

where work had to await for many years completion of other projects such as bridge removal and highway construction. He did, however, see the realization of many other improvements in which he played an active

role and which made this city famous for urban renewal.

Mr. Van Buskirk's passing severs another link with this city's progressive recent past. The giants of the "renaissance" are gone. How

are they to be replaced? A revival of their vision and public-spiritedness among those left in positions of trust and responsibility would be the best and most appropriate tribute to their memories.

SENATE—Friday, April 28, 1972

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m., and was called to order by Hon. FRANK E. MOSS, a Senator from the State of Utah.

PRAYER

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

O God our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, be with Thy servants here in this perilous age to support and guide them. Sharpen their minds, warm their hearts, kindle their patriotism, and increase their devotion to Thee. Be with them in solitary moments as well as in times of public action. Give them an enduring resolution to serve truth and justice. Work through them Thy purposes for this Nation and for all mankind. Be with them in their going out and their coming in now and for evermore. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. FRANK E. MOSS, a Senator from the State of Utah to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Thursday, April 27, 1972, be dispensed with.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan desire recognition?

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

ROBERT C. BYRD). Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 729, 730, and 731.

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

FARMFEST—U.S.A.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 182) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in Farmfest—U.S.A. and the world ploughing contest in September 1972 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 182

Whereas the United States will host the Nineteenth Annual World Ploughing Contest in September 1972 in Blue Earth County, Minnesota, and

Whereas up to twenty-two nations can be expected to participate in this contest on September 15 and 16 as part of a weeklong Farmfest—U.S.A., and

Whereas the 1972 National Ploughing Contest and the 1972 Grand National Tractor-Pull Contest are included in the scheduled events of Farmfest—U.S.A., and

Whereas Farmfest—U.S.A. will feature exhibitions of machinery, equipment, supplies, services, and other products used in the production and marketing of agricultural products; promote foreign and domestic trade and commerce in such products; and salute worldwide agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to invite by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in Farmfest—U.S.A. to be held in Blue Earth County, Minnesota, from September 11, 1972, through September 17, 1972.

NATIONAL COACHES DAY

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 213) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating October 6, 1972, as "National Coaches Day" was

considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 213

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating October 6, 1972, as "National Coaches Day", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

NATIONAL ARTHRITIS MONTH

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1029) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May of 1972 as "National Arthritis Month."

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am very gratified that the Senate is today considering House Joint Resolution 1029. This resolution would authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May as "National Arthritis Month." Senate Joint Resolution 180, the Senate version of this proposal which I introduced, was cosponsored by 37 Senators. The House form, which we are presently considering, was introduced by Representative DAVID PRYOR of Arkansas and cosponsored by 68 Members. It received the approval of the other body on April 12, 1972.

The Judiciary Committees of both Houses are to be commended for their favorable action on this legislation. I would especially like to thank the distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, Senators HRUSKA and McCLELLAN, for their interest in this serious problem of human welfare.

I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 180 to help call attention to the need to better combat the human and economic curse imposed upon our Nation by arthritic and rheumatic diseases. May is the month during which the Arthritis Foundation conducts its campaign to collect funds for arthritis research and treatment.

It is my hope that more private and public resources can be directed toward eliminating the suffering which arthritis and similar diseases cause millions of Americans of all ages. Because of the fact that they do not often result in death, many of our citizens do not realize the national health problem posed by these diseases. As a matter of fact, after heart disease, arthritis and rheumatic diseases are the most widespread chronic illnesses in the United States. The Arthritis Foundation estimates that 50 million Americans are afflicted by some form of arthritis—17 million of these seriously enough to require medical care.

One in four families include an arthritis sufferer. This debilitating disease does not restrict itself to our older citizens, but in its most violent rheumatoid form attacks primarily people under 45 years of age including many children.

Arthritis imposes grave economic, as well as human, costs upon our society. Various sources estimate that arthritis and rheumatic diseases cost individuals and the National Government over \$3.5 billion annually in lost wages and salaries, medical costs, payments by the Veterans' Administration, and losses in Federal income and excise taxes. One can fairly add to this list the \$400 million which it is estimated arthritis sufferers spend on "quack" remedies each year.

I want to emphasize that this illness denies to the Nation the talents of the citizens it strikes. Our society cannot safely overlook these human resources. It is especially important that through arthritis research and treatment, as well as through other means, we increase the ability of our older citizens to contribute to the national life.

Medical research and therapy is one area of public and private endeavor for which our society must provide adequate financial support. We cannot abide the human suffering and economic losses which would result from the failure to do so.

In conclusion, I would like to state that the version of the resolution reported by the distinguished committee contains the amendments made by the House. These changes are perfectly acceptable to me.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations on the Executive Calendar, under "New Reports," will be stated.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William D. Rusinak to be a first lieutenant.

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

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MOSS. 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

INTERCONTINENTAL WATER PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on behalf of the people of Utah and all of the Western States, I want to congratulate President Nixon and Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada for the successful conclusion of an agreement with Canada to begin the long and costly job of cleaning up the Great Lakes.

Perhaps because of the intensity of the warfare in Southeast Asia, perhaps because of everybody's concern about the rising cost of living, perhaps because of manifold dissension among us, perhaps because of the Democratic Party primary activity, perhaps even because of the unprecedented delay in the start of the baseball season—whatever the reason—this agreement has not had the public attention it deserves.

The 1972 pact with Canada to begin a planned and coordinated attack on pollution in the Great Lakes is one of the more significant events of this decade. Its importance may not be widely apparent for some years, but by the end of the seventies it will be recognized as a major step, and, yes, a turning point toward a policy of preserving instead of degrading this beautiful land we occupy.

In addition to congratulations, I want to express the gratitude and pleasure of the people of the Western States, and particularly the water-conscious States represented in the Federation of Rocky Mountain States—including Utah—for the accomplishment of this highly constructive step toward keeping America beautiful and extending our life expectancy here.

Before we know it, the U.S. bicentennial year will be upon us. From all we can see going on, it may not be a very happy birthday party. But if we carry through on our part of the bargain made with the Canadians, we will, by 1976, have something to celebrate as far as water resources are concerned.

My colleagues in the Senate, some of whom may be a bit impatient with my constant pressing for water resource care and development, may wonder why the Senator from Utah is so elated about the good fortune of the people in the Great Lakes States in the commitment of the Federal Government to do something, finally, about the pollution of the Great Lakes.

I will tell you why I am elated. It is

because the 1972 Great Lakes agreement between Canada and the United States is clearly the first step toward an eventual consultative arrangement on the care and constructive utilization of waters in other parts of the continent.

This agreement is a turning point because it is in the direction of cooperation and coordinated work. It is a first step because it commits both countries to stop flushing their untreated industrial and domestic sewage into the world's largest natural reservoir of fresh water.

Today, I would like to offer for the consideration of the Senate, and I hope of the Office of Management and Budget a suggestion as to the next four steps in the direction of good neighborliness and long life and prosperity for Canada, Mexico, and the United States on the continent of North America.

These are steps primarily oriented toward Western water development, but eventually benefiting all the States. I say this not just because the economic and social health of the water-short areas of the West is important to the rest of the country. I say it because the East as well as the West will benefit from water resource planning and development which treats the continent as a whole and not a collection of jurisdictions. Nature's boundaries and political boundaries are badly out of phase. There is no use trying to adjust them. We have to deal with nature on her terms.

The four steps call for a very small investment of dollars, but a very large investment of intelligence.

The steps I propose we take now are:

First. Establishment of a Water Basin Commission, under the Water Resources Planning Act, for the Colorado-South Pacific States;

Second. Immediate funding of Alaskan water and related land resources studies already outlined by State and Federal representatives in Alaska;

Third. Initiation of Water Resources Council study of possibilities of the transfer of water from Alaska to the coterminous States of the Union;

Fourth. Inauguration of technical consultations with Canada and Mexico for water resource planning across the board.

Before explaining these straightforward steps, let me review the situation which faces us.

The United States faces a wide range of water problems in the years ahead. They are serious enough as a consequence of historic abuse of resources and current demands, but will become more serious with increases in population. In the Eastern part of the country, pollution, flood threat, and watershed damage are the more serious problems. In the West, inadequacy of supply threatens to limit the economic activity of a vast region of the Nation.

The supply problem is probably the most difficult to solve. As the Nation's population increases, the water-short regions which have space and could provide new opportunities for better living will necessarily fall out of step with the rest of the country unless a solution is found to foreseeable water supply problems. Individual or separated massive projects, even of the caliber of the Cali-

fornia water project, offer partial and limited relief. A new approach is indicated for the long term.

Continentalwide, multibasin, integrated planning, with a step at a time development, offers a promising and practical approach. The vast water resources of Alaska make realistic new and imaginative concepts of collecting surplus water in the North and redistributing it to regions which are short. It could be a grand system. No commitments need be, can be, or should be made until Canada, Mexico, and the United States have satisfied themselves that continentalwide planning and development makes sense. The first step is to gather the data necessary for planning concepts.

The problem we face—along with the Canadians and the Mexicans—can be quite simply outlined.

First, the total amount of water available to us is limited; the population dependent upon it is not.

Second, the distribution of the water resources, the regions of water production, and the distribution of population—the regions where people want to live and work—are not congruent, nor are they reasonably manageable.

Third, the exploitation of natural resources and the industrialization by which we live place an ever-increasing burden on both the quantity and the quality of our water supply.

Fourth, the care taken of our water resources, or the damage done to them, in one part of the continent eventually has an impact on the rest of the continent.

These four points determine the boundaries of a dilemma from which there is no escape except through intelligent and logical analysis and planning for the care and use of all the water resources of the continent.

I am encouraged by signs of recognition of the realities of this situation. There is reason to believe that the Canadians, some of whom have been offended by what seemed to them to be ill-considered or even greedy policies on the part of Americans, are going ahead with studies of their own water resources, with a view to determining whether or not any kind of joint planning with us makes sense. They are doing the right thing. I believe that the National Water Commission report due next year will provide some guidance for our own efforts for at least the rest of the decade.

THE REGIONS OF THE WEST

The concept which I advance today are realizable with today's technology. We are ready to go. The benefits will be available to the entire continent. The vital interests of three countries are involved. The principles on which continentalwide water resource planning are necessarily based can be applied, and eventually must be applied, to all of the United States. Even if no multinational program is envisioned, the United States must still treat itself as a whole, not as a collection of separated and isolated drainage basins.

This discussion deals only with the West. The West includes Alaska and the contiguous States of Arizona, California,

Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. These 12 States have been grouped into three drainage-area regions, consistent with the practice of the Federal Water Resources Council. The regions are:

Alaska, which alone covers a dozen major river basins with tremendous quantities of high quality water and an area greater than that of either of the two multi-State regions;

Columbia-North Pacific region, as defined in the first biennial assessment of the Nation's Water Resources by the Water Resources Council, covers the Columbia River drainage basin and all of the State of Washington, most of Oregon and Idaho, and parts of Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming;

Colorado-South Pacific region—or Southwest Pacific—covers the entire State of California with its several basins, the great basin, largely encompassing Nevada, and the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins. In addition to California, the region covers all of Arizona, most of Nevada and Utah, and large parts of Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

THE WATER PROBLEMS

For purposes of establishing the basis for a west-side water plan, following is a brief summary of the assessment of water problems by regions.

A quick, gross assessment: Alaska and the Columbia-North Pacific region are generously endowed with water resources; the Colorado-South Pacific region is not.

Alaska's water problems relate primarily to flood threat, scattered pollution points, erosion, and general lack of capital for investment in water resource development. A preliminary study leading to a comprehensive development plan was prepared several years ago by an ad hoc State-Federal work group under the Water Resources Council. While Alaska has no basins commission under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, coordinated planning has been carried forward on a voluntary and informal basis. A Basin Commission formed under the provisions of the 1965 act would provide a proper planning mechanism for the long-run care and development of the State's vast and incalculably valuable water resources.

The Columbia-North Pacific region, with extensive development of water resources, has moderate and scattered problems of pollution, flood threat, erosion, and watershed land care. All are subject to solution with good planning and reasonable funding, within the context of the region's economic and social momentum. The region is organized for coordinated planning and programming among local, State, and Federal agencies through a Basin Commission, staffed and funded as authorized by the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. Its long range forecasts indicate total commitment of the region's water resources before the end of the century.

The Colorado-South Pacific region has serious problems related to inadequacy of supply and deteriorating quality of water. The region has intensive development,

particularly for irrigation and power, and fears serious shortages. The demand for industrial and municipal use increases steadily with population. The problems, particularly in the Lower Colorado Basin, become more serious each year. While relief may be available through improved use, the basic problem of supply is not subject to solution without new sources—unless irrigated food production is continuously reduced, a prospect with far-reaching impacts. Without additional supply, the region faces actual restraints on the economic and social momentum of this great section of our country. Regional planning is now loosely coordinated through a voluntary interagency committee of representatives of State and Federal agencies. While the Colorado is the Nation's most intensively studied and used river, there is no regional commission to apply the provisions of the Federal Water Resources Planning Act.

INTERREGIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

For more than half a century, but particularly in the last decade, one of the most widely discussed solutions to the Southwest water shortage problem at least among the residents of the region, has been the transfer to the Colorado River of some 3 to 5 million acre-feet of the annual 90 million acre-foot runoff of the Columbia. In a public service paper titled "Water for the West, Summary of Regional Water Plans," published in October 1967, the Los Angeles Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers cited a half-dozen proposals which would tap either the Snake River or the mainstem of the Columbia for the benefit of the Southwest. Another would tie in the Snake and the Yellowstone, tributary to the Missouri. One would use the channel of the Snake to remove water from the Columbia. Two proposals would transfer water from northern California rivers to southern California, one via an undersea aqueduct and the other by exchanges with the Colorado. The proposals also included a continental plan which would have tied the Columbia into a water collection and distribution system extending from Alaska to Mexico and from Quebec to Texas.

With respect to the plans using the Columbia or its tributaries as a source, the ASCE publication treated them as practical from the engineering and construction standpoint. Other considerations were obviously beyond the scope of the paper. The assumed economic and social benefits were not checked out. The plans were not checked out from the standpoint of the total national interest. This is one of the opportunities for the National Water Commission, which is not barred from the study of interbasin transfers.

The Commission, created by Congress in 1968 and due to report in 1973, is also authorized to make use of basin commissions in support of its own studies. The people of the Southwest were fearful of the statutory bars to interbasin transfers which the Congress saw fit to put in both the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 and the Central Arizona Project Act of 1968. The latter has a 10-year moratorium on such studies. But, as

Henry P. Caulfield, the former Executive Director of the Water Resources Council, told the Los Angeles civil engineers in his critique of their public service paper, these prohibitions will not always be the law of the land. In his words:

What the Congress is trying to do is to make certain that deliberate steps, with very careful consideration at each step, be taken in resolution of this unprecedented and major issue of interstate interbasin transfers of water.

The comprehensive framework studies in title I of that act are, in Mr. Caulfield's words:

Part of this deliberate effort to have orderly resolution of this issue in the national interest.

In other words, even in front of the statutory bars, study and data analysis work should go on.

A look at some of the problems which might be expected in undertaking massive interbasin transfers—especially those having to do with the terms and conditions of removal of such a resource from the contributing region, the ecological effects of the movement of water, the socioeconomic impacts and what might be called a cost effectiveness comparison with the emerging technological alternatives of weather modification and desalting—reveals the fact that the remainder of the period of the 10-year moratorium can be constructively used for basic planning for relief of the Colorado and aligned basins. There is no statutory prohibition of study by basin commissions which basins having a surplus to confirm that they really have the surplus and of studies to determine how they might dispose of it beneficially. Such information will be essential effectively to follow up to the work of the National Water Commission, and for the continuing national assessments by the Water Resources Council. The questions involved are truly—necessarily—national and are not subject to solution on a simple basin or regional basis. Furthermore, a vast amount of basic geophysical, ecological, and socioeconomic data is necessary for international planning.

