anderson, dated October 14, 1970, to Dr. Homer E. Newell, Associate Administrator of NASA; a statement entitled, "Skylab Solar Astronomy"; a statement beginning, "Furthermore, scientists have pointed out that unmanned flights produced the most advantageous applications of space technology"; a statement beginning, "However, even if a new, ambitious manned space effort could be justified, it is premature to begin development of the shuttle/station now"; and a statement beginning, "Congress now has a unique opportunity to reorient the U.S. space program."

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

UNMANNED FLIGHTS IN OUR SPACE PROGRAM

"Many of our most prominent space scientists argue that we should now reorient our space program toward unmanned flights—which are far more economical than manned flights. Luna 16 and 17 have produced meaningful results for a fraction of the costs of our manned flight to the moon."

There are two points addressed in this paragraph, both of which need to be placed in perspective. First, Luna 16 and 17 certainly have produced meaningful results, but so did our Surveyors, which landed on the moon many years ago, and which together with our Lunar Orbiters literally revolutionized the study of the moon, by providing material for a comprehensive high resolution Atlas of both the near and far side of the moon, and by furnishing chemical and physical analyses of the lunar surface at a number of different spots. We could indeed have continued with these unmanned techniques for our lunar exploration program, but the potential of the manned approach so far outweighed that of the unmanned approach that after the initial unmanned investigations we chose to use the manned approach for further lunar research. The correctness of this choice is fully borne out by the results. The Apollo missions have to date returned 123 pounds of lunar material, compared to the Soviets three or four ounces. Moreover, the Apollo samples were carefully selected and documented by the astronauts' personal presence on the moon which permitted them to carefully select and document samples, to discover unexpected features, and to describe in great detail conditions on the moon even when different from what was anticipated in advance. In addition, the astronauts implanted on the lunar surface a variety of instruments which have since then continued to give us extremely valuable information on the seismic, magnetic, environmental, and orbital behavior of the moon. As a consequence the returns from the Apollo manned missions far outweigh those from the unmanned spacecraft on both the Soviet and U.S. sides. Thus, although it is true that the unmanned approaches are less expensive, the returns are also proportionately less.

This leads directly to the second point namely the question of the interest of space scientists in manned flight. While some space scientists argue strongly against continuation of the manned space flight program, there are equally prominent scientists who argue strenuously for the continuation of the manned flight program. NASA has received letters signed by a total of 45 space scientists urging NASA to continue to fly Apollo missions to the moon. A list of these 45 scientists is attached. So exciting and fundamental

have been the results from the Apollo program, and so fundamental are further results anticipated, that it is a matter of anguish to these scientists that NASA had to eliminate two of the Apollo flights from our planned program. The fact that some of the rocks and soil on the moon are a billion years older than any that can be found on the earth today, shows the moon to be our only presently available opportunity to investigate the early history of the solar system (including our own earth). Many scientists feel it to be extremely important that we bring to bear on this opportunity the most powerful capability available to us, namely the Apollo manned missions to the moon.

SCIENTISTS URGING NASA TO CONTINUE TO FLY APOLLO MISSIONS TO THE MOON

Dr. Isidore Adler, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. Edward Anders, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Dr. James R. Arnold, Department of Chemistry, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California.

Dr. Gustaf Arrhenius, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California.

Dr. H. W. Blodgett, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. Michael D. Bottino, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. T. E. Bunch, NASA, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California.

Dr. A. L. Burlingame, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Dr. George M. Comstock, General Electric Company, P.O. Box 8, Schenectady, New York.

Dr. Allan Cox, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Dr. Philip Cressy, Jr., NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. Samuel Epstein, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California.

Dr. Robert L. Fleischer, General Electric Company, P.O. Box 8, Schenectady, New York.

Dr. D. E. Gault, NASA, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California.

Dr. Subrata Ghose, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. Billy Glass, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. R. B. Hargraves, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Dr. Lincoln S. Hollister, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Dr. Patrick Hurler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Dr. I. R. Kaplan, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Dr. William M. Kaula, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Dr. Klaus Keil, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Dr. Truman P. Kohman, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Ursula B. Marvin, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Dr. Vance I. Oyama, NASA, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California.

Dr. John A. Philpotts, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. William H. Pinson, Jr., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Dr. Cyril Ponnampereuma, NASA, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California.

Dr. Martin Prinz, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Dr. John H. Reynolds, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Dr. A. E. Ringwood, The Lunar Science Institute, 3303 NASA Road 1, Houston, Texas.

Dr. R. Schmitt, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

Dr. Charles C. Schnetzler, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. William Schopf, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Dr. Leon T. Silver, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California.

Dr. G. K. Snetsinger, NASA, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California.

Dr. C. P. Sonnett, NASA, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California.

Dr. Hugh P. Taylor, Jr., California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California.

Dr. Jacob I. Trombka, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California.

Dr. Louis Walter, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Dr. G. J. Wasserburg, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California.

Dr. John T. Wasson, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Dr. George W. Wetherill, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Dr. John A. Wood, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, 60 Gordon Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

SOME \$2 BILLION A YEAR FOR OUR SPACE PROGRAM

"Dr. James Van Allen has estimated that a fully adequate unmanned space program would cost no more than \$2 billion a year. This should be compared with NASA's projected space budget of almost \$7 billion per year in Fiscal 1979 if development of the shuttle and station proceeds. Such an increase in our annual space budget will further limit the availability of funds for our vital domestic programs."

Once again there are several points that need to be set in proper total context. First of all, the NASA space budget does not have to rise to \$7 billion per year in Fiscal Year 1979 if the development of the space shuttle proceeds. Quite the contrary, the space shuttle will provide the means for a far more economical space program by reducing both transportation costs and the costs of producing and operating unmanned as well as manned spacecraft. As a consequence, the availability of the space shuttle will permit both greater productivity per dollar invested in the space program, and also a highly productive program at lower total cost. Moreover, the development of the space shuttle does not require the space budget to go to anywhere near \$7 billion per year, but rather can be carried out in a program of substantially smaller funding requirements than during the mid-60's.

The second point is that Dr. van Allen is describing as "fully adequate" a program that happens to meet his own personal scientific interests and tastes. It must be recognized that the scientific community is comprised of a broad spectrum of individuals, whose interests and opinions vary widely. Many dozens of highly competent, prominent space scientists strongly urge the continuation of the Apollo manned lunar missions. Moreover, there is also intense interest on the part of many scientists in manned space flight experiments in earth orbit, as well as on the moon. The attached discussion of Skylab solar astronomy describes the high scientific value of the Apollo Telescope Mount experiments to be conducted, and brings out the intense interest of the scientific experimenters in this research. Drs. Leo Goldberg, Riccardo Giacconi, and Richard Tousey, all have devoted many years of their careers to preparing for these experiments. Their comments contained in the discussion show why they feel this kind of work is so valuable and important. Of particular interest are the remarks by Dr. John W. Evans, Director of the Sacramento Peak Observatory, who is not personally involved in Skylab, but who nevertheless feels that the Skylab experiments are of great importance to the field of solar astronomy.

Looking beyond Skylab, the availability of the shuttle will have a special additional

importance. Because of the moderate flight environment of the shuttle, scientists will themselves be able to go aloft in the shuttle, together with their instruments, and conduct experiments much in the manner in which scientific experiments are now conducted in high-flying aircraft. Since it need not go through the rigorous periods of tests that now must be prescribed for spacecraft to be launched on our current launch vehicles the equipment for such shuttle experiments will be orders of magnitude cheaper than present experimental equipment. For this reason many scientists strongly support the shuttle.

Looking even further to the future, there is a considerable interest in development of space stations. At a recent conference on space station utilization, nearly 400 individuals from universities, industry, government and institutions abroad spent two days at their own expense in an intensive review of future space station concepts. NASA has received over 300 responses from conference participants. Of these, 94% expressed the desire to join in the planning for eventual space station utilization, and 87% have indicated specific areas of interest. For example, the University of Ohio was represented by Professor Charles A. Randall. Upon his return to the University, he presented the conference material to 14 science and engineering departments. We have already received 29 different suggestions from these departments for significant investigations to be performed from the space station. Similarly, Professor Gielisse of the University of Rhode Island has forwarded some 20 suggestions stemming from his participation. Many other universities and institutes have reacted along the same lines, enthusiastically and with positive contributions. Thus, Dr. Van Allen does not in our opinion speak either for all space scientists or for the scientific community as a whole. This is perhaps best borne out in the attached letter from Professor Kinsey Anderson of Berkeley, a distinguished scientist who studied under Dr. Van Allen.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY,
Berkeley, California, October 14, 1970.
DR. HOMER E. NEWELL, Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NEWELL: Last winter I discussed with Henry Smith the interest of many engineers and scientists on the Berkeley campus of the University of California in manned space stations. At that time, the interests were not very specific, but I was impressed by the great variety of them, considering that only one campus was involved.

After NASA had publicly announced the outlines of a Space Station and Space Transportation System, I asked many of these individuals how they might make use of such a space platform in their research work. There has been a strong and diverse response from both applied and basic research areas. The numerous responses that I have received range from general statements of interest to quite detailed proposals. Some of this information is attached to this letter, and I think much of it will interest you.

I can summarize these interests as follows: About 35 scientists and engineers on this campus are now engaged in programs which rather clearly can make use of a manned space station. They represent 20 groups in basic and applied sciences, including biology and biomedicine, earth resources (chemistry, geography, forestry), astronomy (X-ray, infra-red, EUV), plasma physics, magneto-spheric physics, cosmic ray physics, and engineering studies (materials science, closed ecological systems, transportation, hydrology, etc.).

There were several somewhat surprising aspects to my survey. The astronomers were

very enthusiastic about the possibility of a manned observatory. There was much more interest in this than there has been in the past in the unmanned scientific spacecraft. The response from applied science and engineering researchers was very strong (see the attached letter from Professor Mitchell). Finally, there is a general acceptance of the space laboratory concept here among scientists. No one said that he would rely solely on unmanned spacecraft.

I would like to go one step further and say that there would be acceptance by this group of a timely development of a space transportation system by NASA. We all recognize that a space station containing large, complex scientific equipment can be effectively utilized only if the cost per pound of payload put into space can be greatly reduced. I think either an earth-orbiting space station or a lunar surface station could meet the interests here and, of course, other factors, particularly economic, may point toward the earth-orbiting station. Possibly, there would be somewhat more interest in a lunar surface station. A further factor is to the aspect of cooperation with the Soviet Union—if this could be done more effectively in a lunar surface station, that would be a point in its favor.

The Space Sciences Laboratory is most interested in encouraging the present interest on the Berkeley Campus in a large manned space laboratory such as the Space Station, and in seeking even broader interest in it. At the same time, the Space Sciences Laboratory would like to lend what support it can as NASA develops the space transportation and space station concepts. In order to work toward these ends, the Space Sciences Laboratory can assist in the following ways:

(1) If NASA plans to have panel discussions or group studies concerning the uses of Space Stations (as suggested at the Ames presentation), I am sure people from the Berkeley Campus would welcome the opportunity to participate. The enclosures with this letter provide information on the interested groups.

(2) The Space Science Laboratory will continue to act as a focal point of interest in the Space Station for the Berkeley Campus. We have provided interested groups with as much information as we can. For example, a large number of the NASA publication EP-75, Space Station: Key to the Future, were circulated around the campus.

(3) Some time in the near future, the Space Sciences Laboratory would like to create a small liaison group, consisting of scientists and engineers, which would begin translating some of the Berkeley interests into experiments that could interface with manned space laboratories. This group would acquire, in the process, as complete a knowledge as possible about space station design. Eventually, this staff might be as large as five Ph.D. scientists and two engineers in order to develop specifications for the large, complex equipment envisioned and to develop some of the experiment hardware requiring long lead times.

(4) From the Space Sciences Laboratory's point of view, an active interest in space stations could represent a smooth transition from the past multidisciplinary program into a balanced program of applied and basic science. We have already moved in this direction with the California Integrated Study of Earth Resources. The Space Station appears to us as a way of building upon this beginning.

We are also interested in the concept of including scientists, engineers, and technicians in the Space Station crew. In fact, a physics student here has been in regular touch with me on the planning for Space Stations. He looked over most of the documents that I brought back from the Ames conference. His ambition is to become in-

involved in space science and to become a Space Station crew member. A potential source for scientist-crew members exists at Berkeley in the very large group of graduate students who are working in the space sciences and applications.

Your sincerely,

KINSEY A. ANDERSON,
Director.

SKYLAB SOLAR ASTRONOMY

The major problem areas of solar astronomy today deal with the mysteries of coronal heating; of non-thermal processes like the solar wind, radio noise, and corpuscular

emission; and of solar activities such as sunspots; magnetic regions; flares and proton events, and the solar cycle. Beyond the surface of the sun, the familiar laws of physics sometimes appear to be disobeyed; e.g., how can the corona at 2,000,000° F. be so much hotter than the 10,000° F. photosphere when the latter is presumably the source of the heating of the former? A major problem is to explain how the magnetic energy of the sun is converted into electromagnetic and particle energies emitted in solar flares. Indeed, just what is the nature of a solar flare, and exactly how are such flares related to the particles and fields that so strongly influence the

earth's atmosphere and space environment during times of enhanced solar activity?

The investigation of these questions is the task of the solar astronomy principle investigators associated with the Skylab Apollo Telescope Mount (ATM). The six instruments outlined in the attached table are mounted together in the ATM and operate at the direction of the scientist-astronaut crew members. In addition, the ATM has a pair of pointing telescopes, operating in the red hydrogen-alpha light of the sun and used by the astronauts to display solar regions on their control panel via a television link.

(The table follows:)

APOLLO TELESCOPE MOUNT SCIENTIFIC EXPERIMENTS

Experiment numbers	Organization	Principal investigator	Instrument	Purpose
S052	High Altitude Observatory	Dr. R. MacQueen	White light coronagraph	Monitor the brightness, form and polarization of the solar corona in white light.
S082	Naval Research Laboratory	Dr. R. Tousey	Coronal spectroheliograph	Make high-spatial resolution monochromatic solar images in the 160-650 angstrom range.
			Chromospheric spectrograph	Record solar spectra in the 970-3940 angstrom range with high spectral resolution.
S054	American Science and Engineering Co.	Dr. R. Giacconi	X-ray spectrographic telescope	Study solar flare emissions in the soft X-ray wavelengths (2-10 angstroms).
S055	Harvard College Observatory	Dr. L. Goldberg	UV scanning polychromator spectroheliometer	Photoelectrically record high resolution solar images and study emission spectra of selected features of solar disc.
S056	Goddard Space Flight Center	Mr. J. E. Milligan	Hi-resolution X-ray telescopes	Obtain time-histories of the dynamics of the solar atmosphere in X-rays in the 1-60 angstrom range.

The solar processes of interest here are short-lived unpredictable phenomena lasting from seconds to hours. The sun, in essence, reveals itself in short bursts of very high rate data. This requires intensive, continuous observation of the whole solar envelope across the whole electromagnetic spectrum. It further demands very high resolution and high speed data recording. Above all, it demands rapid, accurate, timely response to unpredictable events occurring on or within the sun. To meet these demands, the ATM provides a set of specialized instruments working together, while the astronaut, working in conjunction with ground observing teams, provides the necessary functional control, selecting the phenomena to be observed and operating the instrumentation. The three elements of ground teams, astronauts, and space instrumentation are integral to the success of this part of the solar astronomy program. An added value of man's presence is the capability for use and recovery of film, the highest data rate recording medium available.

The high value that should be attributed to ATM experiments is illustrated in the comments of several of the Skylab experimenters. Dr. Leo Goldberg, who has for the past two years been Chairman of NASA's Astronomy Missions Board, and is a member of the Space Science Board, states:

"The Solar Observatory (Apollo Telescope Mount) to be flown in Skylab, under development and construction since 1965, is undoubtedly the most important solar spacecraft now planned. It will house by far the most powerful and sophisticated collection of solar instruments ever flown in a satellite and the combined payload is designed to investigate a number of very puzzling mysteries surrounding the sun's behavior. For example, the Skylab seeks to discover the mechanism that creates the solar corona, an enormous expanding envelope of gas at a temperature of two million degrees which surrounds the earth and reaches out to the very boundaries of the solar system. The Skylab observations may also reveal how and under what circumstances the sun manages so efficiently and quickly to transform vast quantities of stored magnetic energy into heat, as it does when a giant flare breaks out and bathes the earth and interplanetary space with X-rays and fast moving particles. The launching of Skylab will climax ten years of preparatory work which has been so successfully carried out in the

series of small Orbiting Solar Observatory (OSO) satellites, largely by the same group of experimenters who are involved in Skylab. While solving many problems, the OSO experiments have also sharply defined a number of the most essential and critical measurements that can only be made with instruments as powerful as those projected for Skylab. The astronomical community is eagerly awaiting the results of these essential measurements and the expected breakthroughs in our knowledge of the sun which the Skylab mission promises to bring about.

"Finally I want to underscore the importance I attach to the contribution of astronomy that the astronauts will be making, both by performing certain necessary and useful tasks in connection with the experiments, and in demonstrating man's capability as a scientific observer in space."

Another experimenter, Dr. Riccardo Giacconi writes to express, as he puts it, "my enthusiastic support of the mission from the point of view of solar physics." He goes on to elaborate:

"The ATM mission to be flown on Skylab 1 represents the first large-scale concerted attack on the problem of the heating mechanism of the solar corona. Experiments carried out in the past decade from rockets and Orbiting Solar Observatory (OSO) satellites have given us a tantalizing glimpse into the role of magnetic fields and hot plasmas in this process. For the first time, by the use of space techniques, the current theories could be tested and crucial observations could be carried out. These observations have shown the need for high resolution, highspeed, multiwavelength studies of detailed regions to be carried out over sufficiently long periods of time to encompass the birth, development, and decay of active regions on the sun. The ATM complement of instruments is designed to do this.

"In the X-ray range of the spectrum, ATM offers the only opportunity presently available to utilize the very powerful X-ray imaging techniques developed over years of rocket flights, to study the detailed characteristics of small, physically coherent regions on the sun. These studies may give us the key to understanding the development, containment, trigger mechanisms and decay of hot plasmas on the sun in flare and quiet conditions.

"The sun is our nearest star. Its light gives energy for most of the natural processes

occurring on earth. It is the test-bed for new observational techniques and theoretical understanding of distant stars. How important then that we continue in this process of unravelling its mysteries particularly now when we are on the threshold of new and exciting scientific exploration.

"Abandoning ATM now could be the result only of incredible short-sightedness and levity. Several years of deep commitment and hard work by a large number of scientists and engineers toward its realization cannot be thrown away, just when the time is near when its abundant promise can be fulfilled."

Dr. Richard Tousey, of the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, makes the following observations:

"1. The solar experiments in ATM should be considered by themselves and not considered together with the total cost of Skylab but just on their own. They are a bargain. The experiments should produce results that are far beyond any that can be obtained with existing vehicles and instrumentation or with any planned for this decade. I question whether the 1 arc second solar observatory which is not manned, this is the planned or discussed observatory, will be able to do as much as ATM, and also whether it can be built for \$150 million.

"2. The U.S.S.R. is building some kind of an ATM. We learned this when talking with Professor Severny this summer. The instrument that we know they are building is similar to S-082B, a large spectrograph using photographic film. It does not contain any TV equipment. The astronaut will watch the sun in H-Alpha directly through an eye piece. With this he will see the sun's image on the slit. (On the ATM, a television system is being employed for this.) The instrument is a 30 centimeter Cassegrain double Wadsworth stigmatic spectrograph. This will fly in one of their manned missions, but we do not know when.

"3. The ATM uses photographic film for almost all the instruments. The information gathering capability of photographic film is several orders of magnitude greater than any television equipment now available. Although many people are extremely optimistic about improvements in television, I question whether television will ever come to catch up to photography.

"4. The great question is, will the U.S.A. continue with manned flight in space. I think the answer is yes. If the answer is yes, then I

feel that it is absolutely necessary to continue with Skylab 1. Skylab is a necessary step to almost every conceivable large manned space station. I believe that man is necessary for all large space stations. His use in manned space stations will have to be determined but Skylab 1 could supply many answers to this question. Skylab was set up to explore the capability of man in space. Solar astronomy was the prime experiment but that is not the only one. The proper time to judge its value is after the mission has been completed. At this stage it is absurd to question its value before flight.

"5. Skylab is a tremendous undertaking and will contribute to the advancement of science and technology in a great many ways, not simply through solar observation. Physicists and engineers are forced to work together. NASA management is forced to work with semi-autonomous Centers and with groups of semi-autonomous experimenters, and also with large industrial organizations. This has to be coordinated into one great program otherwise it will not be a success, a great deal will have been learned about the management of complex projects.

"Another item possibly worth mentioning is the method now being studied for operating the complex group of experiments and the spacecraft and orbital assembly. This is apparently going to be handled with the aid of a very large computer program. It seems to me that this presents a new challenge in itself. The computer is supposed to take the input from every separate experiment and the different astronaut functions and produce directions or advice for operating the mission on an hour to hour basis.

"Skylab may be related to the earth observation program of the future. It is too soon to decide. If it is found worthwhile to conduct an extensive earth observations program, I think that man will be found extremely useful to conduct experiments in orbit.

"I have faith in the scientist-astronaut concept even though it may be too early to take full advantage of the scientist-astronaut. His judgment will most certainly be extremely valuable in the ATM. The main question is whether he will have a chance to use his judgment because of the many conflicting demands placed upon him by the Skylab operation."

But the enthusiasm for Skylab rests not only with the experimenters themselves. Dr. John W. Evans, Director of the Sacramento Peak Observatory, who is not involved in Skylab, writes:

"Much has happened in solar physics since the appearance of the Astronomy Missions Board position paper, *A Long Range Program in Space Astronomy*. Although some of the new information has been a surprise, none of it is of a kind that in any way alters the pressing need for the more sophisticated experiments which are now nearly ready for ATM-A. For the first time we will be able to achieve spatial resolution on the sun of better than 5 arc seconds in the extreme ultraviolet wavelengths. This alone will constitute the most important step forward, since the first crude space observations. In addition, however, ATM-A will allow full use of the enormous information capacity of photographic films to record long sequences of solar activity. These will provide for studies of the rapidly changing phenomena of flares, for instance, and the discovery of the features that embody the particle accelerators and X-ray emitters that so strongly affect the terrestrial ionosphere. One of the great frustrations of modern solar physics is lack of any physical description of these mechanisms. Five of the six ATM experiments will throw light on this problem, and could finally solve it. The sixth experiment, observation of the white light corona over long time periods (compared with the few minutes of an eclipse), will

hopefully enable us to see bursts of particles in all energy ranges leaving the sun. We will be able to pinpoint the initial conditions of velocity, density, etc., for comparison with the state in which these particles arrive at the earth.

"In short, solar physics has now reached a barrier to further advance in the most interesting aspects of solar activity. ATM-A is the vehicle which can breach the barrier, and make real physical sense of a tremendous backlog of ground and space observations that we cannot now interpret. From a scientific viewpoint, there has never been such an exciting prospect, and no other project offers such promise of far reaching advances in the most fundamental aspects of solar physics.

"There is one other aspect of the ATM mission that should be mentioned. A number of the most prominent solar astronomers have put their sweat and blood into the project over many years. If anything happened to cancel this mission, the morale damage to the participants in the space program would be catastrophic and irreparable for a very long time. I speak here as a spectator since I am not directly involved in any space experiments. However, like me, the whole solar astronomy community feels it has a large stake in the ATM mission, and to arbitrarily disappoint them would be disastrous."

The solar astronomy program on Skylab is unique; there has been no automated alternative found, either by NASA or by the astronomers themselves, that can provide the depth of scientific research capability inherent in the ATM. Even the Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory (AOSO) concept, parent to the ATM instruments, could not provide the sensitive responsiveness so necessary to solar process study. It is the selectivity and judgment of man in the loop that enhances the scientific returns promised by ATM beyond any other approach yet studied. The concern of greatest moment among the solar astronomers today is, not whether the Nation should pursue the Skylab ATM experiment, but how to assure that the returns therefrom are as great as possible since, for a long time to come, this is to be the sole opportunity for experimentation of this quality.

ADVANTAGES OF UNMANNED FLIGHT

"Furthermore, scientists have pointed out that unmanned flights produced the most advantageous applications of space technology. Indeed, most of the beneficial by-products of our space program have been derived from the unmanned part of the program."

This paragraph completely fails to set the proper perspective. As is becoming better and better understood, the ultimate practical returns that we derive from basic research accrue only after many, many years of effort. A careful review of the history of science, technology, and technological applications shows that it usually takes two or three decades for major practical returns to accrue from basic research. Thus, the advantageous applications of space technology referred to in the above paragraph rest upon scientific work that began in the mid-1940's. For example, the very profitable communications satellites have developed from the seeds that were sown in the radio telemetry used in sounding rocket flights in the 1940's. Also, the meteorological satellite photography of today stemmed from the early experimenting with high altitude rocket photography a quarter of a century ago. The important point to emphasize is that we have these advantageous applications of space technology today because of investments made in new capabilities and techniques not just a few years, but two or more decades ago.

In this perspective, then, the importance of manned space flight is that it is a necessary activity today to establish the very

powerful capability that we will need in the future for continued scientific research and practical applications. Not that all those returns lie in the future; the extremely powerful contributions of the Apollo lunar missions to science, and the very valuable solar physics experiments to be conducted on Skylab are examples of immediate returns. Moreover, a number of extremely important earth resources experiments will also be conducted on Skylab. Nevertheless, the main thrust of the Skylab experimenting at this time is to obtain the data and information need on man's capability to endure space flight over long periods of time in order that NASA may properly plan and develop the utilization of man in space. Likewise, NASA's work on the Space Shuttle must currently be directed mainly to the drastic reduction of costs of operating in space. If we do not make investments now in these types of activities, then our future leaders will not be able to point so happily to new "advantageous applications of space technology" as is done in the paragraph quoted above.

PREMATURE TO BEGIN SHUTTLE STATION

"However, even if a new, ambitious manned space effort could be justified, it is premature to begin development of the shuttle/station now. For this project is based on the assumption that man can function effectively in a space environment for long periods of time. But at this point, the feasibility of long-termed manned space flight is undetermined. Indeed, the Soyuz space mission in June raised doubts in the minds of both Soviet and American scientists about man's adaptability to such long term space flight."