CONTINENTAL PLANNING

Studies of the transfer possibilities involving two basins naturally led to examination of multibasin interconnections. As the potential benefits emerged, so did the problems, and with both came the realization that massive interbasin transfers of waters have to be dealt with first on a national basis. The next step leads beyond national borders to consideration of collection and redistribution of water anywhere on the continent.

In 1964, the Ralph M. Parsons Co. of Los Angeles published a report of its work on just such a continental concept. It became known as NAWAPA—the North American Water and Power Alliance. Sufficient reconnaissance engineering, as contrasted with fieldwork, had been done as an "in-house R. & D." effort to indicate both the technical and economic feasibility of collecting and redistributing to the populous and needful areas of the continent some of the water

now running off unused into the Arctic and North Pacific Oceans. The Parsons concept has been criticized for some of its features, but its greatest value has been to bring to light the opportunities for better use of water wherever it is.

That some of the northern water will always remain unused or unneeded in the basins of origin is a matter that has to be confirmed by two types of study; first by actual field survey and appraisal work to determine the amounts of water actually available, and second by comparing this data with carefully prepared forecasts of future utilization for at least a century. The volume of water flowing from these regions indicates the effort is worth making.

At least a half dozen plans, both American and Canadian, involving international interbasins transfers have applied in part the principles of continentwide planning. The first, by Thomas W. Kierans of Sudbury, Ontario, would tap the supplies of the James Bay Watershed for transfer to the Great Lakes and the bordering States of the United States. Prof. Edwin Kuiper, a world renowned hydraulics engineer of the University of Manitoba, proposed collecting the excess runoff of Canada's central north for redistribution to the southern half of Canada, the Great Lakes, and the States of the United States along the eastern slopes of the Rockies, thence into Texas and the Southwest.

Knut Magnusson, rancher-engineer of Alberta and Ottawa, offered a similar plan drawing water from the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains in Canada. Lewis G. Smith, a retired U.S. Bureau of Reclamation engineer of Denver, submitted to the Federation of Rocky Mountain States an alternative to the Western section of the Parsons plan, avoiding use of the Rocky Mountain Trench as a reservoir, as envisioned in the Parsons or NAWAPA plan.

Similarly, E. Roy Tinney, a Canadian who formerly headed the Washington State Water Resources Center, suggested in 1967 before returning to Canada for Federal water planning work, a centrally based system like Kuiper's serving the Southwest but with no Rocky Mountain component, either in the United States or Canada. He said the Parsons concept relied too heavily on "huge artificial reservoirs, costly high dams, and large pumping lifts." He said a much simpler system, which he called CeNAWP—Central North American Water Project—could do the essential part of the job, supplying both the Canadian and U.S. prairies, and augmenting the Great Lakes, the Rio Grande, and the Colorado. None of these concepts takes into account the possibilities of using Alaskan water to start the system.

THE NAWAPA CONCEPT

The Parsons concept, NAWAPA, covers the entire continent, from Alaska to Mexico and from Quebec to Texas. Applying the same continental or multibasin planning principles in Mexico, water planners came up with an interchange plan extending the benefits to the South. Mexico would receive water

from the NAWAPA system delivered from Alaska and Canada, west of the Rockies, then collect the excess runoff in the rain-rich Tehuantepec Isthmus area for movement north along the eastern slopes of Mexico, irrigating a vast new area in Mexico and tying into the Rio Grande irrigation complex at Del Rio, Tex.

The continental system was designed to distribute both water and power, utilizing the gravity stored energy available from water deposited by nature in high mountainous areas. Such a system could provide new water for the southern tier of the Prairie Provinces of Canada, augment the supply of the Great Lakes, stabilize the flow of the Columbia in the West as well as the St. Lawrence in the East, provide additional water for the Great Plains, including restoration of ground water levels in the southern high plains, augment the flow of the Colorado with supplies for all the areas now tapping that water course, and deliver new and higher quality water for Mexico at several points along the U.S.-Mexican border. The decreasing quality of water supplied to Mexico via the Colorado under treaty is of equal concern to the Mexicans to the threatened shortage.

The NAWAPA concept starts its operations in Alaska. The system picks up water in every water-producing area through which the network passes. The initial studies made by Parsons engineers deal with volumes of water in the range of 160 to 190 million acre-feet per year. Such a system would be operated somewhat as a giant game of "Put and Take," with Alaska, as a separate water producing entity, one of the four players. The others are Canada, the coterminous 48 States of the United States, and Mexico.

Alaska's input of water into the system would be in the range of from 20 to 25 percent, or as much as 40 million acre-feet. Her "take" would probably be about one-fourth of that. In other words, in terms of the total amount of water collected within the State, some 10 million acre-feet—maf—could be utilized within the State. As one of the contributing entities, Alaska would share proportionately in the returns from the sale of water. If the system handled 180 maf, Alaska would contribute a net of about 16 percent, utilizing about 6 percent within her own borders.

Canada would make the largest input into the system, from 40 to 60 percent of the total, depending upon the design of the system. She would "take" for her own use, distributed as she wished within her own national network, something like two-thirds of the amount of water collected within her own borders. For example, in a 180 maf system, Canada might "put" 100 and "take" 60 maf for internal use. She would thus export a net of 40 million, with credit for her share of Great Lakes supplies, for which she would be paid as for any other export commodity. Of the 180 maf considered above, Canada would be a gross contributor of about 60 percent, while utilizing domestically about 33 percent.

Within the coterminous 48 States, another 30 to 40 maf would be collected and fed into the system, supplementing the transfers from Alaska and the imports from Canada. This part of the U.S. input would be 15-20 percent of the total amount handled. The "take" of the coterminous States would be in the range of 50 percent, or up to 90 million acre-feet in a plausible 180 maf system. About half of this would go to the Colorado-South Pacific and Rio Grande-Texas regions, the rest to the Plains, central basins and the East, including the supply taken through the Great Lakes. The United States would thus be a net importer of about 33 percent of the total handled by the system.

Mexico, in a system of this size, would "put" from 5 to 7 percent, or 10 maf, and take from 10 to 15 percent, or up to 25 maf, thus becoming a net importer of from 10 to 15 maf, but having the use of twice that much.

This concept seems grandiose beyond reason, but the reports of the Parsons engineers make it appear worth a closer look. With the United States taking credit for Alaska's tremendous input, the water participation is not greatly out of balance. The United States with Alaska will contribute slightly less than half, and use about half or slightly more. Canada puts in more than half, which takes care of Mexico. But these possibilities have to be checked out. It can be done one step at a time. First step is to inventory the water in the indicated contributing areas. The United States should start in Alaska since it is possible to move Alaskan water to the coterminous States with or without inputs of Canadian water. The Los Angeles ASCE report urges an immediate start because, "experience shows that a leadtime of 25 years is required to solve the many political problems attendant upon such projects, and to plan, design, finance, and build the facilities to supply water needs in the next century."

TIME TO START THE HOMEWORK

In an address before the Royal Society of Canada at the University of Sherbrooke in June 1966, I said that both Canada and the United States had a lot of homework to do before either country could decide to enter such an undertaking. I therefore urged that the United States and Canada put off worrying about anything but gathering the data on which to base the ultimate decisions on continental planning. At the same time the inventory of water is started, a start might also be made on just listing all of the ancillary questions which have to be answered. There are, in addition to the economic and engineering problems, which appear solvable, the technical ones of hydrology, geology, climatology, ecology, and so forth, and the social impact as well as the nature impact. The answers to these questions are not so simple to come by as in the engineering and geophysical realms.

The biggest step taken in the history of either country toward preservation of our joint heritage was the agreement which President Nixon and Prime Minister Trudeau signed on April 15, 1972,

pledging all-out efforts on both sides to clean up the Great Lakes.

As I have said many times in discussing the possibilities of continental resource planning, we must clean up our lakes and rivers before we attempt to restore and stabilize them with new water from distant basins. And, most certainly, we will find that our needs will be much better served and augmentation requirements reduced if we take care of the supplies we have. This is more feasible and therefore more true for the East than for the West. We are already far behind in the ecological, hydrological, economic, and social impact studies that will provide the basis for large-scale multibasin planning and development.

A preliminary review of the possibilities of the NAWAPA concept was made in the fall of 1964 by a Special Subcommittee on Western Water Development of the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works. A report in October of that year, revised January 1966, found that for about 25 percent greater cost the NAWAPA continental system could deliver twice as much water—and was subject to expansion—as that estimated as recoverable from all of the U.S. water-resource development projects envisioned by all agencies of Government in the next 20 years. The initial NAWAPA outline has been expanded to serve even more of the continent, primarily in the East.

BENEFITS FROM CONTINENTWIDE DEVELOPMENT

A significant point that emerges from study of the possibilities of continental water-resource development is the indication of economic benefit to all three countries. At the same time proper water-resource care and development can extend and expand nature's continuing life-support capabilities based on the water resources of North America. The Canadians, despite the depth of feeling on the subject of water and the initial unfavorable reaction in some quarters to the idea that the Southwestern United States had designs on the water resources of a sovereign neighbor, do not appear to be letting whatever annoyance they felt deter them from examining the possibilities.

Their reasoning is based on recognition that the basic data is needed anyway. There are Canadians who feel that in selling water to the United States, Canada might enjoy a new and effective economic incentive to conservation of the water-producing areas of their country. There is also assurance of a continuing inflow of public investment capital from sale of a crop which can be produced on a sustained-yield basis. Export of such a replenishable commodity as water avoids the objectionable facets of the business of exporting raw materials subject to depletion. Water is a renewable resource which can be exported profitably as long as the water-harvest lands are taken care of properly.

On the other hand, the Americans, faced with the prospect of buying water from a sovereign supplier, will be induced to examine all the possibilities of making better use of their own water before

committing themselves to imports. If the Canadians, after measuring their water and projecting their own needs, find they have a surplus, they will be in a position to decide whether they want to sell water, and, if so, how much to sell and for what price. The Americans must then determine whether they want to import water, and, if so, how much they are willing to pay. If the answers to all of these water trade questions are affirmative, we will have continental development and utilization. If they are not, we will not. The Canadians will probably get their answers first, since they are apparently already at work gathering the facts.

A hard and continuous look at the conservation aspects of continental water resource development is essential from beginning to end. A program of conversation analysis is surely the next step. It would make no sense to launch such a redistribution enterprise unless the water production, that is, care of the water harvest fields, were assured at least for the life of the project. It would hardly be worth doing for a planned operating life of less than 100 years. Clearly, any public investment of this magnitude would compel a great expanded and intensified program of conservation in the water producing areas of the three countries. Of almost equal importance is a real clean-up of the river courses to be used for distribution of imported waters. Other benefits naturally flowing from the continental system are vast expansion of navigation and recreation potentials, both of which, with population increases, take on new importance in cost-benefit analysis of resource development projects.

As a matter of fact, the prospects of a continental water system call for a very special new approach to the problem of caring for nature's endowment of soil and water. The approach must be one of "productive conservation," aimed at strengthening nature's support role. This is the essential part of the answer to the question which I proposed to the Royal Society at Sherbrooke: "How long do we want to live here?" Why plan for 50 years instead of 500? I certainly do not want to put any limit on the lifetime of my country. Productive conservation is aimed at securing and expanding or enlarging nature's ability to continue to support us in the number of hundreds of millions at which our population may stabilize—from now on. An eventual grovelling struggle for a poverty-oriented existence on a wasted land is the alternative. Conservation has to be planned for centuries not decades. We have to plan for nature's continuing, not fixed-period, support if we want to avoid national decline according to the historical pattern of peoples who did not, would not, or could not take care of their basic soil and water resources.

The three countries do not have to make a decision now, or even anytime soon, to adopt a continental water system. But the United States can and should decide now, in agreement with Canada and Mexico, not to do things which would be a barrier to a continental system. It does not call for a treaty. Each

government can simply instruct its planners to keep this option open. So much of what is needed as a planning base for a continental system is also needed for separate national systems in each country. But we do occupy the same continent. We do share its bounty.

Canada and the United States and Mexico are interdependent in the care and utilization of the natural resources of the whole continent. Nor can water resource care and development be planned in isolation. Fortunately, productive cooperation in one field usually spills over into others. Our relations with Canada across the board should improve as we work more and more closely together in the water resources field. Relations with Canada are suffering seriously as a result of our economic stabilization efforts. I trust the administration will fully repair the damage, because many different aspects of relations with Canada and Mexico will be intertwined with water planning. One of our first homework assignments should be to identify these auxiliary questions.

WHAT ARE U.S. ALTERNATIVES?

The most urgent part of the United States homework is the pursuit of alternatives within each region. The alternatives too are subject to integration into a multibasin international system. For example, exploitation of rain-making fits into the bigger system, since progress in weather modification technology indicates it may be more effective over basins than over counties, or even States.

The alternatives also include such things as more disciplined use of water, treatment and recycling, desalting, underground storage, and control of surface losses, and land use planning to control irrigation demands. We should also study the possibilities of a national system of interbasin transfers not involving inputs of water from other nations. The elements of such a national system using nothing but United States water, should, however, be designed for eventual integration into a continental system. The latter, conversely, must be designed to accommodate national segments or sections.

The continental system might be built in stages or sections which are themselves international, but not continental. The Great Lakes Basin is a most viable candidate at an early stage. Not all of the new water needs come from Canada. A promising interbasin connection is between the lakes and the James Bay watershed of Quebec and Ontario. The Kierans and Parsons plans both had such a project, but field studies by the two Provinces and the Government of Canada may result in quite a different routing. The Parsons engineers also have a plan for augmenting Lake Michigan from the United States side. The point is, there is an awareness of the desirability as well as the feasibility of augmenting the water in the lakes by transfers from other basins. Canada might also offer to add water for controlled withdrawal by the United States with appropriate compensation.

Some work has been done on another section or stage which would not involve

inputs of Canadian water. This would simply be a route to bring Alaskan water to Montana or Washington, probably paralleling the Rocky Mountains. Canada would be asked to provide only for the transit, selecting the right-of-way and determining how she might like to move the water. An actual trade is not out of the realm of possibility, whereby Canada would take some of the Alaskan water to the prairie Provinces and deliver an equivalent amount from her other basins to the United States. From the point of reentry into the United States somewhere in the Northwest, the water would be distributed in the Rocky Mountain States and the Southwest. All three of the U.S. western regions, Alaska, the Columbia-North Pacific and the Southwest, would necessarily work together and share the benefits.

A STEP FOR WASHINGTON

It will take years for either Canada or the United States to complete the studies needed for a determination of the advantages or desirability of big trade in water. They can proceed with the types of study which will pay off in each country in the meantime. Without any kind of treaty or written agreement, they can proceed in full awareness of the possibilities of joint planning and development, trying to avoid undertakings which would get in the way of the continental prospects.

During this homework period, it would be desirable to have a much broader, less formal, and more effective consultative relationship than has been the pattern up to now through the International Joint Commission. It is clear from the terms of the Great Lakes cleanup agreement and the discussions surrounding it that new arrangements will be needed to coordinate the new multi-billion-dollar program. The IJC was established by treaty in 1911 to handle problems related to the Great Lakes and the other boundary waters. Since the respective sides of the six-man IJC—three Americans and three Canadians—are formally empowered and designated representatives of their Governments, they function only in accord with established national policy and under instruction. The same situation exists with respect to the International Boundary Commission on which Mexico is the partner. These groups cannot serve as an adequate forum for the exchange of views and technical data among professionals concerned with the full sweep of water problems.

It is important to the three Governments that there be continuing technical consultations among appropriate agencies. By the middle of next year, the United States should be in a much better position, better prepared to make decisions after the National Water Commission has made its report. The Water Resources Council is prepared to serve as the coordinating mechanism for the United States.

Four Basin Commissions along the northern border—the Columbia-North Pacific, the Souris-Red-Rainy, the Great Lakes, and the New England Basin Commissions—already share drainage area problems with the Canadians. This Na-

tion's next step should be to share our full planning and development capability with Canada in whatever effective and informal manner might be agreeable. Mexico should be brought promptly into a similar cooperative exchange of technical data and planning ideas. This is another reason why we should have Basin Commissions covering the Colorado-South Pacific and the Rio Grande Basins.