Again, several points to be made. First, in our contacts with the Soviets, which of late have been quite close, there is clearly no doubt in the minds of the Soviets about continuation of manned space flight, or about the importance of long term manned space flight in their future plans. As brought out in the continuing studies by Dr. Charles Sheldon of the Legislative Reference Services, the Soviets are clearly fully committed to an intensive and continuing manned space flight effort, including manned flights into deep space.

Secondly, the shuttle study work should continue at the planned pace, because regardless of Skylab results, the shuttle has numerous applications to both unmanned launchings and spacecraft operations, and to short-term manned space flight and experimenting.

Thirdly, the space station, which we have phased to come after the space shuttle, is already intentionally and properly spaced with respect to the Skylab missions, so that before entering upon any commitment to full-scale development of the space station, we will have the results from the Skylab missions. In the meantime, space station studies should continue to lay the best possible groundwork for the most effective application of resources to the development of the space station at the appropriate time. We are in the enviable position of being able to pace the different pieces of the total program sensibly with respect to each other, so that the early work required to understand fully what is involved in a commitment to a space station can have been completed by the time it is necessary to make any such commitment.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CONGRESS

"Congress now has a unique opportunity to reorient the U.S. space program. By taking advantage of this opportunity, we can have a space program in which our scientists believe and which our people can afford."

This is true. After a dozen years of vigorous effort, marked by many outstanding successes, the U.S. space program has arrived at

a point where it is possible in the years ahead to achieve a genuine breakthrough in the character and costs of our space capability. With the space shuttle, the costs of doing space business will be drastically reduced. Moreover, the shuttle, because of its versatility, flexibility and benign flight environment, will be of service to a broad spectrum of users both in this country and internationally. It will truly be the basis for a wider range of valuable scientific and practical applications than those that our older techniques have afforded us and to which we point with such pride today.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will reject this amendment just as soundly as it did earlier this year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a number of Senators are seeking to cut \$110 million from the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, 1971, which would be part of the NASA appropriation for the definition and design of a space shuttle and space station. As their position reflects a good deal of misunderstanding about the space program, I will take a few minutes to set some of the facts straight.

The independent offices appropriations bill, H.R. 19830, which is being considered today, contains \$3,268,675,000 for NASA—an amount identical to that agreed to by the conferees on the previous independent offices bill, H.R. 17548, which was vetoed by the President. The amount provided for NASA in the bill, however, is \$50,628,000 below that which the Senate had appropriated for NASA. In other words, the Senate lost over \$50,000,000 in the conference. Moreover, it is \$64,325,000 below the NASA budget request and \$427,958,000 below the appropriation for NASA for fiscal year 1970.

They raise again the question of why we send men into space.

I believe the answer to the need for men in space is very simple. There are no space systems in which men are not involved. The only question arises as to where in the system you should put the men. There are some things machines can do that men cannot, and there are some things men can do that machines cannot. This simple statement is obviously true on earth and I believe it is just as obvious that it is true in space. The difference is that men can think and machines cannot. Machines do what they are designed and programmed to do—nothing else. If something goes wrong or does not go according to plan, the machine or spacecraft fails. In contrast, men can analyze the difficulties, figure out what the problem is, and devise and execute a solution. The loss of the \$98.5 million orbiting astronomical observatory—OAO—earlier last week because the automated system was unable to successfully eject the shroud covering the spacecraft during the launch as contrasted with the difficulties of Apollo 13 so brilliantly solved by the men in space, would seem to me to make it unnecessary to belabor this point.

The fact is that today, each time we launch a satellite, we throw the booster away because we do not know how to build unmanned automated space boosters that are capable of placing space-

craft with a high reliability into their proper trajectory and return that booster safely to earth so that it can be reused. These boosters cost large sums. The booster on the OAO cost about \$20 million. A few weeks ago, the Air Force attempted to launch a new surveillance satellite and the mission failed because the booster failed. That booster cost about \$30 million. If the shuttle had been available, the problems run into during each of these missions would have been solved by men in space or the spacecraft would have been returned to earth. Both of these satellites would have been turned into successes and the shuttle launches would have cost no more than about \$5 million each.

However, the booster savings are only a part of the total savings we would achieve with the shuttle system. Automated spacecraft today cost on the order of about \$15,000 to \$30,000 a pound to build because of the high reliability that must be built into the system. The space shuttle would permit spacecraft to be built using much more conventional structural techniques and more off-the-shelf equipment reducing the spacecraft per pound costs in some instances to a few hundred dollars per pound. Equally important, the shuttle would require far less lead time between the initial go ahead for a space mission and its actual accomplishment. Scientists and engineers have been working, for example, on the OAO for a period approaching 10 years and yet because of a simple shroud failing to separate properly, all of this work is for naught. You can imagine that a good many scientists and engineers spent a good part of their careers on this program and have no results from the experiments aboard the spacecraft as there is no back up for this mission.

I want to emphasize that the space shuttle is not a vehicle only for manned space flight. Rather, the shuttle is a new concept for putting payloads into space and the payloads it will put into space are both automated satellites and men—scientists—with equipment to perform experiments in space. The shuttle program will do away with the large stable of boosters the Nation now maintains and will reduce the costs drastically for getting payloads into space. It seems to me that this is the only sensible and economical way for the space program to proceed.

One further point, our colleagues are concerned about long duration flights and the possibility that they may not be feasible. They base their position it seems primarily on the fact that for very long duration space flights we do not yet know all of the design parameters for a space station. They say, "We may learn long duration space flights are not feasible." I believe there is no question that long duration space flights are feasible. The only question is how a space station should be designed to make long duration flights feasible. This feasibility is primarily concerned with the absence of the gravity force field in space. Several solutions are being inves-

tigated for this problem. For example, the space station can be designed to provide an artificial gravity environment simply by spinning the space station. Another possible solution would be to incorporate into the space station a centrifuge system. Other solutions are also being investigated. NASA is taking the zero-g environment and other problems into consideration in planning the space program. The shuttle system itself does not have the problem of long duration effects since it will remain in space only for about a week at a time.

The shuttle system is a transportation system that will operate from the surface of the earth to earth orbit and the shuttle system would be brought along first with the development of a space station coming along later. But if we are going to be in a position to make a decision about a space station certain technology and design studies must be accomplished now.

It is my belief that if the Congress were to eliminate the \$110 million for the space shuttle from the independent offices appropriation bill, 1971, this would be a mistake and in a few years the United States would find itself again in a position with respect to space that it was in 1957.

The committees have studied the NASA space program extensively and it is their best judgment that the United States should go forward at this time with the further study and design of a space shuttle/station system. I emphasize that neither the space shuttle nor the space station are approved programs for development either in the executive branch or in the Congress. What this bill does is provide the funds for further study so that decisions can be made with respect to such development. To delete the funds now would be a mistake. Therefore, I urge the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) on the proposed appropriation of funds to NASA programs and operations.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOWER

Mr. President, I would like to express my support for the funds in this bill allocated to NASA programs and operations. The Committee has recommended and the House has agreed to a figure of \$3,268,675,000 for the NASA appropriations for this year. While I regret that the figure could not be higher this year, I do support the funding for this area that has been agreed upon by the House and the Senate Committees in view of the budget overload that we are facing this year.

In the future, however, I would personally like to see greater emphasis placed on NASA programs and on basic scientific research in general. The technological and economic fallout of these expenditures in the past has been enormous. There is no way to estimate the monetary value of all of this fallout, but it is very evidently greater than the expenditure cost and has also kept us in a superior position in the world technologically, thus enabling us to afford the high cost of our labor and our high standard of living. Without an increased level of NASA

and basic research funding, our ability to support our high wages will undoubtedly decline and our position as a world leader and defender of freedom will decline correspondingly.

I have introduced a measure in the current session which is intended to give NASA a new major task to perform relating directly to our economic well-being as a nation and to progress in our technological capabilities. This measure, S.J. Res. 245, provides that NASA should begin the study of the potential utilization of solar rays for the generation of electrical power. Ultimately, we must tap solar energy directly if we are to progress technologically and economically.

The benefits of full exploitation of this limitless, pollution-free, non-extractive fuel source would be the virtual elimination of poverty and hunger and the salvation of our degraded environment. I think we should support a fuller exploitation of NASA's capabilities to develop usable electrical energy from solar power through full funding of the space shuttle program, an integral part of any effort to tap the energy of direct solar rays, and an authorization for NASA to enter into larger-scale solar ray research and experimentation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, my vote to table the Fulbright amendment adding \$150 million for the construction of new water and sewer facilities should not be interpreted as a vote against a clean environment. In fact when this amendment was considered last summer, as part of the now-vetoed Independent Offices and HUD Appropriations Act of 1971, I voted for it.

My concern, at this point in time, is with the fact that unless this bill reaches the President in a form acceptable to him, and by that I mean in a form exactly like the House-passed version, it can quite readily be subject to a Presidential veto. Such a veto would be catastrophic, for not only are we funding critical housing programs and veterans care programs, but we are also providing \$61.8 million for the construction of a new courthouse and Federal office building in Philadelphia.

Mr. President, there is a critical need for this new facility in Philadelphia and I have labored for it too many years now to see it go down the drain. For that reason, I urge that the Senate adopt this revised appropriation bill in its present form in order that the President can sign it with a minimum of delay.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The Senator from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, before addressing myself to this amendment, which I oppose, let me thank the Senator from Rhode Island for the great work he has done on this bill with regard to the veterans appropriation for medical care. It is vitally important that we meet this obligation as a Nation.

I am also very grateful to the Senator for his kind remarks, made earlier this morning, concerning my efforts.

Mr. President, our country is now at a critical juncture in our program of space exploration and our use of space for human needs on earth.

The American space program has progressed from grapefruit-sized satellites

to lunar exploration vehicles in a period of less than 15 years.

The technology which produced these achievements in space has changed our way of life on earth.

The costs of American preeminence in space have been enormous.

Up to now, we have relied upon launch vehicles costing more than \$200 million each and usable for only one flight. Now the shuttle offers an opportunity for a vehicle capable of making up to 100 trips from the earth's surface into space.

Far, far more is to be gained in space than bringing back samples of rocks from the moon.

At the moment that we have the chance to develop an economical and reusable launch vehicle, we are also beginning to develop highly sophisticated satellites to help solve some of our more pressing environmental and communication problems.

Satellites are now capable of performing such tasks as: land use planning, studies of crop yields, crop irrigation studies, grazing range management, geologic mapping, geothermal and volcanic observation, surface water mapping, watercourse location, plotting drainage patterns, flood monitoring and prediction, air pollution monitoring, urban planning, weather study and prediction, location of fish feeding areas, monitoring shoals and sandbanks, location of shipping hazards, global data collection, forest fire detection, analysis of population growth, and global voice and picture communication.

This list of earth-related satellite uses can be greatly expanded, and more satellites can be developed if we have a more economical way of launching, retrieving, and servicing them.

The space shuttle is capable of doing this, and for this reason it is indispensable.

It could reduce launching costs by as much as 90 percent per pound.

The space shuttle is capable of beginning a new era of space exploration and extensive use of satellites for needs here on earth.

The \$110 million requested in this appropriation by NASA is for development of a reusable, manned spacecraft capable of placing satellites in orbit and bringing them back for repair and reuse.

The shuttle will have a large cargo area capable of carrying space station modules which can be assembled in space.

Thirty million dollars of the \$110 million is for study and development of a space station which would be used in conjunction with the space shuttle.

It is important to note that these development funds do not involve a commitment for production of the space shuttle.

Nor does study of the space shuttle in any way mean that this is a program of manned Mars exploration.

But the Senate must recognize that without a space shuttle there will be no more U.S. manned space flights after 1973.

The State of California has a great stake in the development of the shuttle.

Over a thousand highly skilled engineers and workers are now involved in \$23.5 million of feasibility and design studies for the space shuttle.

California's role is one factor in my decision to support the program.

Of equal importance is the fact that the space shuttle is not an exotic project leading to questionable ends.

It will provide the country with a means to continue its space program in a manner that will not involve the exorbitant costs of our present series of expendable launch vehicles like the Saturn.

Critics of the space shuttle and space station have not recognized that the \$110 million appropriation is necessary in order to make an intelligent decision whether to produce this vehicle.

Without expenditure of these study funds, a decision not to produce the space shuttle is premature and illogical.

I consider our space program to be one of the many important national priorities.

To eliminate it or to avoid ways to make it more economical is not the way to reorder our priorities.

Millions of Americans earn their livelihood from the scientific and technological applications of the American space program.

The space program should continue with both manned and unmanned missions.

We must now begin to develop a launch vehicle that is less costly and more versatile.

This appropriation will enable us to begin an era of space use for earth needs.

I urge that the Senate defeat the amendment to delete the space shuttle appropriation.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, is that an unmanned, instrumented vehicle?

Mr. CRANSTON. We can make it more effective when we can have men up there when necessary and when we can retrieve them when necessary to improve upon them.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think most of the scientists, including Dr. Van Allen, agree that practically all of the examples of benefits given are fallouts from unmanned, instrumented flights.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, it is my belief that they can be made more effective. I base that belief upon my experts, as the Senator bases his belief upon his experts. I believe that it can be a great contribution not only in the areas I spoke about in terms of contributions, but that it can also be handled more appropriately as we develop the shuttle. We can then better handle the problems of hunger that confront so many Americans concerning which I know the Senator from Minnesota is deeply interested in. That problem can be dealt with more satisfactorily when we have better shuttles under better control.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 2 minutes.

WE NEED CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR OUR SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, with all of the serious social problems we face as a nation, there is a tendency to put off those programs oriented essentially to the future—such as the space program—and hope that somehow the resources can be applied to immediate problems. The amendment we are considering to cut back further this Nation's space program is an example of this tendency in operation. We must, of course, find ways to solve today's problems, but not, I am firmly convinced, at the expense of the future.

The space program has from its beginnings served as a cutting edge of technology, and space developments of the 1970's will extend this function into the future. But in addition to the visible space vehicle systems—power, fuels, launch and reentry operations, environmental control, guidance, to mention just a few—are advances in the form of new materials, new processes and techniques, and advances in computer technology, communications and data handling.

The amendment before us is, according to its sponsors, designed to eliminate future manned space travel while continuing instrument exploration of our solar system. The reason cited for support of this move is that manned exploration is far more costly and results in little more knowledge than instrumented probes could learn. I think this view is shortsighted for two reasons.

First, I would like to think back to that day—July 20, 1969—when Neil Armstrong spoke the words:

That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind.

For the first time in the history of man, all the men of earth in all nations stopped to focus on this one event. For one single moment, we were united. For this was not only the accomplishment of one human being or one nation; it was also an achievement of man. It lifted the human spirit. It made us proud to be men.

I do not recall having such feelings when our Ranger moon probe made a soft landing on the moon several years earlier. The people of this planet need the kind of inspiration that only manned space flights can provide. We need the continuing reminder that we are still moving forward, that we can still hope for continued improvement of our lot. This aspect of our space program is often overlooked, yet it is an important one.

It should be pointed out that the funds which would be cut by this amendment are the very funds which will make manned space flight economically far less expensive. The money will be used to develop a space shuttle which can be flown much like an airplane. Once several of these crafts are available, it will not be necessary to keep building new rockets, since these shuttles are reusable indefinitely.

The second reason I feel this amendment is shortsighted is that many of the technological innovations which have come about in the last 10 years can be

directly attributed to the manned space program. This is particularly true in the case of physiological studies and medical monitoring devices, as well as basic biological research. Much of the information will assist us in our exploration of the ocean depths as well as the vastness of space.

Important advances in food processing are another technological development directly attributable to manned space flights. Freeze dried foods—such as coffee—are already on the market for home consumption. Fuel cells, which may someday power our cars, is another example.

In other words, what we are buying with this manned space program money is the technology which leads to new products, new processes, new jobs: a technology which is already being adapted to help solve our pressing social problems. The development of the computer industry is an example. The space program contributed greatly to the development of the technology that now helps control our increasing air traffic and will soon run the Nation's new subway systems. Senator ANDERSON'S Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences held hearings on the adaptation to social problems of technological developments resulting from the space program. The hearings clearly show the tremendous impact of the space program on our society, and I commend them to you.

Our space program is, essentially, a synonym for technological innovation, which we must have for the maintenance of this precious blue gem, the planet earth.

Are we going to stop here, relinquish our hold on technological leadership, and our capability to extend our knowledge into the future? Are we going to disperse further the community of highly trained, highly intelligent, and highly motivated scientists and engineers who have taken us where we are today? Or are we going to continue to support the space program at a level on which it can confidently and meaningfully continue to contribute to the improvement of life for all of us?

Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, leaves me with the impression that we are in the same position as Spain would have been if it had told Columbus, "We have been there once. We need never go back again."

Future benefits from the exploration of space by man will be as beneficial to all mankind as was the original trip of Columbus.

Mr. President, in my view, we have already cut back too far on spending for space. I strongly oppose efforts to further reduce the NASA budget.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not know of any program that has been considered more by the legislative and the appropriations committees for the last 2 years than has the space program,

including a microscopic examination by two committees of the Senate this year. The House Space Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative MILLER, has done outstanding work in examining it in great detail.

Mr. President, there is one argument that I have not heard brought out here as yet. This shuttle is a space vehicle that we hope will lead us to the point of being able to reuse the same vehicle many times. That will be a step that will assure our having a real space program for another decade without the enormous costs associated with expendable, throwaway vehicles.

Mr. President, I have not heard anyone give an estimate concerning a \$50 billion or \$100 billion program or any such figure for a manned Mars program. That is not relevant. This is not a program for Mars. The chairmen of the Senate and the House space committees have publicly said that it is not and that if it were, they would not support it. I repeat, they would not support a program designed as a manned program to Mars.

Mr. President, let us keep our feet on the ground with respect to the present facts. Even though this is a space program, let us keep our feet on the ground. This is still a research and study program. This is an effort to determine the feasibility and practicality of the space shuttle and what it is possible or probably possible to do and what should be done in this field.

We have had this concept in the Air Force for years. We remember that last year the Air Force canceled out the MOL program. Secretary Seamans was there when that was done. I called him a few moments ago. I knew how he felt about this thing, but I wanted to be absolutely sure that he still had the same viewpoint.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator an additional 3 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I find that his interest, instead of lagging, is growing tremendously. The Air Force has entered into an agreement with NASA on the space shuttle and has agreed that NASA will be the lead agency on it. The Secretary stated that whatever is found and developed will be of benefit in future decades to the national security.

No one knows anything in this field we are discussing now. This is purely a march into the future to determine what the situation is and what the need is. We have had this matter up for review many times.

Reference has been made recently to the surveillance satellite that was launched with a Titan III-C. There was a malfunction and the flight was not successful. However, studies are underway on the applications for the utilization of the space shuttle which indicate that the shuttle system will increase our launch reliability as well as reduce our launch expense particularly for these unmanned,

automated satellites as well as for other space operations.

These benefits are quite possible. If they prove out, they will thereby reduce our spacecraft cost, the largest single cost element in the mission.

As one who is not overwhelmed here about supporting a general space program here, I have found that this system is most attractive and is most likely to bring success. It is one that I would pick and that the committee has picked as being one that is essential and has more capability for success in space.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will give good, strong, solid support to this matter. Let us proceed for another year to see what benefits can be shown.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to address myself briefly to the national security aspects of the bill now under consideration.

At the present time, the Department of Defense has no program in the area of manned space flight. The Senate will recall that the manned laboratory program of the Air Force was canceled in 1969. It is not my intention at this time to rehash the arguments regarding the decision to cancel the MOL program; but it is timely to consider where we stand with respect to the future possibility that national security may require manned activity in space.

This bill recognizes the possibility of such a future need in the effort to define the space shuttle during fiscal year 1971. In February of this year the Secretary of the Air Force and the administrator of NASA reached an agreement under which the space shuttle will be defined to be "of maximum utility to both NASA and the Department of Defense." A committee headed by senior officials of the Air Force and NASA will conduct a continuing review of the program and will recommend steps to achieve the objectives of a system that meets the requirements of both agencies.

NASA's experience and research over the years with unmanned systems, manned systems, and in aeronautics have come together in a new concept—the reusable manned space shuttle system—which will bring about a fundamental change in space operations and result in very substantial cost reductions, for both manned and unmanned missions. The objective of the space shuttle is to provide the United States with an economical capability for delivering men, equipment, supplies and other spacecraft to and from space by reducing operating costs to about a tenth of those of present systems. Clearly all agencies of the United States will benefit from such a dramatic improvement in the cost situation.

For these and other reasons, I strongly support the recommendation of our Committee on Appropriations reflected

in this bill to provide funding to proceed with the space shuttle during fiscal year 1971. I urge the Senate to reject the pending amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are many features of this item about which I would like to speak, including the economies from the reusable features which may result from this research, and the fact that both committees of Congress have directly repudiated any commitment to interplanetary efforts or interplanetary missions at this time.

But the thing I wish to talk about, because I have not heard it mentioned, is that so much has been learned in the field of medicine and better attention to human beings by reason of human flight in space.

Dr. Werner von Braun spoke yesterday over television. I am sorry that all Senators did not hear him speak. He spoke of the remote electronic controls which measure heart actions and blood pressure and which show whether people are asleep or active, and all of the other vital features of immense importance from the standpoint of life and death of millions of people. He said that one nurse sitting in a central place in a hospital could supervise 500 different patients because of this electronic surveillance which is now possible and which had been discovered solely because of human flights in space and the electronic equipment developed in connection with those flights.

I sincerely hope this amendment is rejected because it is a backward amendment that tends to take us away from some of the finest developments we have had that help us not only economically and in connection with national security, but also in the field of vital life for our people, because so many of these developments are usable by surgeons and nurses and those who handle the health problems of our Nation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we be told what the time situation is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute remaining on each side.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on each side be extended by 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask that I may be recognized for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I find myself bothered by this amendment because in the past I voted against the entire authorization for the space program. The general demands of outer space, I think, can be postponed until we have met so many of our demands in inner space.

However, one demand we will have in the future is energy. Some day our petroleum resources will be exhausted. We are

having second thoughts about nuclear energy because of the pollution and radiation factors which are present.

Perhaps our most usable energy in the future will be solar energy derived from outer space. This is a thought which may be out of the ball park in 1970, but the same thought in the year 2000 might seem much more likely.

One of the requirements for solar energy will be the development of machines that can fly around in outer space collecting the energy of the sun, converting it into electricity, and sending it back to earth.

I would have opposed this amendment and supported the expenditure if I had found that NASA was planning to move ahead in this important field of solar energy. However, when my office telephoned them to inquire if there is anything in that respect on the drawing board, there was a negative reply.

It did seem to me that the shuttle program is one more development that could be postponed because it does not bear directly on the priorities of men on our planet, even in the foreseeable future, but if NASA moved in the direction of solar energy these expenditures would be supported by Senators who have the same priorities and goals that I have.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in the closing moments of this debate I have only a couple of points I wish to make. This matter has been over the hurdles twice this year with a very decisive vote both on the authorization and on the appropriation. I know how fully this matter has been considered in the space committee under the direction of the chairman, the senior Senator from New Mexico, and the ranking minority member, the senior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH). I know how much time and effort they have given to the consideration of the philosophy behind this matter. The one thing that perturbs me in this debate is that I still hear remarks, particularly one by the Senator from Wisconsin awhile ago, and similar implications I think that I recall from the Senator from Minnesota, that the space shuttle is just the beginning of an advanced space program to the far planets in the universe.

If there is one thing this debate should clear up, and that is to refute that implication. It is true that the space shuttle is designed for both manned and unmanned space flight, but there is no such intention for the space shuttle, as conceived; nor could it be utilized in that way because it could never develop the power for the far-out planetary exploration.

During the previous debate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota placed in the RECORD numerous letters and even they refer to this as the first step toward space exploration, talking about Mars, Venus, and the whole "merry-go-round." This is not so and we should make the RECORD clear in that respect.

One other thing should be made clear. It is true that there are scientists who

are opposed to this program. It is true also, as the junior Senator from Florida pointed out, that many scientists outside of the space program are in favor of it. If anyone wants to know some of the practical applications of the space program, all one has to do is get the volume published by the Senate from the independent offices committee which details at great length the many fallouts of this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, an analogy has been made to the voyage by Columbus to the New World. Given the scientific view of the Shuttle/Station project, it is more analogous to think of Columbus bankrupting Spain to see if he could sail to Barcelona or to see if a square wheel would work after all. This project has no scientific support.

The leading independent scientists are strongly objecting to this proposal because it has no scientific value. It is diverting much needed funds from sophisticated unmanned instrumented flights—from which great technical dividends and technical advances flow—to a show business extravaganza which will cost \$20 billion to \$30 billion for a purpose that cannot be explained. We are told it has great military significance, but the Air Force abandoned its MOL program, saying it had no military significance. We are told that the shuttle could be cost effective, but NASA refuses to make a cost effective study as recommended by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The facts show we would waste money on this project and there has never been a proposal with less scientific justification and a greater cost of completion than this program. If ever there was a time when we could save money, it is by rejecting the motion to table, and by deleting this \$100 million of waste in the space budget.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the time situation now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 3 minutes remaining. The Senator from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. May I have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota? I understand the Senator from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining? Is he willing to relinquish that time?

Mr. MONDALE. I may. I am not sure.

Mr. PASTORE. I have 3 minutes left. What I have to say will take only 1 minute.

Mr. President, after listening to both sides for a half hour, I think it is a draw. I think as much can be said on one side as on the other side. This matter came before the Senate twice. I voted against it twice. As a matter of fact, I was on the side of the Senator from Minnesota. But the matter has been decided. It has been decided by the House and it has been decided by the Senate, and for the reasons I have given before.

If the Senator is willing to yield back his 2 minutes, I will yield back my remaining time and move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back my time and move to lay the amendment on the table.

I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. GOODELL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington (Mr. Magnuson). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GRAVEL (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Illinois. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Byrd), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Stevenson), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Jordan) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. Magnuson) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick), the Senators from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Fannin), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Case) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Mundt) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Fannin), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Mundt) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) would each vote "yea."