REGIONAL STEPS FOR THE COLORADO-SOUTH PACIFIC

As I have indicated, the homework to be done within our borders is of much greater urgency than the trans-border exchange. The compelling first step for the water-short States of the Colorado-South Pacific is to organize for an across-the-board attack on regional water problems. The existing voluntary interagency committee can coordinate work among agencies and States, but considering the urgency and importance, this is far from the most effective approach. The region needs a statutorily empowered Federal-State organization which will enable the seven States to mobilize all their planning forces and talents for an approach in concert toward agreed water objectives. A single Basin Commission under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 should serve four basin areas—the Upper and Lower Colorado, the Great Basin, and California.

The Los Angeles ASCE group listed eight programs of study of the Southwest water problem: Importation from other basins, groundwater development and storage, reclamation of municipal and industrial waste water, reuse of irrigation water, desalting, control of trans- evaporative losses through watershed management, surface conservation, and weather modification. Although the Basin Commissions cannot plan interbasin transfers under present laws, the statutory barriers to interbasin transfer studies should not deter work on other programs. The meaningful approach to transfer studies is first to establish the existence of surplus in the basin or origin. Similarly, the approach in the receiving basin is to establish demand and cost-comparison bases. Interbasin transfer costs will have to be measured against intrabasin alternatives.

The possible eventual successful application of nuclear explosives to excavation might lead to the creation of huge artificial aquifers for storage and transfer of water underground. Such a development would drastically change continental, as well as national, water resource planning. Interbasin transfer planning would probably begin all over again. Flood control activity would take on new dimensions with the prospect of underground storage and ordered withdrawal for use of flood-producing runoff. Underground storage capacity created by nuclear explosives might also be important to the efficient utilization of water resulting from changes in precipitation patterns through cloud seeding. The Atomic Energy Commission has indicated its interest in the development of peaceful nuclear explosives for water-related purposes, but no specific project

has been proposed. Can we move people to water?

In response to grand scale water planning, critics have said it would be cheaper to move the people to the water. Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, was quoted by the ASCE report as saying:

There simply aren't enough whips in existence to force people to move to where the water is instead of bringing it to them.

Mr. Hosmer would doubtless agree, however, that it may be possible without whips, and even desirable to move both people and water to areas indicated by sound national planning and climatological appeal. The population increase for the last third of the century calls for living space, mostly in cities, for another hundred million Americans. Continental or even national water resource planning, with multi-basin interchanges, will permit the location and growth of the new urban centers where the growing is best for everybody. But we can hardly plan wisely for urban resettlement and new cities unless we have a national water plan.

The point was made clearly by the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Senator JACKSON of Washington, in a speech before the American Public Power Association several years ago. He said we have to do better in our planning than just projecting today's problem instead of trying to do something about the problem itself.

Senator JACKSON referred to the trend toward megalopoli—the apparently inevitable concentration of population in urban strips along the east coast, the Great Lakes, and the west coast. Nearly always, these strips are related to water, and the Gulf Coast is on the way to becoming another megalopolis. He said we can do something about this. There is no reason, said Senator JACKSON:

That we have to perpetuate past mistakes; we can establish new policies and new goals. The America of the year 2000 does not of necessity have to consist of straggling cities of urban desolation stretching for hundreds of miles.

His speech was a plea for America to climb out of the rut of pragmatism, accommodation and compromise which we seem to be in. We too readily accept the conditions and forces around us, and, in Senator JACKSON's words,

We seem to be losing our capacity to dream of a better America and a better world.

PLANNING FOR GROWTH

The concept of a continental water system, the idea projected by Ralph M. Parsons and his associates starts with something great. Within the next quarter century, this Nation will have to find space for more than 20 million new households, new family dwelling units. This is one third more than we have now. Where are we going to put them? One of the factors that will determine where we put them is where we have water. If we take care of our water harvest fields, that is, practice productive conservation in the water producing areas of the coun-

try, then collect and redistribute that water in a manner that will best serve the Nation's true long term needs, we can also distribute our new population so that the next 20 million households do not have to take on the burdens of urban crowding, lack of planning, inadequate services, and outmoded standards of living.

Senator JACKSON said we needed legislation to change the pattern of Federal planning toward programs "relevant to the creation of new rural growth opportunities." He mentioned new city sites based on compatibility with "water resources, outdoor recreational opportunities, regional growth patterns and industrial and commercial opportunities." I not only pledge my support of such legislation when it is introduced, but I want to propose that we start right now where we can. Thanks to the leadership and foresight of such men as the late Robert Kerr of Oklahoma and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico, in the field of water resources, we have legislation on the books now enabling us to start the kind of planning that is consistent with the dream of a better America. We can start right now with the type of river basin planning and development which will make continental planning possible, which will make dream city planning realizable.

We will never get a national plan until we have done the basin planning. The arid regions should be taking the lead. The tremendous amount of work to be done in connection with inventorying water within the Southwest Pacific region, projecting ultimate needs, balancing requirements against the economic and social costs of alternatives, determining the degree of shortage, and then selecting a preferred combination of solutions to the problems defined, all this can best be started and guided under a seven-State Southwest Pacific Basins Commission.

One of the longstanding possible solutions is to import water from other basins. The possibilities cannot be determined by the receiving basin. That answer must come from a basin which has a surplus.

THE GREAT STEP FORWARD FOR ALASKA

The water resources of the State of Alaska may be the key to truly long range care and development of continental resources. In the meantime, Alaska offers an incentive to national planning for all the United States and could provide a sound solution to the supply problems of the arid West.

In the system proposed by Parsons, collection of water starts in the mountains of South Central Alaska, headwaters of the Susitna, the Copper, and the Tanana Rivers, and gathering place of the approximately 90 million acre-feet of annual runoff of those rivers. The Federal Power Commission estimates that the potential hydroelectric capacity of sites on these three rivers at more than 8 million kilowatts, of which 3.6 million could be generated at the Wood Canyon site on the Copper.

In its 1967 Planning Status Report on Alaska (Water Resource Appraisals for Hydroelectric Licensing), FPC said, under the heading of "Need for Additional Studies":

Alaska today, in the first years of statehood could be on the threshold of an era wherein her bountiful natural resources will support a growth economy. Low-cost power may be the stimulus to put Alaska beyond that threshold. Studies are needed first, to examine the State's potential market for large blocks of hydroelectric power; second, to minimize cost of power through possible interconnection and coordination; third, to consider the feasibility of exporting Alaskan power in the light of recent advances in transmission technology; and fourth, to examine NAWAPA and the possible proposals which would export Alaskan water, to determine the effect of such diversions on Alaska's hydroelectric power potential.

I have seen no evidence that the FPC has changed its mind.

The NAWAPA concept would provide for generation of nearly 1,200,000 kilowatts at two dams on a huge Susitna-Copper-Tanana reservoir, joining the three watersheds by tunnels. No analysis has been made as to the effect of this impoundment on the potential hydro capacity cited by the FPC. Indications are that flow stabilization on the Susitna and Copper would enhance downstream generating prospects. The Parsons engineers have estimated that the NAWAPA impoundments on the Tanana River above Tanacross would have held back enough water to reduce the flood peak at Anchorage in 1967 about 7 feet.

As in the case in the Colorado-South Pacific region, Alaskan water planning at present depends primarily upon the cooperative spirit among the concerned State and Federal agencies. An ad hoc State-Federal WRC work group several years ago prepared a Preliminary Plan of Study for a comprehensive water resource care and development program for the entire State.

The State-Federal work group estimated that the 800 million acre-feet of annual discharge of high quality water from Alaskan rivers is some 40 percent of all the fresh water available under the U.S. flag. Alaska's development is an important national goal. The development, according to the group's preliminary study:

Focuses on a strategy for developing (these) resources on an interrelated, coordinated basis, consistent with good environmental management.

The group agrees that—

Wise conservation and development of Alaska's water and related land resources are certainly keys to the strategy.

It was the conclusion of the group, in the study completed in August 1968, that—

In the present state of development, inadequate knowledge, and in a period of budget constraints, the available funds should be concentrated on inventory and reconnaissance studies, mapping, research, and planning as a foundation for action programs to follow. The framework study of water and related land resources is such an endeavor.

We want to emphasize those words:

The available funds . . . for action programs to follow.

POTENTIALS FOR ALASKAN DEVELOPMENT

The study proposal clearly foresaw two parallel directions for water resource development in Alaska, which are interdependent and should be started at the same time. One is the problem of Alaska's own use of her immense water resources, the other is the development for export. The Nation has a need for Alaska's vast raw materials, Alaska has a need for capital to develop and expand her economy. These are complementary factors, said the study group, and—

Alaska, with its tremendous resource assets, including water, has a unique opportunity to contribute to satisfying the larger needs. In so doing, Alaska can develop a strong regional economy.

It would seem from these observations that Alaska and the Southwest Pacific should get together. They cannot, of course, except with the aid of Canada and the Columbia North Pacific region of the United States through which water would pass if conveyed overland from Alaska to the southwest.

The machinery for doing this is available through the Water Resources Council with basin commissions which bring together the institutional resources of the local, State, and Federal agencies.

The suggestion has been made that funds from non-Federal sources might be available for water resource studies in the Southwest Pacific region, utilizing the facilities of the Council and the basin commissions for the start of studies in Alaska. If congressional authority for such cooperation among States is necessary, it should be readily forthcoming. The funding situation in Alaska is set forth as one of the problems which faced the study group in the following paragraphs:

One of the greatest problems facing water resource planners is limited knowledge of the resources—mineral, water, land, and the others that would be affected by water resource developments. As a complicating factor, many of the planning "yardsticks" developed for other areas simply cannot be applied in Alaska. This is a critical situation with respect to determining criteria, costs, and single-purpose benefits for even a small water resources project. It largely precludes effective weighing of long range alternatives and evaluating impacts of larger potential developments.

This is particularly important in evaluating the most desirable water and related land uses. Those portions of water and land resources that represent optimum use in their natural state should be defined and reserved. For the remainder, sufficient knowledge of the resources must be gained to insure advancement of the most appropriate development proposals.

An overall Alaska problem—small population and limited tax base—severely limits the state's capability for funding planning and resource development activities. Considering this, the national importance of the resources involved, and the extent of public lands in the state, it is reasonable to expect that Federal participation in resource development programs must remain at a high level for the foreseeable future.

These are the words of the members of the work group made up of represent-

atives of the State of Alaska and seven Federal agencies working together with the help and guidance of a Federal field coordinator for development planning in Alaska. The tone and wording of the work group report reflects recognition of the possible gains from cooperation with other regions. Such cooperation will be facilitated if the water-rich Alaskan region and the water-short Southwest Pacific take steps immediately to establish basin commissions under provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. The Water Resources Council has funds for the purpose. And if the Federal Government does not have the funds available to help Alaska, perhaps the water-short States do.

The 1961 report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources headed by the late Senator Kerr of Oklahoma, has been the foundation for most of the water legislation passed since, particularly with respect to pollution control and resource planning. One important step along this path of progress was the establishment of the National Water Commission through legislation introduced by Senator JACKSON as chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Out of the same committee in 1965 came the Water Resources Planning Act, which provides legislative framework for this step-at-a-time plan. The most important of the steps to be taken at this time is to provide the modest initial funds to begin the collection of data in Alaska.

It does not make sense to wait another year to start a project which will take years to complete, which has to be done, and which is ready to go. Every year lost in the gathering of data in the fields of climate and meteorology, hydrology, and flood control is a year's handicap. These three areas are the most urgent of the 18 study elements identified 3 years ago by the State-Federal work group for the Water Resources Council.

Alaska is now ready, however, for a "framework" type study. In the absence of a basin commission to undertake the studies, the Alaska Power Administration is in a position to serve as the lead agency. Funds could be made available through the Water Resources Council for assignment to the special projects required in support of the meteorology, hydrology, and flood control studies. The whole range of work involved should be considered in order to avoid having some stages get seriously out of phase with the first three elements.

In view of the importance of planning for the prompt but orderly development of the vast natural resources of Alaska, and to avoid as far as possible the costly abuse of those resources, the full framework study should be authorized and funded for fiscal 1973 through 1975.

SUMMARY—FOUR STEPS TO TAKE

In summary, truly long range water resource planning for the West can get underway with four simple steps:

First. The Colorado-South Pacific States which have the most serious water problem of any region of the Nation are losing valuable time by failing to establish a basin commission to get on with

serious long-range study of practical solutions in the obvious national context. The obvious initial step for the Colorado-South Pacific States is completion of a framework study and establishment of a basin commission.

Second. Alaska has an indicated surplus water and preliminary studies indicate it will be to her long-term advantage to export this water. The next step is to begin the surveys needed to confirm this surplus and identify the constructive potentials for utilization of the water, preferably under a basin commission functioning under the provisions of the 1965 act.

Third. The Water Resources Council as coordinator of planning among the basin commissions established under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, should sponsor studies to determine whether surplus water in Alaska might be made available to meet the needs of the Southwest.

Fourth. If it develops from these coordinated studies that there is surplus water for export in Alaska and if its transfer to the Southwest appears technically economically feasible, the United States will need the full and continuing cooperation of Canada to make the transfer. The fourth step, therefore, is for the President to advise the Canadians of these studies and propose the start of continuing technical exchange in the field of water resources in a manner that will best serve the interests of both nations. The great lakes agreement is a good start.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

IMPORTATION OF CHROME ORE FROM RHODESIA

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly this morning on an action taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which action seems to me to be very ill advised.

The Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972, contains a provision which would repeal what Congress did last year. The President, on March 17, 1971, signed into law legislation which would end the dependence of the United States on Communist Russia for a vital strategic defense materiel; namely, chrome. November 17, 1971, was only 6 months ago. Yet the proposal of the Foreign Relations Committee would repeal that action and once again make the United States dependent on Communist Russia for a strategic defense materiel.

Mr. President, President Johnson unilaterally by Executive order in 1966 decreed an embargo on trade with Rhodesia. From that point on the United States was cut off from the main source of chrome. And that resulted in the fact that the United States subsequently found itself in the position where it had to depend on Communist Russia for a

majority of its source of this strategic materiel.

I would point out that chromium is one of the top strategic materials, and in 1939, along with three other metals, it was the first to be designated for stockpiling.

When Congress considered this matter last year, there were a series of votes taken in the Senate, and the Senate concluded that it was unwise for the United States to be dependent on Communist Russia for this material. The Senate voted to lift the embargo on the importation of chrome from Rhodesia. When a vote came in the House of Representatives some time later, the House of Representatives by a vote of 251 to 100 took the same action that the Senate had taken. The President of the United States on March 17, 1971, signed such legislation into law.

Mr. President, I think it significant to point out that when the votes were taken in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, Representatives from 46 of the 50 States voted to permit the importation of chrome from Rhodesia. So, this matter is not a regional one. I say again that Representatives from 46 of the 50 States voted to permit the importation of chrome from Rhodesia.

At this point, I want to pay tribute to Representative JAMES COLLINS of the State of Texas who authored similar legislation in the House of Representatives to that legislation which was passed in the Senate. Representative COLLINS was a very able and effective advocate of the proposal to permit the importation of chrome from Rhodesia. He had much to do with the overwhelming vote of 251 to 100 by which the House of Representatives approved the action previously taken by the Senate.

Mr. President, this is a defense matter. The Foreign Relations Committee is seeking to amend the Stockpile Act which deals with strategic and critical material. I say again that this matter is a defense matter. Chrome is a vital defense material. The report submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations states:

The Rhodesian Chrome Amendment put the United States, for the first time, in a position of defying the UN Security Council. We were the first nation to break its formal adherence to UN sanctions. The effects of this action on the UN and on our relations with the African Continent have been serious.