The respective pairs of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis) and that of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) have been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick) is paired with the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Case). If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 413 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Aiken	Ervin	Pearson
Allen	Fong	Prouty
Allott	Griffin	Randolph
Anderson	Gurney	Saxbe
Baker	Hansen	Schwelker
Bellmon	Holland	Scott
Bennett	Hruska	Smith
Bible	Inouye	Spong
Boggs	Jackson	Stennis
Brooke	Jordan, Idaho	Stevens
Byrd, W. Va.	Long	Symington
Cannon	Mathias	Talmadge
Cooper	McClellan	Thurmond
Cotton	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Cranston	Montoya	Yarborough
Dole	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Pastore	

NAYS—26

Burdick	Hughes	Nelson
Church	Javits	Packwood
Eagleton	Kennedy	Pell
Fulbright	McCarthy	Proxmire
Gore	McGovern	Ribicoff
Harris	Miller	Tydings
Hart	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hollings	Muskie	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—4

Goodell, against.
Gravel, for.
Mansfield, against.
Metcalfe, against.

NOT VOTING—20

Bayh	Eastland	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Fannin	Percy
Case	Goldwater	Russell
Cook	Hatfield	Sparkman
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Stevenson
Dodd	Magnuson	Tower
Dominick	McGee	

So Mr. PASTORE's motion to lay Mr. MONDALE's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to review briefly the changes in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration activities since the Senate last considered the fiscal year 1971 independent offices appropriation bill which was subsequently vetoed by the President.

The present bill, H.R. 19830, contains \$3,268,675,000 for NASA—an amount

identical to that agreed to by the conferees on the previous bill, H.R. 17548. However, this is \$50,628,000 below that which the Senate previously approved for NASA; it is \$64,325,000 below the NASA budget request; and it is \$427,958,000 below the appropriation for NASA for fiscal year 1970.

As a result of the \$64 million reduction from the NASA budget request in the previous appropriation bill, H.R. 17548, subsequently vetoed, and in view of the long lead time and long duration aspects of decisions on NASA projects, NASA on September 2, 1970, adopted an interim operating budget for fiscal year 1971 sized to the appropriation level of \$3,268,675,000. This interim operating budget also looks ahead to the budget levels which the agency might anticipate in future years. In so doing, NASA canceled another two lunar exploration flights—Apollo 15 and 19—and a new manned space flight plan was established. Under this new plan, the Apollo lunar exploration program will be completed in 1972 before flying the first Skylab mission in December 1972. This reorientation of the manned flight program eliminates the necessity for maintaining a lunar flight capability during late 1972 and 1973 when the Skylab missions are being conducted. This permits substantial savings of the costs that would have been associated with maintaining the lunar operational capability during these 2 years and in addition saves the mission operational costs of the Apollo 15 and 19 missions now canceled. For clarification, perhaps I should mention at this point that the remaining Apollo missions have been renumbered as Apollo 14, 15, 16, and 17.

The trade-off, of course, is that two lunar missions to which the scientific community had looked with great interest as furthering the scientific return from the Apollo program and for which flight hardware is essentially complete will not now be flown. The Space Committee has received letters from many scientists protesting this cancellation but from a long-term view, the decision to cancel the two Apollo flights will free resources for supporting future space developments, such as the space shuttle, within the limitations of a continuing restrained total space budget. In addition, it conserves two Saturn V large launch vehicles for later significant missions.

NASA in implementing the decisions that I have outlined has and is continuing to restructure its operations to the \$3,268,675,000 appropriation recommended in this bill. For example, NASA has gone through a reduction in force of its own direct Federal employment to realign its work force with the reduced program levels envisioned for the immediate future.

Mr. President, many of the actions by NASA taken since the Senate considered the fiscal year 1971 NASA authorization bill and the appropriation bill earlier this year, have been painful in lost jobs, in the loss of lunar data which the scientific community had hoped to receive, in that some of the completed lunar hardware will not be used, and in that much of our

hard-earned space flight capability has been reduced to a bare-bones basis. This has been done with the recognition that a reallocation of national resources is in order but also with the recognition that it is imperative that the Nation maintain a viable, forward-looking space program during the years ahead.

The actions taken by NASA, reflected in the establishment of an interim fiscal year 1971 operating plan on September 2 at the funding level included in this bill, do support a minimal space flight program through mid-1973 and do make provision for undertaking new programs which are designed to maintain the Nation's space leadership through the development of vehicles and spacecraft which, in turn, should measurably reduce the cost of space operations and, therefore, facilitate and encourage the utilization of space for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. President, in closing I want to re-emphasize that the \$3,268,675,000 for NASA in this bill, H.R. 19830, not only is \$50 million less than was approved for this agency by the Senate 5 months ago but is also the level necessary to support the reoriented and reduced space program.

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1094, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) proposes amendment No. 1094, as follows:

On page 53, beginning on line 20, strike out all through line 10 on page 54.

The language proposed to be stricken reads as follows:

SEC. 512. No part of any appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of or for the payment of the salary of any person engaged in the procurement of any hand or measuring tool(s) not produced in the United States or its possessions except to the extent that the Administrator of General Services or his designee shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of hand or measuring tools produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed from sources in the United States and its possessions or except in accordance with procedures prescribed by section 6-104.4(b) of Armed Services Procurement Regulation dated January 1, 1969, as such regulation existed on June 15, 1970. This section shall be applicable to all solicitations for bids opened after its enactment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if we may have the attention of Senators, I understand that we can agree on a limitation of time on this amendment as well.

Mr. JAVITS. Before we do that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. I am going to move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, the Senator can ask for the yeas and nays on that.

Mr. PASTORE. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That request on tabling is not in order at this

time. The yeas and nays have been requested on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that we can agree on a limitation of 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, and with a very great likelihood that we will not need all that time. But I should like to ask one consideration: If there is an amendment to the amendment or a perfecting amendment, that there be 10 minutes, with 5 minutes on a side.

Mr. PASTORE. That is satisfactory to me. I make such a unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, we can deal with this amendment very promptly.

This is not a money amendment either way—not to increase or to reduce. This amendment seeks to strike out a piece of legislation which is contained in section 512 of this bill, which is a buy-American provision relating to procurement under this act—to wit, procurement by the GSA. That is the issue, very simply stated.

The difference is this: If we apply the defense standard to this particular kind of procurement, then we give a 50-percent preference, regardless of the nature of the bid, to this kind of procurement, to a product which is made in this country. If we stick with the present law on that subject, there is a 6-percent preference, with the right to increase that preference to 12 percent if there is substantial unemployment in the industry in which the procurement is being made. That is the existing regulation. That is the issue.

This is a matter of first impression, and this provision would have been subject to being stricken out on a point of order if it had not come over from the other body. But it did come over from the other body, and therefore it is not subject to a point of order.

The whole question here is this: Does the Senate wish to impose at this time, when we are about to consider new trade legislation, when we are in a big struggle in the world with regard to protectionism, another nontariff barrier to trade, when we, ourselves, are the principal exponents of the idea of eliminating nontariff barriers to trade?

It seemed to me—as I am a strong opponent, with others, of the trade bill which is coming to the Senate—that, if those of us who feel as I do are going to raise the issue of policy, we have to begin to raise it when it presents itself; and this is an instance in which it presents itself very forcibly.

I am advised that what is involved here is approximately 1 percent of the procurement of the GSA, and this is a multimillion-dollar operation.

It is interesting to note that, just as we are running into a great deal of flak in terms of international argument about the trade bill generally, we are running into international flak on this issue—the non-tariff-barrier issue—as well. In-

deed, it has been widely publicized that the State Department has had considerable protest on this question.

Mr. President, I wish to state that the administration supports this amendment, and I am advised to state that by the Under Secretary of State dealing with economic affairs. We made inquiry about this, and they, too, feel that it is unwise, in view of our position with respect to trade generally, to include this new non-tariff-barrier restraint to trade in this particular bill.

As I said a moment ago, it is a situation in which our whole attitude toward international trade is being tested. Many people would counsel us that, in view of the fact that the world has not given us the degree of cooperation which we have a right to feel it should, we should immediately start the process of "protecting ourselves." On the other hand, many of us argue, as I do, that we have so much at stake in respect, for example, of farm exports and high technology exports, that protecting ourselves could lead to retaliation in an area where we earn more than we are paying out. In fact, our trade surplus this year should approximate \$3 billion. Many of us would argue that the dismantling of nontariff barriers to trade around the world—probably by an international agreement which will have the significance which the Kennedy round had in respect of conventional tariff arrangements—would be of enormous benefit to the United States as was the Kennedy round before we lost control of the inflationary pressures in our economy. The United States should not itself invalidate its own position on a matter, for example, such as this, where there is not enough at stake to warrant compromising our position by passing this kind of law.

I feel very strongly that the future of the world in terms of its peace and prosperity is heavily premised upon the degree to which there is an open and freely trading world. I think the whole complex of problems in our country involves inflation as well as our balance of payments. The status of the dollar as the standard currency of the world—indeed, the principal reserve currency—is very intimately linked with the ability to maintain an open trading world.

I think we are too big and too important to the world and to ourselves to jeopardize these enormous values by a provision of this character, which only compromises a situation which is very good for us not to compromise and which is very regressive and adverse to us if we do compromise it.

For all those reasons, Mr. President, I have proposed the amendment, and I hope the Senate will support it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from New York seeks to strike out section 512 of the bill. I will not read the section, but I ask unanimous consent that section 512 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section 512 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sec. 512. No part of any appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of or for the payment of the salary of any person engaged in the procurement of any hand or measuring tool(s) not produced in the United States or its possessions except to the extent that the Administrator of General Services or his designee shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of hand or measuring tools produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed from sources in the United States and its possessions or except in accordance with procedures prescribed by section 6-104.4 (b) of Armed Services Procurement Regulation dated January 1, 1969, as such regulation existed on June 15, 1970. This section shall be applicable to all solicitations for bids opened after its enactment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reference has been made that this particular amendment is not subject to a point of order because it came over from the House, and that is true. It did come over from the House. But I think the Senate should also be on notice that this amendment was also in the previously passed bill which was vetoed by the President. Therefore, this is not a matter of first moment for the Senate. It was in the previous bill and is in the bill that the House just passed.

I wish to turn briefly to another part of this complicated question. Defense does have a 50-percent differential, and the GSA has a 6-percent differential on small handtools. But the GSA also has to figure in certain tariffs in figuring their differential. So that what you end up talking about is really not a differential between 6 percent and 50 percent. You end up with a differential of approximately 20 percent.

Why is this provision in this bill at all? I call attention to the fiscal year 1968 report.

This is of the independent offices and HUD appropriation. We say there:

FOREIGN PURCHASING POLICIES

The attention of the committee has been directed to the difficulties the handtool industry has been experiencing due to inconsistent foreign purchasing policies followed by the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense.

In order to alleviate the balance-of-payments problem, the Department of Defense in 1962 adopted a 50-percent differential test governing foreign procurement. In the meantime, the General Services Administration, which applies a 6-percent differential, has taken over much of the procurement for the Department of Defense. This has resulted in a paradox whereby GSA procures items for the Department of Defense which the Department could not have purchased. The committee was advised that the brunt of this inconsistency falls on the handtool industry, and whereas foreign procurement comprises only one-half of 1 percent of GSA purchases, nevertheless 57 percent was in the handtool market.

The Joint Economic Committee has recognized this problem. The committee directs the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration to examine the recommendations of the Joint Economic Committee and attempt to reconcile the differences. The Department of Defense and GSA are further directed to submit a report to

the committee before December 31, 1967, on this matter.

Mr. President, nothing was done pursuant to that conclusion, only that this matter came up again each year, and in 1970 in the report of the committee on page 10, under "Foreign Purchasing Policies," in which there is another comment by the committee relative to the inclusion of section 512, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN PURCHASING POLICIES

The attention of the committee has again been directed to the difficulties the handtool industry has been experiencing due to inconsistent foreign purchasing policies followed by the General Services Administration with a 6-percent differential and the Department of Defense with a 50-percent differential.

Previous attempts have been made to correct this paradox, including a statement in the committee report on the 1968 bill, resulting in the GSA report of September 14, 1967, printed in the 1969 hearings.

The committee urges GSA to continue its efforts to remedy this unfortunate and continuing situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the gist of this is exactly the same as the gist of the things we have put in the report from year to year. Yet even after requesting these reports, year after year after year, we have from Robert Kunzig to Mr. Mayo a letter, dated April 24, 1970, which tells us absolutely nothing.

After about 5 years now, at least trying to get somewhere with this matter, and having failed to get any definitive answer from any administration on it, the committee finally decided that it would act and bring it to a head; and that is the reason for section 512.

I have not seen any report from the Secretary of State—I think the Senator said he talked with the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs—who puts his approval on this matter. We have been into this matter so many times. The inequities it exerts upon our home industry and the number of people it puts out of jobs justifies putting in this section. Finally, after trying these many times, we put it in the bill. It is applicable to funds only for this year and not succeeding years. No great damage will be done except to call to the attention of the executive branch that the words we write in our reports mean what they say.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the key to what the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) has argued is found in his last few words "no great damage will be done," except to remind the departments of what we want them to do. That is exactly the attitude, in my judgment, which dictates the difficult position in which we place the administration if we do this. The fact is, the world will see, observe, note, and act accordingly. It will not be confined to a stimulus in our departments. In addition, this is substantive law and will call for the expenditure of greater amounts depending upon American bidding for what we want to buy. Every foreign nation will look up to the United States and say, "You are

badgering us to deal with the nontariff barriers to trade, yet you erect another nontariff barrier injurious to our exports." This gives Japan reason to pause in lifting their nontariff barriers which limit our exports of automobiles to Japan, France pause in lifting their nontariff barriers on various types of machinery as well as automobiles, and various sanitary laws, and so forth.

If we pass legislation establishing additional nontariff barriers, our exports will face the kind of retaliation which foreign nations feel justified in making. So the answer is not to wake up the departments alone, since the whole world observes and acts upon the extra evidence of what is the foreign policy of the United States regarding trade. In my judgment, we can, on balance, lose infinitely more than we can gain by this type of action. I think the administration is right in its assessment of the situation; namely, that we will find it counterproductive to our own interests, to the U.S. national interest.

One further point, Mr. President. The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) asserts that this has been done with respect to defense, that it is justified on the basis of defense, and that it affects directly our international balance of payments because of the large amount involved and the maintenance of our forces abroad. Indeed, it was qualified as a provision in the defense appropriation. Exactly on that ground, I think the representation implicit there is that it will not be applied to procurement generally. The defense appropriation is *sui juris*. There is a unique applicability here to this situation. Here, it is extended in one product generally. Every indication is that it will be extended to other products, if we let it go this way.

For all those reasons, and because it is against our total economic interest, considering our total trade and the total posture we have in the world, I repeat, I do not believe it is worth while, or pays for us to do this, with what it implies in terms of compromising our policy, and periling our own exports.

For all those reasons—I know the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) will move to table—I repeat, this is not a money amendment. It is not money either way. It is essentially foreign policy. I think we would be unwise, especially in the presence of a complete review of the whole foreign trade situation which we will undertake, because we will have the trade bill, even if we put it over until next year. That will be the hottest subject going. I believe it most unwise to compromise it by a relatively minor matter of this character, in this offhand way, in an appropriation bill.

I therefore hope that the motion to table will be defeated and that the amendment to strike it is sustained.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong debate on this subject. It is easy to talk academically about free trade. By instinct I am not a protectionist. I have always voted for the trade expansion act, whether under President Eisenhower or President Kennedy. But, when one sees within his own State, establishments closing down just before

Christmas, like Brown & Sharp, putting perhaps 1,500 people out of work, there we get right down to the guts of the problem. We cannot say to these people, "The whole trade posture must be considered," because so far as they are concerned there is nothing darker or blacker for them than midnight, when they have lost their jobs.

If we knock this out, we should knock out the buy-American provision under the Defense Department as well. We are trying to equalize it. I was carried away with these arguments at one time until I began to experience the contrary. I have learned that every nation in the free world has some limitation against American products.

We had a man come before our committee for confirmation as an economist for the Commerce Department. He was an economist for the Eastman Kodak Co. He came before our committee for confirmation and I said to him, "I am very happy to read about your background. You were with the Eastman Kodak Co. Now tell me, can you sell a Kodak camera to Japan?"

He said "No."

Look at the photographers around the Capitol these days, or anywhere else. They are nearly all using Japanese cameras.

I say that international trade must be a two-way street. When we see people thrown out of work only because we are more liberal than those who are criticizing us, then I say that something needs to be done.

I am glad to hear the Senator from New York say that the whole matter has to be reviewed. I think that insofar as international trade is concerned, we are legislating in the past.

We have this situation in Europe today where only recently West Germany made a nonaggression treaty with Russia extending over a period of 20 years. Yet, we find that if we want to remove all American troops out of West Germany, the hue and cry goes up that the Communists are coming.

Not too long ago, they entered into a credit contract that extended over a period of 20 years whereby Germany would sell them pipe and they would buy back from the Russians the natural gas.

That was backed up by every bank in West Germany. If the West Germans can trust the Russians for 20 years, what are we doing there?

Try to move our troops out of Europe and see what happens.

It is the same thing with the economy. Let something go wrong with the economy of Great Britain, France, or Canada. They will put on the brakes immediately. If we try to do it in the United States of America, we get academic about it.

This is a massive problem. I have seen these men out of work. That goes for Taft-Pierce in Woonsocket as well.

Here it is Christmas time, and they are out of employment. What am I going to say to them? What do they care about totality? They care about bread and butter. That is what we are concerned with—bread and butter for the American worker.

Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion?

Mr. PASTORE. I withhold the motion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, every one of these arguments gets into the total trade debate. I will advise my colleague that we will have a lot of chance to get an education on that matter.

Suppose that the export industry employs 5 million people and that the people allegedly hurt by imports employ 4 million people. Let us say it is 5 million and 4 million. Is that going to be the standard, that that particular plant is going to close down because it is hurt by imports but that the one dealing with exports can go on? Is this not wanting to have your cake and eat it too?

Then also the wealthiest man on the street does not and cannot follow the example of the poorest man on the street. We have different criteria. It is awfully easy to throw the garbage out of the window. If one is the richest man, he does not do it even though the other man does. I am sorry, but I have heard this argument made by the Senator many times. The answer is that the worker is interested in the total picture and realizes that every company going out of business is not going out of business because of imports.

Studebaker Corp. in South Bend went out of business because they were behind the times.

The textile plants went out of business in New England. They were replaced with the electronics industry. If this industry closes because of imports, they will be replaced with more sophisticated hardware because we are the most able people in the world. And the more sophisticated industries that have developed as the United States has moved forward—and we continue to move forward—pay higher wages and generally offer better working conditions.

I and other Senators will vote for whatever we need to help those companies transform to another line and readjust. Let us look to the future rather than trying to preserve the past.

This is not a question of dumping or a question of countervailing duty. We have never been faced with that. Looking at this strictly as an economic argument, the question is what is the cost-benefit ratio. In my judgment, the cost-benefit ratio is heavily and strongly against us on the protectionist line.

The Senator made the classic argument of the protectionist, that plant A is closing allegedly because of imports. It has been shown that it is for other reasons that the company has gone down the drain. It is all too easy for imports to be the scapegoat in times of economic downturn.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the argument was made with respect to Japan that it had a big balance of payments and that they would go protectionist. If the world went protectionist, we would be the biggest sufferers. We are the biggest outfit on the street and have traditionally enjoyed a substantial trade surplus.

The peace and security of the world is heavily premised upon our financial security. We cannot jeopardize it by an ill-advised trade policy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, why can we not sell a Kodak camera in Japan?

Mr. JAVITS. We cannot sell a Kodak camera in Japan because the Japanese are stupid enough to bar that Kodak camera.

Mr. PASTORE. We are stupid enough to give them our largess.

Mr. JAVITS. No. There are many things that we can sell to Japan.

Mr. PASTORE. They buy raw cotton and they make shirts and send them back here.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, but throughout most of the 1960's Japan had one of the biggest balance of trade deficits with the United States and their present trade surplus position which I have vigorously attacked as being politically and economically unsustainable has shown signs of declining this year.

Mr. PASTORE. No. The balance of trade is \$1.5 billion in their favor. We do nothing about it.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do not like to disagree with my good friend, the Senator from New York. Many years ago some of us went up to see a great American in charge of our trade negotiations. We pointed out to him that the Kennedy round incident to tariff agreements would not be beneficial on a mutual basis unless the other countries agreed that there would not be nontariff barriers after we reached tariff agreements.

I think what the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island just said with reference to selling cameras in Japan is pertinent.

Any trade agreement, especially when we have increasing unemployment between a foreign country and the United States, should be a two-way street.

I will vote to table the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York because I do not think the record shows there has been a two-way street, between many other countries and ourselves.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Rhode Island. The only point I argue in this whole matter concerns the most effective way to accomplish the ends we seek. I could still agree with the Senator

from Rhode Island and the Senator from Missouri and still strongly stick to my thesis. I say that the most effective way is to do this with a scalpel. It would only get worse if we do it with a sledge hammer. The best way that we can make the trade in the world more healthy is by continuing to adopt a more liberal policy but, at the same time, have laws on our books which in a specialized way will enable us to deal with specific and unit problems, laws on our books that would better provide for corrective action when there is not reciprocity of treatment.

I think this is across the board legislation which will not help us but will hurt us.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from New York on the table.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senators from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebras-

ka (Mr. CURTIS) is paired with the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY). If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) is paired with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 414 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alken	Fong	Nelson
Allen	Griffin	Pastore
Allott	Gurney	Pearson
Anderson	Hansen	Pell
Baker	Hartke	Prouty
Bennett	Holland	Randolph
Bible	Hollings	Ribicoff
Boggs	Hruska	Schweiker
Brooke	Inouye	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Smith
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cooper	Long	Symington
Cotton	Mansfield	Talmadge
Cranston	McClellan	Thurmond
Dole	McIntyre	Tydings
Eagleton	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Murphy	

NAYS—23

Bellmon	Hughes	Muskie
Burdick	Javits	Packwood
Church	Kennedy	Proxmire
Fulbright	Mathias	Saxbe
Goodell	McGovern	Stevens
Gore	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gravel	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Hart	Moss	

NOT VOTING—24

Bayh	Fannin	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Percy
Case	Harris	Russell
Cook	Hatfield	Sparkman
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Dodd	Magnuson	Stevenson
Dominick	McCarthy	Tower
Eastland	McGee	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PASTORE's motion to lay Mr. JAVITS' amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the Senate today to approve Senate bill H.R. 19830, the independent offices appropriations for 1971, without delay. This bill, as we well know, contains the funds that are required to operate our housing programs this year.

It was indeed unfortunate that a difference between the Congress and the President on the desirable level of expenditures for urban renewal and community facilities should result in the delay and slowdown of our programs to provide better housing and better neighborhoods for all Americans. The difference, some \$600 million, is, in these critical budget days, not an insignificant matter. The need to temper our budget finely, to the point where it can support improvement without inflation, is clear to all of us. But, it is also significant, I must point out, that the sum in question is but a small fraction of the amount

that is proposed for the development of lower priority items. I maintain that the question of what we spend our tax dollars for is no less important than how much we are spending. There is, I have said many times before, no more important issue facing us in this country today than improving our environment—our residential environment—where we as individuals live out most of our lives. If we neglect that environment, we shall, I fear, in a relatively short time, find that, while there are many places we can visit, there will be few we care to live in.

The 1971 appropriations bill which I urge the Senate to support contains substantially increased funding for homeownership and rental assistance programs. I find this partially gratifying. These programs for low- and moderate-income families have, in a very short time, helped a large number of Americans secure better housing. While there are improvements to be made in the administration of these programs, I am confident that this Congress and future Congresses will continue to recognize the merit and the great popular demand for the 235 and 236 housing assistance programs.

In urging prompt action on these appropriations, I reflect serious concern for the many families who have applied for housing assistance only to be told that there are no funds, or that the waiting list is long and the waiting time considerable. In sponsoring and working for the passage of homeownership assistance, I do so deeply believing that the achievement of homeownership is, for many low-income families, part and parcel of the achievement of other goals in life. For many, it may in fact, be a goal that is essential to fulfillment. It was struck, and I think you will be, with one example of this that came to my attention recently. It dramatized for me, in very human terms, what the homeownership program means in the inner city, and what a delay in funding, or inadequate appropriations may imply. My office received a letter recently from Mrs. Charleen Snipes of Chicago. Her communication was not unlike others that I, and my colleagues have had to answer in recent weeks. Mrs. Snipes wrote that she had applied for assistance through her realtor, in purchasing a home earlier in the summer, but was told that program funds were exhausted, and that there was no telling when they would be available again. She wrote to me, very simply, to find out if, and when, funds would be available.

What made this common inquiry uncommon was a newspaper clipping she attached. The clipping was a picture-story of her and her seven children. Mrs. Snipes was in graduation cap-and-gown, and her handsome children were dressed in Sunday best witnessing her accomplishment. It was a most striking picture-story. With her community college degree achieved, Mrs. Snipes informed me, she is now pursuing an advanced academic program, and at the same time, assisted by her own mother who supervises the children until dinner time, she works at the college to support her effort to secure an education late in life and stable future

employment to enable her family to stand on its own feet.

It takes little imagination to see possible connections between her inquiry and her efforts. I found it particularly disturbing when answering her letter, to consider the gap between her commitment and ours. In voting for these appropriations, we will be voting a greater commitment that is urgently needed.

I feel compelled, however, in voting these appropriations, to remind my colleagues that there is a part of our commitment—a part of our existing housing law—that we are not recognizing in this appropriations measure. Until we put a modest sum of money where our law is, under the title establishing a National Home Ownership Foundation, we will not be fulfilling the commitment we made in 1968 to assist low and moderate-income families in this Nation to own their own homes and to rehabilitate more of our housing structures in the innercity for this purpose.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—HUD APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) and the members of his subcommittee for their long, diligent efforts on this year's appropriations bill for Independent Offices—Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is, of course, the second time this year that the Senator has been called upon to consider this vital measure. President Nixon vetoed the earlier appropriations bill on August 11, 1970, thus demonstrating this administration's false sense of domestic priorities.