The committee is correct in that the United States was the first nation to break its formal—and I emphasize the word "formal"—adherence with the United Nations sanction. However, the American Ambassador to the United Nations has subsequently stated in the Security Council and publicly that virtually every member of the Security Council at one time or another has refused to adhere to the sanctions against Rhodesia. But the overwhelming question, as I see it, is not necessarily what is best for the United Nations, but what is best for the United States.

I do not see how the Congress of the United States can put the United Nations ahead of the defenses of our own

Nation. It is a very serious matter when the Congress is called upon to appropriate \$77 billion of tax funds for the defense of this Nation and yet simultaneously, up until November 17 of last year, our country was dependent on Communist Russia for strategic material essential to the defenses of the United States.

I think it is highly significant, Mr. President, that Representatives from 46 of the 50 States recognized the seriousness of this problem and voted to lift the United Nations sanctions insofar as the United States is concerned in regard to the importation of chrome from Rhodesia.

I note that on Wednesday of last week 13 Members of the House of Representatives filed a suit in the U.S. district court at Washington to forbid any further importation of Rhodesian chrome and the use of that Rhodesian chrome which has already arrived.

According to the leader of the group:

The importation of chrome contrary to U.N. Security Council resolutions and executive orders issued by (former President Johnson) violates solemn commitments of the United States to the United Nations, as a system for maintaining world peace, and violates treaties and laws of the United States embodying these commitments.

That suit is now in district court. If the courts can decree that the Congress of the United States cannot take action to protect itself, that such action is contrary to the desires of the United Nations, then I say this country is, indeed, in very real trouble. While I realize those 13 Representatives are serious in their endeavor to bring this matter before the Federal courts, I cannot conceive that the Federal courts could act affirmatively and take the action being sought by those 13 Representatives.

If the Congress of the United States is in that position that would mean it is in the position where whatever course it pursues in regard to its defense matters must coincide with actions previously taken by the United Nations and I say we are, indeed, in very serious trouble. I think the action of the 13 Representatives was ill advised and I think the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations in seeking to repeal legislation which became effective last November 17 was also ill-advised.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Never Say Die," published on April 25, 1972, in the Northern Virginia Daily, whose editor is J. J. Crawford, of Strasburg.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by saying that at the appropriate time I shall present an amendment to the Foreign Relations Authorizations Act of 1972 to repeal section 503 of that act.

EXHIBIT 1

NEVER SAY DIE

Last fall, after a long and arduous Senate fight led by Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., the President signed into law Section 503 of the

1971 Military Procurement Authorization Act. Section 503 ended five years of dependency on the Soviet Union for vital chrome by authorizing resumption of purchases from chrome-rich Rhodesia.

With the arrival of the first shipments of Rhodesian chrome in this country there was the usual picketing by dissident groups echoing the leftist line. These were directed against both the Administration for resuming the buying of chrome from Rhodesia and against Union Carbide and Foote Chemical, the two American companies for which the shipments were destined.

But these demonstrations were of minor consequence. The real battle against doing business with Rhodesia is still centered in Congress where last week it flared up again in the form of two separate congressional efforts to abrogate Section 503.

On Wednesday of last week, 13 black members of Congress filed suit in the U.S. District Court in Washington to forbid any further importation of Rhodesian chrome and the use of that which has already arrived. According to Rep. Charles Diggs, Democrat and leader of the group:

"The importation of chrome contrary to U.N. Security Council resolutions and executive orders issued by (former President Johnson) violates solemn commitments of the United States to the United Nations, as a system for maintaining world peace, and violates treaties and laws of the United States embodying these commitments."

This is an extremely significant case because it is the first court test of the question of whether the United Nations' legal authority to direct the actions of its members, in this case the United States, is greater than the authority of the Congress of the United States.

The argument by the plaintiffs is that as long as the United States is bound by its membership in the U.N. and its treaty agreement to abide by the decisions of the U.N., it acted illegally in legislating to lift the embargo on Rhodesian chrome at a time while the U.N. embargo was still in force.

What the 13 congressional contestants are saying is that when the Senate approved the treaty making this country a member of the United Nations it surrendered the legal sovereignty of the U.S., making our nation subject to the world organization, and that we are bound to obey all U.N. mandates. Thus, if the U.N. says no chrome from Rhodesia, then it's no chrome from Rhodesia.

Meanwhile, in addition to this frontal attack, there is another, if somewhat quieter, effort being spearheaded by Senators Dale McGee and Ted Kennedy to repeal Section 503 by attaching a provision to accomplish this onto the pending State Department Authorization bill.

Powerful forces are out to kill Section 503, each for their own partisan reasons, and each using whatever device is at hand to get the job done.

But it is our observation that if either of these attacks on Section 503 were to succeed there is a still more powerful force in this country which will be very much upset—the general public.

Survey after survey has shown that a majority of Americans are fed up with the idiosyncrasy of relying on Soviet Russian sources for chrome (the source of our supply of this material while the U.S. observed the U.N. embargo) at prices per ton far above what the U.S. could have and presently can buy it for from Rhodesia.

But this matter now involves another factor of even greater importance and this is the suggestion—by 13 U.S. congressmen no less—that the vital interests of the United States can be dictated by the U.N. General Assembly. This assertion does not deserve to be dignified by an answer from a federal court but it doubtless will be.

If the court's decision is anything other than a flat rejection of U.S. subservience to the U.N. in matters involving our national security, then we are in real trouble.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

THE RUSSO-GERMAN, POLISH-GERMAN TREATY A UNILATERAL PROPOSAL

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, yesterday the West German Government of Chancellor Willy Brandt narrowly survived in the Bundestag—247 to 249—a no-confidence vote called for by the opposition Christian Democratic Union—CDU. It marked the first time in West Germany's 23-year postwar history, that an attempt had been made to unseat an incumbent Chancellor through such a parliamentary maneuver. The narrow margin of victory illustrates the political vulnerability of the present West German Government and could undermine the entire diplomatic structure with its allies.

Although the Brandt government has been plagued by its inability to control inflation and other domestic ills, the fundamental issue was, and remains, Chancellor Brandt's treaties with Moscow and Poland.

Next week, on May 4, the Bundestag—lower house—of the Federal Republic of Germany—West Germany—will vote on the ratification of the Russo-German and Polish-German Treaties, the most significant of which, because of the world power involved, being the Russo-German Treaty, or commonly referred to as the Soviet-West German Non-Aggression Pact.

This pact, and its ratification, has been considered by many observers as the linchpin of continuing East-West negotiations. It has been the focal point of Chancellor Brandt's Ostpolitik, and it could well be an issue upon which his government finally stands or falls.

It is a treaty of profound significance not only to its signatories, but also to the world community. It is a treaty, like all international treaties of today, whose implications affect the institutions of diplomacy throughout the world. Therefore, it is a treaty that cannot be considered solely an internal matter of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As such, it deserves the attention of those that will be affected by its provisions.

Over the past months, Americans have been interested, though distant observers, watching the heated debate within the news media and the halls of government. Indications are clear that Americans understand our country's stake in this hotly contested issue.

The possibility of the treaty's failure has triggered fearful echoes in diplomatic circles throughout Europe and has brought angry threats from the Soviet Union that if ratification is not forth-

coming, "The Berlin Agreement," although officially quite separate from any treaty commitments, will not go into effect and that the treaty will not be subject to renegotiations. These high pressure blackmail tactics of the Soviet Union hold the ominous threats of a return to stepped up cold war tensions if the U.S.S.R. does not get what it wants. At the same time, in order to favorably influence the ratification of the treaty, the Soviets opened the doors to the Berlin Wall and permitted West Berliners to visit relatives in East Berlin and East Germany during the Easter holidays. Additionally, Mr. Brezhnev recognized the reality of the European Economic Community, to which he has been opposed, and the Russians included West Berlin in the first trade agreement between West Germany and Russia since 1963. Such transparent efforts to manipulate German public opinion and influence the official acts of the government should be a clear warning to the world that the Russian bear has not changed his treacherous and ill-tempered nature.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE RUSSO-GERMAN TREATY

A review of the Russo-German Treaty—Polish-German Treaty is essentially the same—makes it explicitly clear to me the Russian anxiety for ratification of article 3 of the treaty. This is the only concrete provision in the entire text, and I wish to quote:

In accordance with the foregoing purposes and principles the Federal Republic of Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics share the realization that peace can only be maintained in Europe if nobody disturbs the present frontiers.

They undertake to respect without restriction the territorial integrity of all States in Europe within their present frontiers;

They declare that they have no territorial claims against anybody nor will assert such claims in the future;

They regard today and shall in the future regard the frontiers of all States in Europe as inviolable such as they are on the date of signature of the present Treaty, including the Oder-Neisse line which forms the western frontier of the People's Republic of Poland and the frontier between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.

This article of the treaty clearly seems to support the charge that, in effect, the treaty is a postwar border treaty, disguised as a nonaggression pact.

The recognition of the Oder-Neisse line relinquishes any future German claims to German territories and their populations east of that line presently being administered by Poland and Russia under the provisions of the Potsdam agreement. To me, it appears that this article, by far, is the most significant in the entire treaty and is clearly to the Soviet Union's advantage. The remaining articles concern themselves with diplomatic rhetoric that has been heard so often in the past, and at best, offer only fleeting hopes of normalization between the two countries in the distant future.

THE HUMAN FACTOR IGNORED

The treaty totally ignores the plight of the German ethnic groups in Russian- and Polish-occupied territories. It ignores their desire to emigrate. It ig-

nores their desire for family reunification. It ignores the simple desire for normal mail and parcel service to and from families in the West. It ignores their desire to maintain ethnic identity, and it totally ignores the long suffering, of not just Germans, but Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, and many others, caused by artificial barriers created by the Soviet Union over the past 27 years.

The treaty casts away German territory for Russian implied promises. It is unlikely that the Soviet Union will permit a relaxation in the physical and intellectual barriers that separate East and West. It is unlikely that men in control in both the Soviet Union and its Eastern bloc countries will risk their positions of power for the sake of accommodations with the West, and a better life for their subjects. It is, therefore, wishful thinking to believe that implied promises, which totally contradict the existing political realities, will ever see fruition.

THE RUSSIAN RECORD

It is difficult to accept such agreements when one looks back over the years on the Russian record of international relations. One need only to go back to 1948, shortly after the end of the longest and costliest conflict in history and one sees the Russian blockade of the Autobahns leading to the four-power city of Berlin; a blockade that cost many American lives, as the memorial at Berlin's Tempelhof Airport vividly testifies. One need only to look back to the Russian-financed invasion of South Korea, that cost 50,000 American lives; to the 1956 invasion of Hungary; to the construction of mine fields, high tension barriers, and machinegun towers along the West German-East German frontier; to the construction of the infamous Berlin Wall; to the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia and to the financing of the invasions of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. This record ever since the end of World War II speaks hardly of a desire for peace; rather, the record speaks of a policy of desire for deception and blatant power politics. To ignore the record of the Soviet Union and to place one's confidence in the baseless promises offered in the treaty is sheer folly and irresponsibility. Such a policy represents an almost childish disregard for historical facts and human realities.

A WORLD MATTER

Mr. President, I raise these issues of concern, because I consider them of world significance and not merely the subject of an internal matter of the signatories.

The United States has vast military and political commitments abroad. It has been the backbone of NATO since its inception and to this day has over a quarter of a million men stationed in the country whose government is the principal with the Soviet Union in this treaty—West Germany.

Our commitment is affected by this agreement. The weakening of the West German position, and that of the West, and I maintain it would be if ratification is achieved, will place a greater burden

upon the American role, not only in West Germany, but Europe as a whole.

Mr. Brandt has publicly stated that the 310,000 U.S. troops now in Europe must remain in order to maintain security. I ask why? Why must 310,000 American troops remain, when Germans are signing a nonaggression pact? Apparently, the signatories do not themselves believe it truly is a nonaggression pact. If a nonaggression pact is to be enforced by the existing level of military might, then strongly question the benefits to be derived from such an agreement. Even the German Government must doubt its true intentions and results. German ratification of this treaty will surely call for a reappraisal by the Congress of our present military commitments in Europe.

Mr. President, if the West Germans feel strongly that this is indeed a nonaggression pact, if they firmly believe it to be in their interest and the interest of the free world, then let them show it. Let them provide the necessary military might to enforce such an agreement, if their interpretation of the agreement requires a continued military presence. But let them not, for the sake of their own political expediencies and temporary personal political advantage, believe they can lead the American people into an uncompromising position at the continuing expense of the American people.

Mr. President, I have opposed efforts to reduce American troop strength in Europe in the past. The ratification of this treaty will certainly cause me and I am sure it will cause others to reexamine this position. If the German Government is now to put its confidence in a nonaggression treaty with the Russians, why not bring our troops home?

THE BERLIN AGREEMENT

The Soviet Union's threat not to sign the Berlin agreement, if ratification is not forthcoming, bears assessment.

The Berlin agreement is separate and apart from the treaty and when one considers the agreement and looks back on the original four power administration of the city, one is once more reminded of the cunning treachery of the Soviet Union.

The city of Berlin, at the end of World War II, was divided into four sectors—American, English, French, and Russian. Free movement between all sectors of Berlin was a right to citizens of Berlin, along with free access between West Germany and Berlin—not East or West Berlin, but Berlin.

Slowly, the Soviet Union began to impede this freedom of movement. First, as I stated earlier, in 1948 the Berlin blockade, and then intermittently, at will, and as the occasion suited their purposes. Slowly, mine fields, high wire fences, and machine gun towers began to shape the East European Prison. In 1961, the Berlin Wall separated the American, English, and French sectors from the Russian sector and East Berlin was created, with its imprisoned population. Now the Russians want to negotiate a Berlin accord, with the West apparently a willing partner. What the Russians are in effect saying is—now that I have taken away your rights—what will you give me for their

return? But even here, their agreement is unilateral. No one mentions freedom of movement for the East Berliners or East Germans to the West; their proposals should not even receive the courtesy of a reply.

This country has continuously acquiesced. It has lacked the intestinal fortitude to require negotiating of fair and equitable agreements. It has participated in agreements of convenience, ignoring the implications, and often at the expense of unfortunate imprisoned populations, so that the West may realize a more harmonious existence with hostile governments and agreements with hostile power—without uttering a word—and at the expense and long-term detriment of the American people. This must stop.

If the West Germans want this treaty ratified, if they feel it is important to them, even at the expense of the continued Soviet cancerization of Europe, then they must pay the price—not we.

A TREATY PROPOSAL

If the Russians are truly interested in peace, then let the treaty be truly a peace treaty. Let it provide for the military reduction of both NATO and Warsaw Pact powers. To date, the Russians have refused to address themselves to this point. Let the treaty provide free East-West access. To date, this treaty ignores the rights of the East Germans and East Berliners and the ethnic Germans in occupied lands to visit their relatives in the West.

Let the treaty provide for the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, the elimination of the minefields, the high wire fences and machinegun towers. Let the Soviet Union show desire for peace, by giving self-determination to the peoples, all the way from Estonia to the Black Sea. But let us not encourage continued Soviet erosion of Europe through Western acquiescence, and particularly through the government of the Federal Republic of Germany's expedient desire for peace in the perpetuation of a political illusion. Let us not create the illusion of peace—let us stand firm and demand true peace.

Let us demand from the Soviet Union the concrete expression for the desire of peace through actions that can be seen and felt—not written rhetoric which finds itself hidden in the files of government. The Russo-German Treaty, in my opinion, is an ill-conceived instrument of expediency. It holds nothing of substance for the West; except perhaps the temporary political gratification of one government. It provides for yet another incursion by the Soviet Union into the Western domain. It is truly a unilateral treaty, to which I am wholeheartedly opposed, and to which all men who desire true peace, should be opposed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). At this time, in accordance with the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with speeches by Senators limited to 3 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES, THE SDR-DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE "LINK" AND UNCTAD III

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senate's attention to a situation which very importantly involves the future economic development of the less developed world and the actions the administration is taking with respect to it.