The bill before us today is identical in all respects to the measure which was vetoed except for a reduction of \$150 million in the appropriations for urban renewal programs, and a similar reduction of \$150 million in the money available for water and sewer grants.

President Nixon professes to be anxious to lead a crusade against pollution, and yet he has forced us to delete the money for the adequate water and sewer facilities which are essential if we are ever to clean up the waters of our Nation. Regardless of his words, the President's actions are inhibiting our efforts to clean up the environment.

It is regrettable that these cuts in funding had to be made, but faced with the mulish obstinacy of the Nixon administration, there seems to be no other alternative if the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Veterans' Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and 20 other Government agencies are to receive the money they need to operate during the current fiscal year. The bill now under consideration contains a total of \$17.7 billion which is \$300 million less than was proposed in the vetoed version. Surely the President will accept this as a reasonable compromise.

During the past year, we have been confronted with a number of shocking revelations about the law and inadequate quality of care that the Veterans' Administration has been able to provide

in its 166 hospitals and 202 outpatient clinics across the country. Throughout my 12½ years tenure in the Senate, I have fought to assure our veterans the best medical care that money can buy. This bill wisely retains the \$105 million increase provided by Congress for veterans' medical care that was deleted from the President's budget request. I hope that our veterans do not once again fall victim to a sense of priorities that seems to tell them "the ABM is more important than your medical care."

I also call attention to the fact that included in this independent offices—HUD appropriations measure is \$7,401,800 for the construction of the San Antonio Federal courthouse and Federal office building, and \$916,000 that I was able to have included in the original bill for the new Denton Post Office. These facilities are urgently needed and will greatly benefit the people in the Denton and San Antonio areas. I am gratified that the funds for these two vital projects were retained in the bill.

This is, I believe, a reasonable appropriations bill except for the reduction in money for urban renewal and water and sewer facilities. The level of funding may not adequately provide for every existing need, but that dilemma is familiar to us all. I hope President Nixon will recognize the urgency of the need, sign this bill, and thereby demonstrate that he is not totally out of touch with the real needs of the American people.

APPROPRIATIONS INCREASE FOR VETERANS' MEDICAL CARE

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am delighted that this bill, H.R. 19830, which contains the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, is being acted upon today, and that it retains the full increase of \$105 million over the amended budget request for essential medical care for our veterans.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, and the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) the ranking minority member of that subcommittee, are most deserving of praise for the work they have done on this bill, and for their deep concern for our veterans expressed by their recommending this proposed increase for veterans medical care. I also wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. RUSSELL) and the ranking majority and minority members of the Committee (Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) for retaining the increase in this second version of this bill.

This second successful passage of this increase represents the culmination of a long and often difficult battle to ensure that our veterans returning from Vietnam have the highest quality medical care we can provide, and that all our veterans receive the same quality care.

One year and 3 weeks ago, on November 11, 1969—Veterans Day—I announced to the Senate the initiation of an investigation by the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee of medical care for Viet-

nam veterans in VA hospitals. The subcommittee proceeded to receive testimony from 45 witnesses, including eminent medical school deans and medical experts, seriously disabled veterans, and rehabilitation experts of veterans' groups. The subcommittee staff and I visited a number of VA hospitals—most unannounced—to talk with patients, administrators, physicians, nurses and other personnel, and to look over the general hospital situation.

Our subcommittee investigation, focusing on immediate care problems for wounded Vietnam veterans, illustrated graphically that war is not merely a killer: It is a cruel and terrible crippler.

Everybody knows that men get wounded in war. We get the statistics of the wounded right along with those of the dead. But somehow, we do not seem to feel for the wounded the way we feel for the dead. We count the cost of battles in dead, not maimed. We count bodies, not agonies.

For many, wounded men evoke a vision of a brief period of pain, a stay in the hospital, rest and recreation, and the purple heart. Then, many people seem to presume everything goes back to normal for these men, and they push them out of their minds. But the men that many Americans have forgotten have become uppermost in my mind since I learned what was happening to those whom the Nation treated as heroes only a short while ago.

I found some eye-opening and heart-rending facts. I found that the Vietnam war is the most crippling and seriously disabling war in our history. So far 292,345 men have been wounded in Southeast Asia.

I found that the wounds suffered by our men are incredibly severe because of the kind of war we are fighting—a war of high-powered rifles on the one hand, and, on the other hand, a war of mines and primitive booby traps that destroy a man without killing him.

I found that 10 percent of our surviving wounded are so badly shot-up or burned that they would have died in any other war. But, miraculously, we are keeping these men alive. It is a great tribute to our country that we are saving these men—a tribute to the intensity and compassion of our rescue operations.

Probably no other country spends as much manpower and money in rescuing a downed pilot or evacuating a wounded infantryman. But, science and man have their limitations. And I found that our veterans hospitals are being filled with more and more paraplegics and quadriplegics, more and more amputees and patients with multiple injuries.

And what is perhaps even worse, I found that these men—along with our hospitalized veterans of previous wars—are not getting the top quality medical care which they so richly deserve and have so painfully earned. I found hospitals severely understaffed, with insufficient numbers of general physicians and specialists, too few nurses, too few technicians. I found overcrowding in some hospitals and, in others, I found empty wings and idle equipment because there were not enough trained people to put them to use.

I found dedicated and conscientious staffs—overworked because of personnel shortages, and frustrated by inadequate and obsolete facilities. I found many of the patients wasting precious months and years of their lives because they are not receiving the care and compassion they must have for rapid recovery and rehabilitation. I found others suffering deeply from debilitating neglect.

As a result of all this, when on May 27 I went before the Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished and able Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), I asked for \$174 million more than had been appropriated by the House for the hospital and medical program.

Our investigation showed that this sum was necessary to provide high-quality hospital and medical care to our disabled veterans—to make up for the major deficiencies that plague very many VA hospitals. For the financial squeeze over the last 5 years has produced deterioration and a dangerously enlarging crisis in our VA medical system. This crisis did not occur overnight. It is the result of a steady erosion.

A Democratic administration and a Republican administration share responsibility for the sad state of affairs that now confronts us—a crisis caused by taking it for granted that things could be done without adequate funds. The executive branch in two administrations has turned down the budget requests of the VA's medical staff.

Year after year, the purchase of essential equipment and supplies has been deferred, along with renovation of facilities, construction of new facilities, and acquisition of staff. This process of slow deterioration, masterminded by the Bureau of the Budget, dramatically surfaced when increased numbers of Vietnam veterans began flowing into our VA hospitals.

The No. 1 problem facing VA hospitals today is a shortage of staff. VA hospitals have an overall staff-to-patient ratio of only 1.5 to 1 compared to staffing ratios of about 2.7 to 1 in community hospitals.

To help overcome this unfair, intolerable situation, I recommended to the Pastore subcommittee adding about \$51 million to fund an additional 5,000 more staff positions in VA hospitals. This would increase staff ratios to about 1.7 to 1, a substantial improvement which should help every veteran in a VA hospital.

I also asked for \$46 million to eliminate the serious backlog in equipment purchase, maintenance and repair.

The plight of those who have spinal cord injuries is especially deplorable. The ratio in the VA spinal cord injury units, as of April 1970, was approximately 1.02 staff for each spinal cord injury bed. In stark comparison, the ratio at New York's Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, headed by the world famous Dr. Howard Rusk, who is a consultant to the VA, is 2.17 to 1—more than twice as high. Many VA spinal cord injury centers are well equipped, but I have found only a few patients actively engaged in therapy at one time. Others wait endlessly for their turn in an unhappy, helpless, hopeless prone line. And still others have lost the incentive to come and wait, and wait.

I have proposed that by the end of fiscal year 1971 we provide the Veterans' Administration with \$10 million to double the spinal cord injury staffing ratio.

Under the impetus of our investigation and embarrassed by the recent Life magazine article, the VA decided to re-allocate funds and make a 25-percent increase in spinal cord injury staffing ratios for fiscal 1971. They had not planned to do this. I am glad we helped change their minds. I also recommended adding almost \$6 million to eliminate an outrageous backlog in dental examinations and treatment.

Although I have focused my recommendations primarily on the needs of disabled Vietnam veterans, I have tried to stress that inadequate conditions in our hospitals affect all veterans of all wars. You and I know, too, that there is growing, exploding need now for long-term care facilities for aging and infirm veterans of World War I and World War II. Because of this, I proposed an additional \$6 million to convert 1,000 more present hospital beds to nursing care use.

Despite strong Veterans' Administration opposition to every one of my recommendations, the Appropriations Committee accepted the bulk of them. It voted to increase the House-passed bill by \$100 million.

During the subsequent Senate debate, 35 Senators took to the floor to state their strong support for this increase, and the Senate passed it—unanimously.

Altogether, the Senate passed \$175 million more than was requested in the President's initial budget—the \$100 million added by the Senate—\$25 million won on the House floor by Chairman TEAGUE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee—and the \$50 million belatedly added by the administration to its original budget after our congressional investigations aroused the Nation and shook the White House.

The support we received in the Senate was characteristic of the bipartisan effort I have tried to foster for all veterans' matters. During the time I have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee all actions of our subcommittee, our full committee, and the Senate on VA education and training and medical legislation and on appropriations for these programs have been unanimous.

The amount finally passed by both Houses totaled \$105 million above the administration amended budget request. Chairman TEAGUE and I accepted the conference recommendation to eliminate the \$20 million which the Senate had earmarked for additional construction, because it was our understanding that most of the priority items, including design of a replacement hospital for both the Bronx Hospital in New York and the Wadsworth Hospital in Los Angeles, would very likely be carried out by the VA with existing construction money.

We thus felt that the crucial money was in the medical care category. We were particularly pleased that the full \$105 million for medical care was accepted by the conference committee.

The only problem was that when Congress sent the appropriations bill to the President, he unexpectedly and unjustly

fiably vetoed it on August 11, 1970. This meant that the entire process had to be repeated in order to get essential medical services to our veterans. My great regret is that this 4-month delay can never be entirely made up. This delay has irrevocably impaired the Veterans' Administration's ability to recruit very necessary personnel, whose energies and talents could have been well used in our VA hospitals. We will never get back the lost medical care and the lost rehabilitation our maimed veterans desperately need now at this very moment. And with every week that goes by until the VA finally receives its appropriation, it will be more and more difficult to recruit all the additional staff it so desperately needs.

However, I welcome this increase, even though it is long overdue, and now clearly, probably, too little, by half at least. It can be fully used up just to purchase necessary equipment and make repairs, renovations, and improvements. And the VA can at least begin the recruiting and hiring of personnel that has been delayed so long.

I urge the President to mitigate his previous action in denying adequate medical care to veterans through his veto by moving as swiftly as possible to approve this bill, and then to see that the full amount is immediately released by the Office of Management and Budget to the Veterans' Administration. I trust that the President will again not lose sight of the desperate need of our wounded, disabled, and ill veterans by vetoing this appropriation bill a second time.

This increase in appropriations for our veterans medical care is most welcome. Even at this late date, it will still serve to improve the care which we have a deep obligation to provide to our veterans and which they urgently need. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this essential matter and insuring the actual expenditure of these crucial funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator

from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 415 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Alken	Griffin	Murphy
Allen	Gurney	Muskie
Allott	Hansen	Nelson
Anderson	Hart	Packwood
Baker	Hartke	Pastore
Bellmon	Holland	Pearson
Bennett	Hollings	Pell
Bible	Hruska	Prouty
Boggs	Hughes	Proxmire
Brooke	Inouye	Randolph
Burdick	Jackson	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Saxbe
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Schweiker
Church	Kennedy	Scott
Cooper	Long	Smith
Cotton	Mansfield	Stennis
Cranston	Mathias	Stevens
Dole	McClellan	Symington
Eagleton	McGovern	Talmadge
Ellender	McIntyre	Thurmond
Ervin	Metcalf	Tydings
Fong	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Gore	Montoya	Yarborough
Gravel	Moss	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—1

Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—24

Bayh	Fannin	McGee
Byrd, Va.	Fulbright	Mundt
Case	Goldwater	Percy
Cook	Harris	Russell
Curtis	Hatfield	Sparkman
Dodd	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Dominick	Magnuson	Stevenson
Eastland	McCarthy	Tower

So the bill (H.R. 19830) was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has again witnessed the outstanding advocacy of the senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). Once

again he has steered this highly important appropriations measure to overwhelming Senate approval. He has done so with the same outstanding legislative skill and ability that have characterized his many years of public service. This funding measure provides vital support for our many housing programs and programs that are designed to assist the cities with their grave and pressing problems. Those interests could not have a better advocate than JOHN PASTORE of Rhode Island. He deserves the highest commendation of the Senate.

Joining Senator PASTORE was the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT). His strong cooperation and assistance were indispensable to this great success and the Senate is most grateful.

Offering their own strong and sincere views during the consideration of this measure were the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), and the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). They and others contributed immensely to the high level of the debate. They and others exhibited their own strong interests in the programs funded by this bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1406, H.R. 19590. I do this so that it will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES). The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 19590) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be nothing done on this bill tonight, but the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) will be prepared to make the opening statement at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination reported earlier in the day from the the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerard D. Reilly, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

ELIMINATION OF MULTIPLE CUSTOMS DUTIES ON HORSES TEMPORARILY EXPORTED FOR USE IN RACING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 217, H.R. 4239.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4239) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent the payment of multiple customs duties in the case of horses temporarily exported for the purpose of racing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Finance with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, after line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

H.R. 4239

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the free importation of certain wild animals, and to provide for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products", approved August 22, 1964 (Public Law 88-482) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs))" and inserting in lieu thereof "106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs)), and 106.30 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen lamb meat)"; and

(2) by striking out "725,400,000 pounds" and inserting in lieu thereof "738,400,000 pounds".