It is signalized by a lead editorial in the Washington Post today, entitled "Two Nixon Breakthroughs on Development," and features also a speech made by the Administrator for AID, Dr. John Hannah, on April 20, 1972, before the International Development Conference here in Washington, and also the remarks of a Treasury spokesman regarding the SDR-development assistance "link."

Clearly the administration is taking positive steps to strengthen the ties between the United States and the developing world as the world UNCTAD conference unfolds. The initiatives of the administration fall into two related areas:

First, to expand the negotiating forum which then will undertake the task of reforming the world's monetary system to include representatives of the developing world—Under Secretary of the Treasury Volcker has now announced that the major nations of the world now appear ready to accept a 20-nation negotiating forum which would include the representatives of 10 developing nations to replace the "rich man club" Group of Ten. Thus, in slightly more than a month, the suggestion of Secretary Connally that "the representational pattern of the IMF Executive Board provides one possible approach" is on the road to becoming a reality.

Second, to consider an SDR-development assistance "link" as SDR's become established as a growing and important new international monetary reserve unit in the international monetary system.

Dr. John Hannah, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, stated in a prepared speech in Washington on April 20 that—

Giving the developing countries special access to SDRs—the new reserve assets administered by the IMF—could provide an additional \$2 billion a year or more in external financial resources. The United States in the past did not favor these proposals because we wished to avoid overloading the new SDR system. By now, the system has proven its acceptance and workability. SDRs will play an important role in the present restructuring of the international monetary system. The position we are taking at UNCTAD is to support, in parallel with other developed countries, a full study by the IMF of how SDRs can be used to support development in the LDCs. I believe the United States will support such proposals although complex questions of timing, volume, procedures, and negotiations will have to be resolved. If we are to carry out our fair share of the total responsibility, I see no better way to do it.

This statement is entirely consistent with the concurrent resolution Congressman REUSS and I introduced in the Congress on March 17 which recommended that a "link" be established between special drawing rights and development assistance. It is my expectation and I

would assume the expectation of the world that the spokesman of the U.S. delegation at UNCTAD III will soon reiterate Dr. Hannah's position in an official statement before UNCTAD III.

The United States clearly cannot afford to be less forthcoming on this crucial issue than the other major developed nations of the free world. I note that at the recently concluded meeting of the European Common Market Finance Ministers in Rome that their spokesman, Italy's Minister Colombo, indicated agreement was reached that SDR's should be used as an indirect form of development assistance. The spokesman of the Japanese Government at UNCTAD III was similarly forthcoming.

It is my strong view that if the United States wishes to strengthen its ties with the developing world and if developing world cooperation is sought in the upcoming negotiations on the reform of the international monetary system that all appropriate efforts should be taken to insure that the "link" does not become a "bad trip" for the United States. As Dr. Hannah has pointed out, the United States has had difficulties meeting internationally negotiated or its own agreed-to commitments in the development assistance field including the adoption of a generalized preferences scheme, our IDA contributions, and the 1-percent AID target which was agreed to by the nations of the world at the 25th anniversary session of the United Nations.

Despite newspaper reports to the contrary, I find Dr. Hannah's statement consistent with the formulation of a Treasury Department spokesman that the "first priority" in any discussion of the reform of the international monetary system is the future role of the SDR in this system. Everyone would agree that SDR's have to be alive and well as an international reserve asset before the "link" can become a reality. Similarly, however, it would be unfortunate if the "link" concept were not alive and well at the time the nations of the world make their next decision on the future allocation of SDR's particularly if there is to be a 3-year tranche of SDR allocations as in the past.

After all, the future peace, well-being and security of the world depends heavily upon bringing up the developing countries and closing the gap, which is increasing rather than narrowing, between the standards of living in the developed countries, the industrial countries, and the standards of living in the developing countries.

So it is my view, Mr. President, the administration's moves along these lines are very constructive, and I hope that they will persevere in them, and that that is the position which the United States will not only take itself, but will utilize every means at its command for the purpose of bringing about agreement on the part of the other major industrial nations of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Hannah's speech and the Washington Post editorial of April 28 be made part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial

and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO NIXON BREAKTHROUGHS ON DEVELOPMENT

The Nixon administration, confounding its critics on this issue—including, we cheerfully confess, ourselves—has quietly taken a couple of giant steps toward doing its fair share to help the world's poor. So giant and so quiet are these steps, in fact, that most of the world is unaware they have been taken.

The first step, disclosed in Paris last week and confirmed in Washington, was a turn-about on the sensitive issue of debt repayment. Such repayments by the developing countries now total about \$6 billion a year and are increasing at twice the rate of their export earnings, making progress in development incredibly difficult. In Paris, the United States and 13 other government creditors agreed to let Chile delay payment of most of its debt falling due in the 14 months beginning last November.

On its part, Chile agreed to make "just compensation" for nationalized properties. Thus ended, at least for the year, the ugly possibility that the United States would use its multilateral creditor's leverage to force settlement of its bilateral compensation disputes. This is a major policy breakthrough by Mr. Nixon, at once enlightened and generous. AID Director John Hannah confirmed it explicitly the next day in a Washington speech, saying that "multilateral debt relief agreements" can become a substantial source of external aid for poor countries with big debt problems. That's most of them.

The second American step offers conceivably even more promise. It was contained in Mr. Hannah's disclosure that the United States would agree to a full study by the world's rich of how to "link" distribution of the new international reserve known as Special Drawing Rights (SDR) or "paper gold" to development. Previously the United States had refused even to study the poor's demand for such a "link." But under the spur of having to present a position on the issue at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development currently meeting in Santiago, it formulated a position—and a positive one of great potential mutual benefit. The poor would get a means of buying more desperately needed goods and services from the rich; the rich would be able to increase their exports, thereby improving their own payments balances and employment alike. Mr. Hannah spoke of providing to the developing countries "an additional \$2 billion a year or more" in SDRs—no paltry sum.

Rescheduling debts and distributing more SDRs to the poor do not by any means fulfill all of the United States' political requirements and moral obligations to the rest of the world. Not only will these new policy announcements take time and fuss to implement, and they will be implemented only selectively, but other steps are required. Lowering tariff barriers to the poor's exports remains a priority project to be tackled by the President as soon as political conditions permit. More development aid, especially in the soft loan category, is essential, and so are better arrangements to stabilize commodity prices. This list is not meant to be inclusive.

The debt and SDR policies, nonetheless, are major moves, belying the administration's image up to now as an International Scrooge. They can be of real value to the developing countries, and of course to the United States too. And they are ways of transferring resources to the poor—ways which spare the President his ever more bruising aid battles on Capitol Hill. Bilateral aid seems to be becoming no more than a glorified technical assistance program. But that may be just as well, if the President succeeds in opening up new channels of responsibility elsewhere.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE DEVELOPING WORLD

(By John A. Hannah)

I

One of the most felicitous developments in recent years has been the Green Revolution. The work of the plant breeders in producing new productive varieties and the use of fertilizers and pesticides have yielded exceptional increases in the production of cereal grains. India is currently self-sufficient in food grains—a feat that a few years ago would have been regarded as difficult to achieve as the American landings on the moon.

The Green Revolution sometimes encounters second generation problems. Problems such as susceptibility to new plant diseases requiring new measures to control them and new research to develop resistant varieties. This was not unexpected.

Development, basically, is a process of challenges and solutions. Each new generation of problems requires new solutions—new answers.

As of now development assistance has second generation problems. Like the Green Revolution, development assistance programs enjoyed a period of vigorous growth. Beginning with the Marshall Plan, Point IV and evolving through the interim programs and U.S. AID, the concept was adopted and adapted by most of the developed countries. The resulting bilateral assistance programs supplemented by the U.N. agencies and the World and Regional Banks have yielded resources and results beyond anyone's early expectations.

But in recent years, the growth of development assistance has been stunted. Transfers of official development assistance have grown only marginally since 1967. In the United States we are completing the most difficult 12 months in the history of the Foreign Assistance program. Bilateral aid was reduced substantially by the Congress. At one point, the Senate actually voted the program following its debate of issues pertaining to the Vietnam war. Funding for the World Bank and other multilateral institutions has been reduced and delayed. We have been unable to proceed with legislation granting trade preferences to less developed nations. The negotiations on untangling bilateral aid were interrupted by the realignment of the international monetary system. For U.S. development assistance, this year has been—in the words of the drug culture—a bad trip.

But the problems affecting development assistance—like the second generation problems affecting the Green Revolution—are neither fatal nor permanent. The concept of Development Assistance has enduring validity.

The United States will not become a world drop-out. We remain committed to doing our fair share in the common effort to help the people of the developing countries help themselves move in the direction of utilizing their resources for providing lives of better quality for all of their people.

At this period in history our country is evolving new relationships with developed and developing countries—relationships which inevitably affect the scope and content of development assistance programs.

II

Looking ahead, I would like to comment on three factors which appear important in the evolving relationships between the developed and the developing countries.

First, there will be increasing diversity in the patterns and goals of development as developing countries confront new problems in this increasingly complex and rapidly changing world.

Second, the developing countries will increasingly expect to be treated as equals in their dealings with the developed world.

Third, the developed countries and the less developed countries may discover a greater mutuality of interests as they seek to solve their basic problems of growth and change.

Let me comment briefly on these three points.

First, the old belief that the path to growth in the poor countries lay in learning the ways of the West has been decisively undermined in recent years. This morning's session—labeled, perhaps over-dramatically, the "Crisis In Development Strategies"—pointed out that the developing countries confront many new problems—problems which did not face the developed countries in the earlier days of their development. For instance:

The labor forces in many developing countries are growing at far faster rates than were experienced in the western developed countries, or in Japan.

The developing countries face particularly acute problems of income distribution, which require new methods and programs. For instance, it is estimated that if India relied solely on rapid growth of agriculture and national income to solve its nutrition problem it would be more than 30 years before the lowest third of India's population could afford an adequate diet.

In education, the developing countries cannot continue to emulate Western style educational systems. Education budgets have been rising twice as fast as GNP in most LDCs, but half of all their children are still out of school because there are no schools for them, no teachers, no books. The developing countries have the need to develop non-traditional, low-cost systems of education, if they are to roll back the tide of illiteracy. For the country with a per capita GNP of \$200 per year or less, it is futile to advocate universal educational opportunities in Western type schools with 30 or fewer students per school room, teachers with graduate degrees, modern visual aids and all the rest. Their economies cannot support that kind of a school system.

I could give other examples. But the basic point is that many of the major problems facing the poor countries have either not been duplicated in Western experience or are not solvable with existing Western technology and institutions. They are different problems. They require new types of public and private institutions, new policies for allocating resources, new means for delivering services, and, in some cases, new technologies.

The severe problems of unemployment, underemployment and income distribution require new development formulas which achieve a better harmony between growth and equity.

As the developing and developed countries grapple with these problems it is reasonable to expect: First, that we will find more experimentation and variety in patterns and goals of development among different countries. We see some of this today. For example, India's increasing attempts over the years to find its own patterns for solving its poverty problem and the current interest in some of the approaches to development in the People's Republic of China.

Second, that as the donor countries become increasingly concerned with the new problems, their approach to the developing countries should tend to become less prescriptive and more cooperative. The old tutorial relationship—born of the belief that we in the West possessed the readymade answers for the problems of the underdeveloped—should diminish. Hopefully there will evolve a more collaborative problem solving approach.

The developing countries will appropriately press for increasing recognition of their right to influence donor policies and the course of worldwide development assistance. We see many signs of this today: the growing resistance to directive styles of assist-

ance; the United States agreement to have its economic policies reviewed by the Latin American countries instead of always the other way round; the increasing restiveness with developed country dominance of the multilateral institutions; and the prominent current example of the UNCTAD now meeting in Santiago, Chile. There the developing countries are pressing their right to influence the restructuring of trade and monetary systems.

A headline in a recent issue of the *Journal of Commerce* summed up what I think will be a major theme for this decade. It was: "Poor Lands Demand Decisive Influence."

Finally, perhaps paradoxically, as the developing countries face new problems and evolve new solutions we may discover a greater mutuality of interests. It is possible that methods and procedures found by the poor countries to be useful in solving their urban problems may be useful in developed societies. We can expect that some of the truly unique experiments in effective low-cost education will come from the poor countries. They may have relevance to our country. This may also be true in health care and in other areas. The truism that we are all developing countries and can learn from one another may increasingly be a reality as well as a cliché.

III

What does this imply for United States assistance programs? Although the problems of development are changing, the need to transfer resources, training and expertise from the developed to the less developed remains undiminished.

The Person Commission estimated that the developing countries would require \$16.2 billion a year in official assistance from the developed countries by 1975 to sustain a six percent annual growth rate. The UNCTAD estimated a total resource gap of about \$37 billion in 1980. While such estimates are highly tentative, no one seriously questions that the amount of resource transfers which will be needed from the developed countries to achieve reasonable growth in the developing countries is significantly higher than that now flowing.

There will be strong efforts by the developing countries to establish mechanisms for resource transfers which avoid the incursions on dignity and independence which some of the developing countries feel are inherent in current assistance programs. Many of these issues are front and center at the UNCTAD III meetings in Santiago. Key items include these three: (1) *expansion of LDC exports and trade preferences*; (2) *earmarking a larger share of SDR's for use by developing countries*; and (3) *debt relief*. I would comment briefly on each of them.

The United States is committed to the adoption of a system of generalized tariff preferences. Secretary Rogers has again recently confirmed the intention of this Administration to introduce generalized preference legislation in Congress.

The submission of a bill has been delayed because of the concern that it might be counterproductive and encourage the possibility of protectionist rather than liberalized trade policies. It is hoped that the climate will be more favorable next year. Whether such legislation passes may hinge on continued recovery in the domestic economy and a clearer indication of the effects monetary restructuring will have on our international economic position. I am confident that the United States in its own best interest will eventually approve trade preference legislation.

Giving the developing countries special access to SDRs—the new reserve assets administered by the IMF—could provide an additional \$2.0 billion a year or more in external financial resources. The United States in the past did not favor these proposals because we wished to avoid overloading the

new SDR system. By now, however, the system has proven its acceptance and workability. SDRs will play an important role in the present restructuring of the international monetary system. The position we are taking at UNCTAD is to support, in parallel with other developed countries, a full study by the IMF of how SDR's can be used to support development in the LDCs. I believe the United States will support such proposals although complex questions of timing, volume, procedures and negotiations will have to be resolved. If we are to carry our fair share of the total responsibility, I see no better way to do it.

Annual debt repayments by the LDCs now total about \$6 billion a year and are increasing at twice the rate of LDC export earnings. Multilateral debt relief agreements can become a substantial source of LDC external finance for individual developing countries with large debt problems.

The World Bank has taken the position that it will encourage developed countries to grant debt relief and will take the lead in working out guidelines for doing so, but that it will not grant relief of debts owed to it. We recognize that the Bank must maintain its credit ratings in world capital markets. But we hope that the Bank will find ways to participate in multilateral debt relief arrangements by being willing to consider rescheduling for debts owed it.

When and how these proposals for debt, trade preferences, SDRs and other more exotic proposals will be agreed upon is difficult to predict. The end of the decade may well find a large fraction of resources transferred from the developed countries to the LDCs flowing through these channels.

President Nixon has made it clear that an important part of our policy for future development assistance is to encourage the growth and use of multilateral institutions. These institutions grew with surprising vigor in the 1960s. Loans authorized by the World Bank, IDA, and the regional banks rose from \$1.3 billion in 1962 to \$3.3 billion in 1970. This Administration plans to give full support to continuing this growth.

We must recognize that while many in Congress support multilateralism, there are many others who do not. We must also recognize that the United States cannot unilaterally build multilateral institutions. If these institutions are to retain their international character, increases in U.S. contributions must be matched by comparable increases in other donor contributions. It will be a long-term job to work out the required agreements with other countries to substantially increase the proportion of total resources flowing through multilateral channels.

The World Bank has taken the lead in coordinating aid programs and providing guidance for donors and counsel for recipients. This relationship is well established and fully supported by the United States.

Now, what about the bilateral assistance administered by the Agency for International Development? Many of you have often listened to me and I will make this overview very concise.

First, this Administration will continue to work for the separation of economic development assistance from Military Assistance Programs and from Supporting Assistance programs in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Jordan, Israel, and other countries where our political or security interests are engaged. This proposal was part of the foreign assistance legislation which the President sent to Congress a year ago tomorrow. Congress deferred action last year and agreed to give it serious consideration this year. It is now evident that action will be postponed until after this fall's election. We hope the Congress will act on it early next year.

The marriage of long-term development assistance with short-term military and sup-

porting assistance in a single Foreign Aid bill was a product of the cold war. But these programs have different objectives, and a divorce is long overdue.

Second, U.S. bilateral assistance will concentrate on assisting developing countries find answers to a limited number of basic human problems: problems such as food production and nutrition, population growth, and health and low-cost education systems. The solution of some of these problems requires new technologies and institutions. Our country's great store of scientific knowledge, our problem solving approaches, our capacity to provide applied and useful training programs for foreign nationals, and the capabilities of our professional people can make great contributions in these and other areas.

We should not forget that our U.S. AID training programs have provided training for more than 160,000 persons now returned to their own countries and these former trainees are well qualified for important roles in development programs. Many of them have demonstrated high competence in the service of their governments, and across the board in civilian pursuits.

We will increasingly emphasize research, innovation and joint problem solving programs with the developing countries.

We will devote significant emphasis to building the capacity of U.S. private institutions such as universities, foundations, voluntary agencies, cooperatives, farm groups, labor groups and other groups to provide assistance in these basic problems.

The pervasive objective is to focus our loans, grants, research funds and other resources on a limited number of basic development problems where U.S. technical skill and experience can make a significant contribution.

We will give increasing attention to the problems of employment, income distribution, and equity.

The proper focus for U.S. bilateral aid is on the basic problems of people. People are at the center of development. Development is meaningful only if it can be translated from impersonal statistics, and graphs, and measures, and emphasis on GNP into more and better food, education, health, and jobs for people.

Above all, no matter how rugged and unrewarding life may be for this generation in the least developed countries, there must be justifiable hope that life may be better for their children.

U.S.A.I.D. will increasingly combine its bilateral financial resources with research and U.S. technical skills to address—jointly with the recipient countries—a relatively limited number of development problems which are basic to human welfare. *This is the direction in which we are headed.*

If we are to succeed, consistent, continuous, and understanding help "where it counts" will be required from you and your friends. We have been traveling a rough road. It may not get much smoother until the war in Indochina is wound down. When that time comes, I am certain that if the people of America have all the facts before them they will insist that our country be a responsible part of tomorrow's world, and play a responsible role in it.

In closing I return to a point made earlier. The pace and direction of development assistance will increasingly be determined by the developing countries themselves. Their problems must be solved in their countries by their people. At best external aid can only provide encouragement and help for the peoples in the assisted countries as they move in the direction of harnessing their resources to improve the quality of life for all of their people.

That is what U.S.A.I.D. should be about.

QUORUM CALL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VIETNAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the reason I am speaking today is that this morning I read on page 14638 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday a statement by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, referring to what I had said earlier, wherein he said:

I have never heard that the North Vietnamese have demanded as a condition for a political settlement the surrender of weapons given to the South Vietnamese.

I had stated repeatedly that that was one of the demands the enemy were making of us in South Vietnam. So this morning I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the terms which were submitted to us in Paris on February 3, 1972, and repeated only yesterday.

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

NLF "TWO POINT" "ELABORATION" OF THE "SEVEN POINTS"—FEBRUARY 3, 1972, NGUYEN VAN TIEN—DEPUTY HEAD OF NLF DELEGATION AT PARIS TALKS

(The proposal was reported in Paris session of April 27, 1972.)

Proceeding from the fundamental rights of the Vietnamese people and the South Vietnamese people's right to self-determination, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam wishes to elaborate on the two key problems in the seven-point solution to stop the U.S. war of aggression, and to put a complete end to the "Vietnamization" policy as follows:

1. Regarding the withdrawal of U.S. troops and the cessation of the U.S. air war and all U.S. military activities in Vietnam.

The U.S. Government should stop its air war and all military activities in Vietnam, rapidly and completely withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. troops, advisers, military personnel, weapons and war materials and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp and dismantle the U.S. military bases in South Vietnam.

The U.S. Government should set a specific terminal date for the complete withdrawal from South Vietnam of all U.S. troops, advisers, military personnel, weapons and war materials and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp without posing any condition whatsoever. This specific terminal date will also be the terminal date for the release of all militarymen of the parties and of the civilians captured during the war (including the U.S. pilot captured in North Vietnam).

2. Regarding the political problem in South Vietnam.

The U.S. Government should really respect the South Vietnamese people's right to self-determination, put an end to all interference in the internal affairs of South Vietnam.

Nguyen Van Thieu and his machine of oppression and constraint, instruments of the U.S. "Vietnamization" policy, constitute the main obstacle to the settlement of the political problem in South Vietnam. Therefore, Nguyen Van Thieu must resign immediately, the Saigon administration must end its warlike policy, disband at once its machine of oppression and constraint against the people, stop its "pacification" policy, disband the concentration camps, set free those persons arrested on political grounds and guarantee to the people the democratic liberties as provided for by the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam.

After the above has been achieved, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam will immediately discuss with the Saigon administration the formation of a three-segment government of national concord with a view to organizing general elections in South Vietnam, to elect a constituent assembly, work out a constitution, and set up a definitive Government of South Vietnam. The general elections will be held according to procedures agreed upon among the political forces in South Vietnam so as to ensure effectively their free, democratic and fair character.

Agreement on the above two key problems will make it easy to resolve the other problems with a view to ending the war, and restoring peace to Vietnam. For its part, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam is prepared to negotiate an overall solution for the purpose of signing a comprehensive agreement.

If the U.S. Government really wants a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem, it should respond to the seven-point solution whose two key problems have been elaborated above, and it should engage in serious negotiations at the Paris conference of Vietnam.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall not read them all, but here is one of them:

The U.S. Government should stop its air war and all military activities in Vietnam, rapidly and completely withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. troops, advisers, military personnel, weapons and war materials and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp and dismantle the U.S. military bases in South Vietnam.

I do not know what could be plainer than that, that they are demanding that we withdraw all defensive weapons which we have given to the South Vietnamese people to defend themselves. Also, a question has been raised, that when I said that 200,000 people were killed in North Vietnam between the years 1950 and 1956 or 1957, that this statement may not be exactly correct. The figure of 200,000 is the best estimate that I can get from talking with officials of that government and refugees who got out of the country in time to save their own necks, and from officials of our country and officials of other countries as well. That figure, 200,000, is an estimate, I admit. But if the slaughter was as low as 100,000, it was not justifiable that we should stand by and see them slaughtered, and that is why we helped move 900,000 of them to the south.

It is not justifiable now that we should yield to the demands of the enemy to leave the 900,000 refugees helpless so the north can get hold of them and give them the same punishment they gave those who were not able to get out in time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a colloquy which

took place between Secretary Rogers and myself on April 17, 1972, when several members of the Foreign Relations Committee, including the chairman, were present.

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

COLLOQUY

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Aiken.

Senator AIKEN. I have only two or three questions, Mr. Secretary. I am not going to base those questions on conditions which existed in the war between the states in 1861 to '65 because I don't recall a few hundred thousand Southerners had been butchered in the North previous to the invasion of the South.

So my question first is, President Eisenhower directed many of our ships to move refugees from North Viet Nam to South Viet Nam in 1954, I believe. Approximately 900,000 people were moved. What was the reason that President Eisenhower took, well, say, advantage of this situation to move all of those people out of North Viet Nam? Was there any good reason for it?

Secretary ROGERS. I don't believe I know the answer to that.

Senator AIKEN. The answer to that is the North Vietnamese had already killed 200,000 of these people. They had butchered them. And after that we, the United States, this hardboiled country, used its ships to move about 900,000 more people out of North Viet Nam to the South in order to keep them from suffering the same fate. I think I am correct on that.

Secretary ROGERS. Yes, that is in answer to the question the Chairman asked me.

Senator AIKEN. You partly answered it in your testimony earlier. Do you think that the nature of the North Vietnamese has been changed since?

Secretary ROGERS. No, I do not.

Senator AIKEN. Since those days when they deliberately slaughtered two hundred thousand—that is the best estimate I can get. Probably some of the State Department people can give a better one.

Secretary ROGERS. Senator, I don't think they have changed. I don't think they have any intentions of living up to international law. As you know, they haven't lived up to the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war. There is no indication they have any respect for international law at all. And I think that if we pull out of South Viet Nam quickly, as some have suggested, that it would result in a horrible massacre.

Senator AIKEN. And weren't about 750,000 of those refugees taken out because of religious beliefs?

Secretary ROGERS. That is correct.

Senator AIKEN. Between 700,000 and 900,000 in all had to clear the country of North Viet Nam to get into the South.

Secretary ROGERS. That is right.

Senator AIKEN. Now, as I understand it, there are people in this country who have spoken, people who are quite prominent from time to time, demanding that we accept the North Vietnamese terms for ending the war over there.

Now, these terms, as I understand it, call on us to repudiate the government of South Viet Nam; is that correct?

Secretary ROGERS. That is correct.

Senator AIKEN. And also to remove the weapons which we have furnished to the South Vietnamese people with which to defend themselves; is that correct?

Secretary ROGERS. That is correct.

Senator AIKEN. And if we did that do you think that would do away with any prospect of bloodshed in South Viet Nam after we complied with their demand?

Secretary ROGERS. No, of course it would greatly increase the prospect of bloodshed.

Senator AIKEN. And also the charges made that Vietnamization is not working anyway. I read a story which appeared in one of the Nation's big newspapers on April 9, in the New York Times, telling how the people who owned their homes and worked their farms up in the North were not giving them up and becoming refugees simply on command of the North Vietnamese but were fighting back just as the Americans did at Lexington and Concord some two hundred years ago. Is that correct? I have never seen that story anywhere else. I found it inadvertently in the middle of this big newspaper. I thought it was a very illuminating story.

Secretary ROGERS. That is correct, and I think that is overlooked, at least the papers don't seem to say much about it, is that the government of South Viet Nam has provided weapons for over a million people in South Viet Nam, one out of every 17. If there was great opposition to the government it would be difficult for the government to do that. I think these recent weeks show that people are supporting the government of South Viet Nam and are fighting very courageously to protect their own country.

Senator AIKEN. To what extent do the Viet Cong enter into the picture now compared with what they used to?

Secretary ROGERS. Very little now because the whole fighting is being borne by the North Vietnamese.

Senator AIKEN. And isn't it true some of those who were regarded as Viet Cong or NLF, or whatever they call it, are now fighting for their own homes?

Secretary ROGERS. Yes, that is correct, there have been quite a few defectors now fighting to protect South Viet Nam.

Senator AIKEN. I think it was a rather hideous story being written from 1961 to '69. I do recall we had 543,000 men there by 1969 put in there over my objection, and by the way, the question is now being asked "why didn't you consult the Congress in advance before attacking Hanoi, bombing Hanoi or Haiphong Harbor?"

This is not a question, but I would like about one minute to speak for myself. I was at the White House in 1966, I believe it was, about February, when several of us, I believe including you, Mr. Chairman, were called down there, not to be consulted but to be told that bombing of North Viet Nam was to begin then. It had been decided on. Among those present were Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary McNamara, President Johnson, Chief of Staff and so on, probably 15 people in all. I recall that I protested that decision to bomb the North as vigorously as I could—that I told those prominent people there I wasn't President, I didn't have authority, I wasn't even Vice President, so I couldn't do anything about that, I wasn't even Secretary of State, but I told them,—

Secretary ROGERS. You are getting pretty low.

Senator AIKEN. And I don't want to be now. That that action would prolong the war, it would not reduce the infiltration of either men or arms from the North, and I do recall turning to Secretary McNamara and telling him if he went ahead with that bombing he would put this country in hell. Well, whether it has been hell or not is a matter of opinion. Some people in this world have evidently rejoiced but others agree that it has been a hellish experience that we have had, but there is no comparison between the bombing of Haiphong today and the bombing of Haiphong then when I thought the United States was clearly the aggressor.

Today I feel that by committing its entire military strength into the invasion of a neighboring country that North Viet Nam is the aggressor. I am satisfied that they are going to lose, I am satisfied if any other

country put them up to this, this aggression at this time, that that country is not doing itself much good.

And so I have got that off my chest. I have been carrying it now for about 6 or 7 years, at least, and I do believe there is no comparison between the situation in 1966 and now in 1972. I would not want to stand by and see two million people butchered in South Viet Nam even if two-thirds of them do happen to be of different religious faith than my own. I think we now have an obligation, a humane obligation to consider their security.

Secretary ROGERS. Thank you, I thank you very much. I think the American people have great respect for your statement. I appreciate that statement.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, on October 7, 1968, when campaigning for the Presidency at a UPI conference in Washington, Mr. Nixon said and I quote: "At the present time 90 percent of the bombing over North Viet Nam has been discontinued. The 10 percent that is now being continued is for tactical military purposes to protect the forces in the DMZ zone. I would not raise that level of bombing."

Do you have any comments on that?

Secretary ROGERS. No, I don't, Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I just want to read an excerpt from this colloquy.

I said:

Senator AIKEN. Now, as I understand it, there are people in this country who have spoken, people who are quite prominent from time to time, demanding that we accept the North Vietnamese terms for ending the war over there.

Now these terms, as I understand it, call on us to repudiate the government of South Viet Nam; is that correct?

Secretary ROGERS. That is correct.

Senator AIKEN. And also to remove the weapons which we have furnished to the South Vietnamese people with which to defend themselves; is that correct?

Secretary ROGERS. That is correct.

Senator AIKEN. And if we did that do you think that would do away with any prospect of bloodshed in South Viet Nam after we complied with their demand?

Secretary ROGERS. No, of course it would greatly increase the prospect of bloodshed.

Another statement made by—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield my 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed also the statement by my chairman, on page 6726:

We have abandoned our ancient tradition of nonintervention in other people's affairs and of allowing other people to settle their affairs in accordance with their own traditions and capacities.

Mr. President, we have no tradition of nonintervention with the affairs of other countries. We can go back to the days of John Adams, and find that since then we have, more than 100 times, I would say, interfered in the affairs of other countries, usually—almost inevitably—in a good cause.

I shall not undertake to put the list of our foreign involvements in the RECORD at this time. I simply say that the Monroe Doctrine was an interference with the affairs of European countries which

wanted to settle and colonize the Western Hemisphere.

We had the case of Theodore Roosevelt taking the Panama Canal. We had the Spanish-American War, as it is called, where we went to the defense and obtained the liberation of Cuba and the Philippines from Spain. We had the Boxer Rebellion in China. We went into the Dominican Republic in 1903, and into Haiti, and in World War I we mixed into the affairs of Europe very substantially.

As I say, there have been more than a hundred cases of interference. However, I did not approve—I have not approved at any time—of the military interference to the extent to which we went into Indochina. But when it is said that by becoming involved in Vietnam we are abandoning tradition, that is sheer nonsense, because our tradition, other folks might say, has been one of interference in the affairs of other countries. If anyone wishes, I can submit a list of perhaps a hundred instances. But nearly every intervention on our part has been in the interest of our own security or a humane cause.

At the present time, although I want to see complete withdrawal from South Vietnam at the earliest possible moment, I admit we are interfering with the desires of North Vietnam when we try now to prevent them from retaking perhaps more than a million people who escaped their vengeance in North Vietnam from 1954 through 1956.

So I am inserting these documents in order to keep the record accurate.

ORDER FOR THE SENATE TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION ON MONDAY OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, immediately following the disposition of the amendment by the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) to restore the full authorization for USIA, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 732, H.R. 14582, the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY UNTIL 10 A.M. TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Monday next, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Tuesday next.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY UNTIL WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Tuesday

next, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2743. A bill to establish a working capital fund for the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-766).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 9545. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide that the Legislature of the Virgin Islands shall prescribe the minimum age for membership in the legislature (Rept. No. 92-767).