(b) Section 2(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture, for each calendar year after 1969, shall also estimate and publish—

"(3) the quantity of the articles specified in item 106.30 of Tariff Schedules of the United States which bears the same ratio to the aggregate quantity estimated by him pursuant to paragraph (1) for such calendar year as the average annual quantity of such articles imported during the years 1966 through 1968, inclusive, bears to the average annual quantity of all articles described in subsection (a) imported during such years, and

"(4) before the first day of each calendar quarter in such calendar year, the quantity

of the articles specified in item 106.30 of such Schedules which (but for this section) would be imported in such calendar year.

In applying paragraph (4) for the second or any succeeding calendar quarter in any calendar year, actual imports for the preceding calendar quarter or quarters in such calendar year shall be taken into account to the extent data is available."

(c) Section 2(c) of such Act is amended—
(1) by striking out "under this section" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "under this paragraph";

(2) by striking out "under this section" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "under paragraph (1)";

(3) by renumbering paragraph (3) as (4), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) If the quantity estimated before any calendar quarter by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b)(4) exceeds the quantity estimated by him pursuant to subsection (b)(3), the President shall by proclamation limit the quantity of the articles specified in item 106.30 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during such calendar year to the quantity estimated for such calendar year by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b)(3)."; and

"(4) by inserting after the first sentence of paragraph (4) (as renumbered) the following new sentence: "The Secretary of Agriculture shall allocate the quantity proclaimed under paragraph (3), and any increase in such quantity pursuant to subsection (d), among supplying countries on the basis of the shares of the articles specified in item 106.30 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which such countries supplied to the United States market during a representative period, except that due account may be given to special factors which have affected or may affect the trade in such articles."

(d) Section 2(d) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (a)" in paragraph (2) the following: "(or in the case of a proclamation under subsection (c)(3), the supply of articles of the kind specified in item 106.30 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States)".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to calendar years after 1969.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I urge rejection of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Without objection, the amendment is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to prevent the payment of multiple customs duties in the case of horses temporarily exported for the purpose of racing, and to provide for the imposition of quotas on lamb meat."

ORDER FOR THE SENATE TO CON- VENE AT 10 A.M. EVERY DAY FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate convene at the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BELLMON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that at the conclusion of the disposition of the reading of the Journal on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT AND FEDERAL AVIATION ACT, 1958— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 10634, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and Federal Aviation Act of 1958, in order to exempt certain wages and salaries for income tax purposes. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The papers are not here.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask that action on the conference report be withheld.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have been particularly interested in the international aspects of the space program. The post-Apollo program—and the reusable space shuttle system in particular—has already demonstrated a remarkable potential for international support. NASA's activities acquainting other countries with the opportunities and benefits of participation in the development of a reusable space transportation system have evoked a positive response that would have been difficult to predict a year ago.

I have been informed by NASA that the 12-nation European Space Conference has taken a number of specific steps to bring Europe to the point where major commitments to post-Apollo contributions can be considered and undertaken:

They have established a full-time office in Washington.

They have named representatives to NASA technology steering committees for both the shuttle and the space station.

They have already committed several million dollars for independent European industrial studies of post-Apollo projects.

And they have sent to the United States a ministerial-level delegation, headed by the Belgian Minister of Science, to determine the ground rules for possible European participation.

The proposition which the nations of Europe are considering, as they have defined it for themselves in preliminary discussions, is nothing less than the expenditure of a billion dollars in the next decade to develop elements of U.S. post-Apollo systems. This proposition has captured the imaginations of European governments and industrial communities. The governments of Europe are considering it at the highest levels because they recognize both the technological benefits of helping to develop a reusable space transportation system and the significance of such a system for doing business in space in the future.

Should such significant European participation materialize, the United States would gain very considerable practical benefits in both finance and technology. The intangible benefits could be even greater in terms of our interest in the Atlantic community and the strength of the Western system. For a long time we have needed programs to compelling significance to ourselves and to our partners. The space transportation system, with its strong appeal to national imperatives, is well suited for the purpose.

The questions of whether and how Europe should participate are difficult by virtue of their scope and complexity, and the members of the European Space Conference will have different attitudes toward them. West Germany, France, and Belgium are together leading a positively oriented group into further discussions with NASA and the Department of State. While some of the smaller countries may not follow them, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, and the Netherlands have said that they fully support such exploratory efforts. The British, who may have the greatest difficulty because of their economic situation, have nevertheless not closed the door to participating in post-Apollo. They are assisting in planning for the next talks with the Department of State and NASA and they are contributing their share to the studies of post-Apollo now in progress in Europe. As the space shuttle program in the United States moves forward, the prospects for participation by the United Kingdom should improve and quite likely fortify the already positive attitudes of West Germany, France, and Belgium.

In considering the post-Apollo program projects before us, we are considering far more than a narrow interest. We are considering the main thrust of the exploration and exploitation of space. We are considering an approach which commends itself strongly to other nations as well as to us and which will

have increasing leverage in bringing those nations together with us in common purpose.

Mr. President, in my view, NASA and the administration are to be commended for aggressively pursuing the goal of increased international cooperation in space. It would be extremely unfortunate if the Senate were to adopt the amendment now before us. Surely such action would be a major—and perhaps irrevocable—setback to truly meaningful international participation in future space programs. I intend to vote against such action.

THE PROPOSED ILLINOIS STATE CONSTITUTION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, because of the general interest in many States in updating antiquated State constitutions, I wish to comment in the Senate today on how the State of Illinois is facing this situation.

On December 15, the citizens of Illinois will go to the polls to vote on a proposed revision to their 100-year-old State constitution. The new constitution, hammered out over a period of 9 months by 116 convention delegates, is a contemporary, flexible document which, if approved by the voters, will enable the State of Illinois to carry out its duties more openly and efficiently.

The proposed document is a significant improvement over the old one of 1870. Where the latter dealt with warehouses and the World's Columbian Exposition, the former addresses itself to such contemporary problems as pollution and transportation. For example, in a new and special section, the constitution states that "each person has the right to a healthful environment" and adds that "each person can enforce this right against any party, governmental or private, through appropriate legal proceedings." And elsewhere, the constitution declares that "public transportation is an essential public purpose for which public funds can be expended." Thus, the improvement of public transportation becomes the primary concern that it ought to be.

In the executive, legislative, and judicial areas, the State charter sheds the antiquated and adopts the innovative, and in so doing offers hope for more honest, responsive and streamlined government.

Under the executive article of the constitution, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor are elected as a team, so as to increase the prospects for a more harmonious working relationship between the State's two top officials. To avoid having State officials swept into office on the coattails of a presidential candidate, elections will be held in off-presidential years. This provision will also insure that State issues and candidates receive the attention they deserve.

In the legislative area, the voters will be given the choice between retaining the present method of choosing State Representatives; that is, by cumulative voting in multimember districts, or abandoning this system in favor of electing the 177 members from single-member

districts. Because of the highly controversial aspect of this issue, the convention delegates wisely separated it from the main body of the constitution, so that its failure will not necessarily result in the failure of the constitution. The minimum age for service in the legislative body is lowered to 21; and the number of State senators rises from 58 to 59.

In the judicial branch, an attempt is made to reduce the heavy backlogs in civil cases, so that the courts can devote more time to the more serious cases. This is done by allowing smaller juries—no smaller than six—and less than unanimous verdicts—no less than three-quarters majority—in civil cases. In this connection, it is noteworthy that defendants in Cook County courts must wait longer than the defendants of any other State before going to trial. The backlog goes back as far as 6 or 7 years.

Two alternative methods of selecting judges will be offered to the voters. They will be able to choose between abandoning the present system of electing judges—which tends to reward personal popularity and party loyalty rather than judicial ability—in favor of having judges appointed by the Governor, after having been nominated by a bipartisan committee of lawyers and laymen. Again, this issue, because it is controversial, will be submitted to the voters in a separate ballot rather than in the main body of the constitution.

The education article of the constitution broadens the aim of our educational system in stating that "a fundamental goal of the people of the State is the educational development of all persons to the limits of their capacities"; and it shifts the burden from locally levied property taxes to a statewide income tax. Henceforth the State will bear the primary responsibility for financing the system of public education. And by making the post of State school superintendent an appointive rather than an elective one, the State's top education officer is freed from the hazards of campaigning, and allowed to devote his full energies and talents to his job.

The most outstanding part of the new constitution is its bill of rights—hailed by some as the best in any constitution of the 50 States.

During a period when the country frequently witnessed the mindless and destructive acts of a fanatic few, Convention delegates resisted the temptation to respond in an equally mindless fashion by weakening or taking away those fundamental rights belonging to the individual. Indeed, it strengthened those rights.

A right until now guaranteed only by the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution, the right of equal protection of the laws, was added to the constitution's due process clause. Only a few States have such a provision.

To the clause on limitation of penalties after conviction, the convention added a most progressive and enlightened provision: that "all penalties shall be determined both according to the seriousness of the offense and with the objective of restoring the offender to useful citizen-

ship." Again, the State of Illinois is far ahead of most others.

To protect against the encroachments of big brother, the convention included, in its section on unreasonable searches and seizures, protection against "invasions of privacy or interceptions of communications by eavesdropping devices or other means."

The right to remedy and justice is strengthened by the substitution of the word "shall" for "ought to" in "He shall obtain justice by law freely, completely, and promptly."

The bill of rights also contains a far-reaching provision in its antidiscrimination clause—which may be the strongest of any provided by the 50 States. This clause clearly states that "All persons shall have the right to be free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national ancestry and sex in the hiring and promotion practices of any employer or in the sale or rental of property. These rights are enforceable without action by the General Assembly."

Rather than weakening fundamental rights, the convention reacted to the particular difficulties of today by stressing that "These blessings—those guaranteed by the constitution—cannot endure unless the people recognize their corresponding, individual obligations and responsibilities."

And instead of remaining silent on the most difficult questions of the day, the delegates chose to recognize them in the preamble of the bill of rights, and to articulate the noble aspirations of "eliminating poverty and inequality; assuring legal, social, and economic justice; and providing opportunity for the fullest development of the individual." In other words, the delegates did not ignore these problems—as they might have—but chose to ask the best of the citizens of Illinois in attempting to solve them.

These, then, are some of the highlights found in the main body of the constitution. There are, however, two more issues to be voted upon which are of such importance and interest to me that I would like to comment on them at least briefly. These two issues are: First, the lowering of the voting age to 18; and second, the abolition of the death penalty.

I hope the voters will decide in favor of lowering the voting age to 18. Never in our history have our youth been so well-informed politically and so concerned about the eradication of social injustices. I believe the energies and aspirations of our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 should be channeled into the democratic process, and not be allowed to wither into disinterest and cynicism. In voting on this issue, I hope the voters will think more about the majority or responsible, concerned youth, and not about the destructive and irresponsible minority who receive publicity all out of proportion to their numbers.

The fourth and final issue to be voted on separately is the abolition of the death penalty. I hope this penalty will be abolished. Aside from the fact that there is no evidence whatever to prove

that the death penalty acts as a deterrent to crime, this punishment puts the emphasis on revenge rather than rehabilitation. More often than not, it is the poor and the friendless who are condemned. And worst of all, the penalty is obviously irrevocable.

The proposed State constitution of 1970 is a well-thought-out, progressive document which will enable our State to move forward in an enlightened manner. At the same time, it retains the best of the old constitution by upholding our best traditions and reaffirming our basic belief in the rights of the individual.

In light of the fact that previous efforts to revise our constitution have failed because of indifference or apathy, I am especially hopeful that a very substantial number of voters will come to the polls and express an interest in this most important and far-reaching proposal. It has my full support and I hope the citizens of Illinois will endorse it on December 15.

CALENDAR CALL OF UNOBJECTED-TO ITEMS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calendar call of unobjected-to items may be had on tomorrow morning prior to recognition of the able Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) under the special order.

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

HIGHWAY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my able senior colleague, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 19504.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL) laid before the Senate H.R. 19504, to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as having been read twice and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause be stricken and that the language of S. 4418, as it passed the Senate on October 2, 1970, be substituted therefor.

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

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 19504) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and request a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAVEL) appointed Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. SPONG, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. BAKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 91-405, appoints the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) to the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 8, 1970, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, December 7, 1970:

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for the terms as indicated, new positions.

For a term of 1 year:

Robert F. Buck, of Washington,
Clifford H. N. Yee, of Hawaii.

For a term of 2 years:

Allie C. Felder, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Daniel Parker, of Wisconsin.

For a term of 3 years:

Gustav M. Hauser, of New Jersey.
James A. Suffridge, of Virginia.

Bradford Mills, of New Jersey, to be President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; new position.

Herbert Salzman, of New York, to be Executive Vice President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; new position.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, December 7, 1970:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

Gerard D. Reilly, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of years prescribed by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.