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A BILL

S. 3393

At the request of Mr. COOK, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3393, a bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide financial assistance to individuals suffering from chronic kidney disease who are unable to pay the costs of necessary treatment.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1171

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, when Congress passed the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act in 1966 it empowered the Secretary of Transportation to establish safety standards for motor vehicles to protect the public "against unreasonable risk of death and injury in motor vehicle operation."

Since then, the Nation has made many real gains in this area and the Department of Transportation and its safety division, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, deserve much of the credit.

The required energy absorbing steering system, for example, which partially collapses on impact, reduces injuries 30 percent according to a scientific study published by the Highway Safety Research Center at the University of North Carolina.

But there is one safety regulation issued by DOT that I find quite disturbing and about which I have been very outspoken. I have been critical of this stand-

ard not for what it requires by way of new safety measures, but for what it fails to require.

It is Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 208, the so-called air bag standard, which mandates completely automated occupant restraint devices on new cars beginning in 1975.

Few people realize that this proposal also strikes completely from Federal auto safety regulations the requirement for safety belts. After August 15, 1975, there simply will not be any seat belts in new cars, unless the owner decides to install them himself, paying a retail price likely to be three times what the belts would cost in mass installation.

It further strikes me as a peculiar and particularly questionable practice to induce the premature implementation of a radically new technology and simultaneously eliminate from Federal safety standards the only objectively tested occupant restraint mechanism.

Perhaps the fact that seat belts will not be required safety equipment should not concern me so much, since only about 25 percent of the people use them, which seems to be why DOT embarked on the road to passive restraints.

But it is particularly bothersome because, despite all of DOT's claims for the air bag, there appear to be some painfully serious problems that ultimately are going to affect the Nation's motorists.

And I feel strongly that until we are assured and shown that every single major problem has been solved, and until it can be demonstrated conclusively that passive restraints—no matter by what name they are called—can perform 100 percent of the time as effectively and efficiently as seat belts, then I think we owe it to the public to assure them that seat belts will be available in every car they buy.

So today, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to S. 3474, a bill "to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966," that expresses the will of the Congress that seat belts should continue as mandatory safety equipment until such time as actual experience with the air bags indicates that seat belts provide no measurable safety benefit.

In no way should this amendment be interpreted as a move to thwart the authority of the Department of Transportation, because I fully support every effort to discover more and better ways of keeping people alive, of keeping them from being hurt in most auto crashes. Rather, it should be viewed as some small measure of added insurance for the motorist until we know more about the new technology that Detroit and European automakers are rapidly perfecting.

Mr. President, when the passive restraint rule was first issued, the primary reason was to get into use a system that would protect more people than the seat belts that get only about 25 percent use. It seemed at the time there was no way to get people to buckle up.

Today, just 3 short years later, we know differently. First, there is the ignition interlock belt system that precludes starting of the car unless belts are

buckled about the occupants. Tests have shown this system to increase belt use of about 75 percent.

Within the last year Australia has boosted seat belt use to about 75 percent and in one State there the fatality rate has dropped 50 percent because of a law that simply requires people to use seatbelts when in a car. In fact, one Ohio city has had a similar law for 6 years—and the police there report a high rate of belt use.

Interest in such laws is growing in many quarters. Both the president of Ford Motor Co., Lee Iacocca, and Richard Gerstenberg, chairman of General Motors, have expressed their support. The National Safety Council has voted to endorse mandatory use laws. And proposals for mandatory use have been introduced in at least 10 State legislatures.

So, it is possible to get people to use belts, even without a massive promotional and educational program that would be highly desirable and productive.

On top of that, there is more than ample proof that safety belts are effective, and I am told that superior, more advanced safety belts are being tested.

One of the most detailed analyses of seat belt efficiency was reported by Volvo, the Swedish automaker. In over 28,000 accidents there were no fatalities among safety belt users in crashes up to 60 miles per hour. Last fall, a General Motors researcher, W. D. Nelson, analyzed 235 fatal accidents and found that only 1 percent of injuries to safety belt users were fatal.

In a very excellent study done by the Highway Safety Research Center at the University of North Carolina, it was found that safety belts reduced injuries and fatalities an average of 43 percent in all accidents, and up to 59 percent in high speed crashes.

Mr. President, I find it difficult to understand how anyone could look at these and other statistics that show how much seatbelts can do to save lives and reduce both the number and the seriousness of injuries, and fail to be impressed.

I think it is important to keep these facts in mind when examining arguments for and against passive restraints, primarily because it can be demonstrated that there are acceptable alternatives to accelerated implementation of the air bag technology, and that safety belts have an intrinsically high value in terms of life-saving capability.

What are some of the problem areas in the field of passive restraints, primarily the air bag, that should prompt us to keep safety belts?

First, there is the matter of reliability. So far in the history of air bags it has not been demonstrated that on a production line basis they will work absolutely perfectly all the time. These are man-made devices; we would be foolish if we believed that they will be perfect. Secretary Volpe himself said last December that we must be absolutely certain of 100 percent reliability, nothing less. So, as a very practical matter, seat belts will offer back-up protection in the event of failure or just as importantly in the event of premature or inad-

vertent operation. That is one reason I have been very outspoken in criticizing the elimination of seat belts, which are a proven, inexpensive safety system.

In recent weeks, the Department of Transportation has conducted crash tests of two "experimental safety vehicles" in Phoenix, Ariz. Both vehicles, equipped with air bags and dummies designed to simulate human passengers, were crashed into a solid barrier at about 50 miles per hour. Neither vehicle was equipped with seat belt systems. Secretary Volpe last week exclaimed that the "eyes of the country" were focused on the most recent test. My eyes, Mr. President, were focused on the dummies, and last week, when the vehicle crashed into the barrier, I watched with horror as the dummies were thrown into the windshield. Seat belts obviously would have prevented such an occurrence, despite the failure of the air bags to deploy. As it was, had those dummies been real people, one or more would have been killed.

Second, there is the matter of protection in multiple collisions. Little credence can be given claims that air bags are going to be manufactured to reinflate for impact after impact after impact, when there still are problems with single bag deployment. Safety belts, on the other hand, have been proven capable of giving continued protection throughout the crash ride.

Next, there are serious questions about the capability of air bags for protection of occupants in all crash modes. While they may be ideal in high speed head-on crashes, some apparently valid questions have been raised about their worth in side collisions and roll-over collisions. I think it worth noting that many deaths occur when occupants are thrown out of cars to be smashed to the ground or crushed beneath the vehicle. It is a well known fact that belts keep occupants inside the car where they are much safer.

Recently the Office of Science and Technology issued a report outlining the effects of regulatory actions on motor vehicle costs. Part of the report addressed itself to passive restraints, and it had this to say:

An important observation to be made is that there is no passive restraint technique yet developed that can, by itself, provide adequate side-impact and roll-over protection, even at the lower speeds, despite technical compliance with MVSS 208. In addition to the use of air bags, structural changes must be made in the vehicle to prevent intrusion into the passenger compartment in side-impact collisions, and either structural changes or belts are needed to prevent ejections from the vehicle in side-impacts or roll-overs. In contrast, active restraints, specifically, lap-shoulder belts, mitigate ejections in roll-overs and side-impacts without structural changes. Moreover, extensive front-seat design changes are required to provide the structural strength to restrain rear-seat passengers in frontal collisions when air bags are used.

A few weeks ago General Motors issued a "Report on Progress in Areas of Public Concern," which included comments by Louis Lundstrom, who heads and coordinates all automotive safety for GM. I found some of his observations quite interesting.

For instance, Mr. Lundstrom said General Motors does not yet have a practicable passive restraint system for rear-seat occupants, and he stated that air cushions as presently being developed would be of no use in rear end collisions. And the cost of the new systems, he said, would be "substantial."

Another concern must be the action that preceded an accident—what happens to the car and driver before a crash occurs. Often drivers will swerve violently in an attempt to avoid a collision, and they usually slam on their brakes forcefully.

If there is no crash, there is no deployment of airbags and occupants, particularly children, risk being tossed about the interior of the car. Also, drivers face the possibility of sliding out from behind the wheel, losing control of the vehicle. Again, these are situations in which seatbelts will be valuable.

Mr. President, the obstinate refusal of the NHTSA to reinstate the mandatory seatbelt requirement has been carried beyond the point of reason. Without making a value judgment as to the effectiveness of airbags, there is no longer any doubt as to the effectiveness of seatbelts. They can, and do, save lives. Last week they would have saved the dummies.

Since my last statement on this problem to the Senate, I have received hundreds of letters from people throughout the country, urging my continued efforts to "save the belts." There has also been substantial editorial endorsement for the maintenance of the seatbelt requirement. There is no question that seatbelts should be retained, until proven to be of no safety benefit. If they save only one life or prevent one person from sustaining permanent injury, they are worth the minimal cost of installation.

Mr. President, I again urge the NHTSA to amend its passive restraint standard to preserve the seatbelt requirement. As a precaution against bureaucratic inertia however, I am today introducing legislation to remedy this unjust and excusable situation.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1172

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday I developed, in a speech on the floor, the dimensions of my concern over what the Foreign Relations Committee did to the USA authorization for fiscal 1973.

As a result of the committee action slashing the USIA authorization, next Monday I will be offering a straight up and down amendment to restore the full amount of the authorization. You may recall that the committee cut the authorization by \$45 million or nearly 30 percent. I believe this to be unwise at this time, and I would like to say a little more about why I think it unwise.

As I stated yesterday, there can be no serious question about the need for a Government information program or the importance of the USIA's function

in the conduct of our foreign affairs. Its efforts are closely integrated with the activities of other U.S. agencies engaged in foreign relations, and its role is a permanent one.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask your indulgence to make a few remarks reflecting my deep concern over the actions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in dealing with the authorization legislation for USIA for fiscal year 1973. The \$45 million slash in funds would virtually gut the capabilities of the U.S. Government to effectively present the views of the American people throughout the world. This action, in my judgment, is ill-timed and ill-conceived. Let me detail for you briefly what these cuts will mean in real, concrete, terms.

The Voice of America will be crippled. Twenty-five foreign languages will have to be dropped, six major transmitter facilities will be closed down, and more than 900 experienced valuable employees will be terminated. Among the languages to be dropped are Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, and all East European languages.

Mr. President, I have traveled widely as a Senator of the United States, as most of us have, and I have made it a particular point to look into the effectiveness of the VOA wherever I have gone. Without exception, I have found it to be highly respected, responsible, and listened to. All over the world, VOA's name newscasters are recognized. Guides at the exhibits in the Soviet Union who were drawn from VOA for temporary duty, time and again find their voices recognized and excitement sweeps through a hall full of Soviets as the word spreads, "Look, there is Nikita Barsky, it is Nikita, it is Nikita." I hardly need to underline the significance of such a reaction in a closed society. Massive Soviet jamming efforts, resumed to the hour, as Soviet tanks rumbled into Czechoslovakia in 1968 reflect the appeal VOA broadcasts have in the U.S.S.R.

The cut proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee, because of its structure and rigidity of form, will abolish all USIS activities in 30 countries and severely reduce them in many others.

USIS will be abolished in Guyana where the battle for power between Moscow-inspired Cheddi Jagan and the more moderate Forbes Burnham has kept a tragic country divided between blacks and Asians; Trinidad, a vital Caribbean port with more than one-half billion dollar U.S. investments and one of the pillars of constructive Caribbean efforts toward regional government and closer relations with the United States; Bulgaria, one of the most hermetically sealed countries in the world; the Dominican Republic, which only a few years ago was the scene of one of our great foreign policy crises; most of the countries of Central America, important to the United States politically, economically, and historically; Libya and Kuwait, two of the great reservoirs of petroleum of the Western World, upon which the entire Western economy has come to depend; and 17 countries in Africa.

Let me say a few words about Africa, particularly. As you know, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee on Africa, this part of the world is especially close to my heart.

In sub-Saharan Africa, the cutback would require the elimination of all U.S. informational and cultural activities normally handled by USIS in more than half of the countries comprising 50 million black Africans. Out of 28 countries where USIS posts now operate, as many as 15 could lose the entire program—library, cultural activities, film, press, radio programming—everything. In five more countries, a total of 11 branch posts and reading rooms outside the capital cities are tentatively slated for closing. The other eight countries, not small enough to be eliminated altogether and not large enough to warrant branch post operations, will be cut drastically.

These developments, taken together with the elimination of most of the African division of the Voice of America—except for French broadcasting—and the demise of the single printed medium for reaching people throughout the continent—the picture magazine Topic—means in effect that all efforts to communicate with 50 million Africans will have been largely curtailed by the U.S. Government.

The message to the remaining 250 million Africans is to be drastically watered down, and in the case of the 120 million inhabitants of five top priority countries—Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, and Zaire—virtually the entire effort would, perforce, be limited to minimum activities in the capital city. This reduction will not only cut out people and offices, but all facilities available to them for doing their job. Because of concurrent reductions in support services back in Washington as well as cutbacks in sheer budgetary support, such standard devices which have been used by USIS posts throughout the world as publication of weekly or biweekly newsletters, and the mailing of special materials of interest to educators, editors, youth leaders, union leaders, and the like, the projection of films, and staging of lectures, seminars, and discussions, will also have to be cut.

In human terms, the reduction of program activities in Africa would mean the elimination of 43 American officers assigned to Africa—out of a total of 100.

This it should be borne in mind, is the necessary impact of this fund cutback on a continent full of people with a number of specially legitimate questions to ask of America. This continent, plagued with disease, illiteracy, underdeveloped commercially, industrially and agriculturally, only a decade from colonial rule, seeks new directions and new ideas to help fulfill its peoples' aspirations. It is not interested in adopting outsiders' ideologies, but it is desperately in need of know-how—straightforward pragmatic answers to questions of social, cultural, and technological organization vital to its move into a modern world. It has exhibited great respect and affinity for the American experience and enthusiasm for the vitality and promise of the American example.

Mr. President, I can only think of one justification for an action like this which would strip our Government of its ability to communicate successfully the views of the American people to the rest of the world. That would be the coming of the millennium in political terms—the end of political competition and pressure between ourselves and the other super powers in the world; the achievement of genuine peace and trust. We all know this day has not yet arrived. Those of us who have any doubts need only read the statements of Chairman Brezhnev who, reiterates again and again the unyielding position of the Soviet Union that political competition and ideological struggle must be relentlessly pursued. President Nixon in his U.S. Foreign Policy for the 70's statement stated:

The United States and the Soviet Union are ideological adversaries and will remain so. We are political and military competitors. . . .

I submit, Mr. President, that in these circumstances, the irresponsible massive reduction of the capability of the United States in information and cultural affairs which would result from this bill would amount to simple unilateral political disarmament and political suicide.

Mr. President, we are not talking about billions. This is not the Nation's defense budget. Savings accomplished in the magnitude of \$45 million are not going to settle this country's fundamental economic crises, nor renew its cities, nor end its educational inequalities. What it will do, however, is jeopardize the capability of the U.S. Government to protect the interests of the American people and win the time necessary to muster the massive resources necessary to cope with our own internal problems.

In sum, Mr. President, I urge the Members of the Senate to support my resolution which proposes the restoration of the full request for the budget authorization of USIA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

AMENDMENT No. 1172

On page 21, beginning with line 20, strike out through line 26 on page 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1973, to carry out international informational activities and programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 8 of 1953, and other purposes authorized by law, the following amounts:

(1) \$194,213,000 for "Salaries and Expenses" and "Salaries and Expenses (special foreign currency program)", except that so much of such amount as may be appropriated for "Salaries and Expenses (special foreign currency program)" may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation;

(2) \$5,036,000 for "Special International Exhibitions" and "Special International Exhibitions (special foreign currency program)", which amount may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation; and

(3) \$1,000,000 for "Acquisition and construction of radio facilities", which amount may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation.

On page 29, line 11, strike out "(a)".

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON THE PROPERTY TAX

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MUSKIE, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, I would like to announce that the subcommittee will begin hearings on May 4 and 5 on the property tax system.

The hearings will be held in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building, at 10:00 a.m.

Anyone wishing to file a statement with respect to the property tax should contact the chief clerk of the subcommittee, Mrs. Lucinda T. Dennis, at 225-4718.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DR. LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH, RECIPIENT OF CIVIL SERVICE AWARD

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this evening, April 28, the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation will receive a "Career Service Award for Sustained Excellence" from the National Civil Service League. The league also confers awards for "Special Achievement," and Dr. Woodworth's citation is special even for them. It recognizes Dr. Woodworth's outstanding contributions to Government during his 28 years on the joint committee staff and his tenure as chief of staff since August 1964.

It is well known to the members of the Senate Finance Committee that Larry Woodworth has one of the most demanding positions in Washington. For instance, during the deliberations on the Tax Reform Act of 1969, the talk was that 3 years of work was done in about 9 months. Instrumental in the process of research, analysis, and drafting was the joint committee staff led by Dr. Woodworth.

I must say that to operate at peak mental efficiency in such an atmosphere of pressure does indeed take an extra measure of stamina as well as technical and administrative skills of a high order.

We members of the Senate Committee on Finance have seen Dr. Woodworth apply these skills year after year as difficult and complex revenue measures have been shaped, considered, modified, fought over, and enacted. The staff, which he has developed and trained, has been most helpful to the members of the committee.

An additional measure of Dr. Woodworth's value is the experience which he brings to his job from his activities outside of Congress, such as his positions in municipal government, active participation in the National Tax Association, and as a fiscal adviser to the Governor of Maryland. For example, I would think that his experience as mayor and as city council member of Cheverly, Md., adds

valuable insight into current Congressional deliberations on revenue sharing.

In my opinion, the excellent work of Dr. Woodworth's has made a significant contribution to the tax legislation of this country and to the quality of its Government. He has earned this high honor, and I would like to add my commendation to that of the National Civil Service League.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1973

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to announce that the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1973, created pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 63 of the 92d Congress, held its organizational meeting on Monday, April 24, 1972. The meeting was held in the office of the Speaker, and Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN of North Carolina was unanimously elected chairman of the joint committee. This is the third time the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has been unanimously elected to serve in this illustrious capacity.

The members of the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in addition to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman, are Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Senator MARLOW W. COOK, Speaker CARL ALBERT, House Majority Leader HALE BOGGS, and House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have always felt the greatest sense of respect and admiration for my friend and distinguished colleague, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the senior Senator from West Virginia. A few days ago, I had an opportunity to go to West Virginia and find out how deeply those sentiments are shared by the people of his State. It was a profoundly rewarding experience, one I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate.

The occasion was the 17th annual banquet of Weirtonian Lodge No. 183, Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America. A crowd of more than 500 people attended the meeting, which took place Wednesday, April 26, 1972.

At that banquet in Senator RANDOLPH's honor, a 17-year-old Eagle Scout, Michael "Mickey" Ceran, received a special tribute from the Boy Scouts and the community for his bravery in saving the lives of two people during the past 2 years. Mickey had also received honors from the Fort Steuben Area Council for his courage.

I was deeply impressed by the remarks of Mickey Ceran and others who spoke at the dinner, including the Rev. Father James Altmeyer, chairman, Mike Sinicropi, and Daniel Grossi, who served as toastmaster.

But I was particularly moved by the comments of Mr. Guy V. Mendola, the national president of the Order of the Italian Sons and Daughters of America. I think Senators would enjoy reading his comments, because Mr. Mendola ex-

pressed very clearly the qualities we have all admired in Senator RANDOLPH.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of Mr. Mendola's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF GUY V. MENDOLA

It is a pleasure and privilege for me to visit again with my brothers and sisters of Weirtonian Lodge . . . to break bread with them on this very special occasion . . . and to participate with them in their salute to a distinguished American . . . one who has been a close friend and who holds an honorary membership in the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America . . . the Honorable Jennings Randolph, United States Senator from West Virginia.

Senator Randolph has played a major role in bringing many distinguished Americans to this city as guests of Weirtonian Lodge. It is most appropriate that tonight we salute him and pay tribute to him as a most distinguished leader and a truly great American.

As we pay tribute to Senator Randolph tonight, I am reminded of the words of the late John F. Kennedy—who, incidentally, was one of the distinguished visitors hosted by this lodge shortly before he became president of the United States. Our martyred president made the following observation about men who are chosen to serve in high public office:

"When at some future date, the high court of history sits in judgment of each of us . . . recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities . . . our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions . . . were we truly men of courage . . . were we truly men of judgment . . . were we truly men of integrity . . . were we truly men of dedication."

It is my sincere belief that Senator Randolph could answer all those questions in the affirmative, because in his long record of public service he has exemplified courage, judgment, integrity and dedication in the discharge of the duties of his office and in his fulfillment of his responsibilities to the people of West Virginia and to his fellow-Americans.

As fraternalists and as Americans, we need the vision and direction which good leaders like Senator Randolph can give us. We need that vision and direction so that each one of us might provide our country during its present period of crisis with the moral courage and cultural stamina which our ancestors have always provided. Our adherence to our essential tradition of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God imposes upon us the need for demonstrating that kind of moral courage and cultural stamina in everything we do. Only then can we be truly united in the accomplishment of our high purpose as responsible and concerned Americans and emulate the example of your friend and my friend, Senator Jennings Randolph.

This is the challenge and crusade of our day. It is the kind of challenge we must accept and a crusade we must rally behind if we are to make the kind of contribution we must make as we begin the hard, long, exciting task of building a greater America. Only then will we be ready to explore new dimensions of human aspiration and achievement. As fraternalists and as good Americans we can afford to do no less.

As National President of the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America, I want to breach the non-partisan political policy of my office for the first time tonight.

I want to state most affirmatively that were I a resident of this great neighboring state of West Virginia, I would work for and I would vote for the re-election of our distinguished friend, Senator Randolph.

NATIONAL MATERIALS POLICY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently published a very interesting article analyzing the interim report issued earlier this month by the National Commission on Materials Policy.

As this interim report is of great interest to many Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the article by William K. Wyant, Jr., be printed in the RECORD.

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

SALVAGE—DO NOT DISCARD, MATERIALS PANEL URGES

(By William K. Wyant, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—The United States is running short of raw materials and must find ways of shifting from the "use and discard" approach to salvage and reuse, the National Commission on Materials Policy reported this week.

Until shortly before World War II, this country's export of minerals exceeded its import. By 1970 it was buying minerals worth about 4 billion dollars more than those it sold abroad. The commission warned that the net trade deficit could reach 60 billions a year by the year 2000.

"In the case of a majority of our basic materials," the presidential panel said in its first interim report, "the gap between our requirements and the remaining easily accessible world supplies is widening."

To illustrate the bind the United States is in, the commission recalled that world production of 31 principal minerals more than doubled in dollar value from 1950 to 1968—to 77.4 billions from 37.1 billions—while this country's output increased only to 18.5 billions from 14.2 in 1968 dollars.

In 1950 the United States was producing 38.2 per cent and consuming nearly 42 per cent of world production. By 1968 this country was producing less than 24 per cent and consuming less than 28 per cent of the world total. In 1968 dollar value, however, American consumption increased to 21.6 billions over from 15.6 the period.

"The unmistakable conclusion . . . is that as the nation's needs continue to grow and as per capita consumption of materials in other countries increases at an even faster rate than ours, it becomes increasingly difficult for the United States to fill its ever-growing deficit by imports, even at increasing prices," the interim report said.

The United States, the commission said, enjoyed vigorous industrial and economic growth over the last century, building up "the highest standard of living in the world." The panel blamed complacency for the nation's failure to develop new sources of materials at home—a failure reflected in more and more dependence on foreign sources.

Both in the acquisition of materials and in the disposal of waste, the panel said, conflicts can occur between the need for the raw stuff of industry and the quality of the environment.

The commission noted that technology and the increasing affluence of the nation's society had nearly doubled the amount of solid waste generated by each person daily. In urban areas, waste collection has soared from under three pounds for each person a day in 1920 to five pounds in 1970.

There has been a change in the character of the waste, it was pointed out, because it contains more and more materials that are nonbiodegradable—that is, that do not deteriorate normally when thrown away. Total solid waste produced in the nation in 1969 has been estimated at more than 4.3 billion tons.

The commission's final report is due on June 30, 1973. Congress created the commission in the Resource Recovery Act of 1970. President Richard M. Nixon appointed the members last June. Chairman is Jerome L. Klafl, president of H. Klafl and Co., of Baltimore.

Other members are Lynton Keith Caldwell, professor of political science at Indiana University; J. Hugh Liedtke, president of Pennzoil United, Houston; Lee W. Minton, president emeritus of the glass Bottle Blowers Association, Philadelphia; Frederick Seitz, president of Rockefeller University, New York; Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton and Secretary of Commerce Peter G. Peterson.

The commission's staff is directed by James Boyd, former director of the Bureau of Mines and president of the Copper Range Co.

In 1970, the commission reported this week, the United States imported all of its primary requirements of chromite, columbium, mica, rutile, tantalum and tin. It imported more than 90 per cent of its aluminum, antimony, cobalt, manganese and platinum, more than half its asbestos, beryl, cadmium, fluor-spar nickel and zinc, and more than one third of its iron ore, lead and mercury.

The commission emphasized the importance of "secondary processing"—the recycling of materials after a product has been made and used, and the reclamation of waste during the manufacturing process.

In the report is a list of key materials that are to be given intensive study for the purpose of improving their recycling. The list includes iron and steel, the alloying elements chromium and nickel, and aluminum, copper, lead, magnesium, zinc and precious metals.

Glass, oil, paper, plastics, rubber and textiles are also on the list. Special attention will be given to municipal and industrial wastes, as well as to certain consumer wastes like junked automobiles.

DEATH OF FRANK L. BOYDEN, FORMER HEADMASTER OF DEERFIELD ACADEMY

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I learned of the loss of one of America's most inspirational educators and molders of men. Frank L. Boyden, who for 66 years served as headmaster of Deerfield Academy, died Wednesday in his home in Deerfield.

Frank Boyden was a big man, though he stood only 5 feet tall. And he guided three generations of Deerfield boys through adolescence and on to distinguished service in every imaginable calling.

He had originally planned to enter the law, and went to Deerfield as headmaster in 1902 for a year in order to save money to enter law school. But his stewardship of Deerfield continued until his retirement in 1968, and in spirit it shall continue for as long as the academy endures.

When Frank Boyden arrived at Deerfield shortly after the turn of the century, the fate of the academy was much in doubt. With only 14 students and a meager endowment, Frank's task was immense. At first he drove around the countryside seeking to enroll students. But it was not long before Deerfield was able to choose from among the top students in the country.

As headmaster, Frank Boyden ruled with a warm heart, rather than an iron hand. For years his office was in the

front corridor of the academy's main building, and he was always available to his students to whom he provided constant and individual assistance. The story is told that when someone donated money for a new office, he declined to use the desk that faced the campus and instead used a chair near the door—as close as he could get to the corridor—so that he could see the students as they went by. And students never failed to come to him, whether in their triumphs or troubles.

Under his tutelage, there developed some of our Nation's finest leaders in the 20th century. While he remained a modest man, others would not let him escape the acclaim he deserved. His fellow educators recognized his brilliance and compassion, and 23 colleges and universities awarded him honorary degrees.

But I am sure, to Frank Boyden, the greatest reward was the success and happiness of those whom he nurtured and guided to maturity.

Frank Boyden's legacy will endure for ages because it is embodied in the thoughts and deeds of thousands of Deerfield graduates who are leaders in their fields of endeavor.

To them, I offer my condolences for the loss of a mentor without parallel. To his widow, Helen, and his two sons, John and Theodore Boyden, his daughter, Elizabeth Boyden, and his grandchildren, I offer my deepest sympathy in their loss of a wonderful husband, father, and grandfather.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about Frank Boyden, published in the Boston Globe of April 26, 1972, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FRANK L. BOYDEN DIES; SPENT HIS LIFE BUILDING DEERFIELD ACADEMY
(By Jean Caldwell)

DEERFIELD.—Frank L. Boyden, who came to spend one year as headmaster of a faltering Deerfield Academy in 1902 and stayed on for 66 years to build it into one of the nation's finest secondary schools, died in his home early yesterday morning. He was 92.

He was a little man—5 feet—and he used to describe his method of raising funds by saying: "I just look old and frail and sick."

But Boyden wielded power far beyond that, perhaps, of any other educator of the century. His power came from the fact that he understood boys, he loved people, he had a showman's flair that was coupled with a deep sincerity, and a willingness to do everything for this school from raising \$100,000 in an afternoon to replacing bits of turf dug up by player's cleats from the football field.

When Boyden became headmaster in 1902, Deerfield had 14 students—some of them regarded as terrors by the townsfolk. The trustees weren't sure whether to close the school or to try to keep it going. Several of Boyden's Amherst classmates had been offered the job. He was the only one who applied.

He planned to stay for one year, save his money and enter law school. It was 20 years before he gave up the idea.

In the beginning he would drive around the countryside in a buggy trying to persuade country boys to enroll in the Academy. After a time he had his pick of the top students in the country.

He always found room for the boys, no one else wanted. Boys who were kicked out of

Andover and Exeter came to Deerfield and went on to do brilliantly in college.

His offices were in the front corridor of the main building. This was the busiest spot in the school. He could sit there and sense the mood of the school, could spot an individual boy who was troubled. Much later, someone gave money for a lovely office to be built off the main corridor. He never sat at the desk which commanded a splendid view of the campus but in a chair near the door, as close as he could to the corridor. He wanted, he said, to see everyone who came by.

Under his leadership, the Deerfield Academy had no catalogue and no printed set of rules. He didn't mind making exceptions for a single boy and then getting agreement from the student body that the exception was to be an exception.

His graduates went on to become doctors, lawyers, bankers, but most, especially, educators.

When he first came, the school was too small to field a team so he played on the baseball team with the boys. He played on the team until he was 35 and was coach for the football, basketball and baseball teams until he was almost 80. He went to every game up to the beginning of March and would sit on the bench with the players.

Last year, the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame presented him with its "Distinguished Americans Award."

Twenty-three colleges and universities awarded him honorary degrees. But the presidents of many more paid him a higher tribute—they sent their sons and grandsons to him to be educated.

He insisted on fresh flowers in every building and at least a single flower on every table in the dining room. But when it came to fees, he often would tell parents to "pay what you are able." At one time a fifth of the student body was there under this arrangement.

He got the boys together at least once a day because he felt this was what families should do.

The campus switchboard was in his rear parlor and for years—until he was 82—he was the one to answer the phone when it rang between 10:30 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

When his wife rejoined his faculty after the birth of their third child, he warned her that should a dispute ever arise between her and one of the boys, he would side with the boys.

Her alma mater got even with him for keeping her worried about her job despite the fact that she was one of the school's outstanding teachers. When Smith College gave her an honorary degree, the citation read: "To Helen C. Boyden, who, with some small help from her husband, built a great school."

But he would say of her: "She is much more important than I am. She has a wonderful sense of humor and deep affection for the boys. She has more influence on the boys than I have. She makes them want to do the work. Her judgment is excellent. It is interesting that a combination such as the two of us could get together. I don't know that I've ever known her really. She could have been the head of any school."

For ten years, from 1960 to 1970, he was chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Massachusetts. He was instrumental in obtaining fiscal autonomy for the university and presided over it during its period of greatest growth.

Robert C. Wood, president of UMass, noted Boyden's efforts in planning for the medical school in Worcester and the UMass-Boston campus.

"Men of the stature of Frank Boyden are a grace to their epoch," he said. "His vitality and energy on behalf of the University of Massachusetts were legend. We shall miss him, but his endeavors are his monument and he will not be forgotten."

In 1967 President Lyndon Johnson awarded him the Presidential Citation for Distinguished Service.

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Helen (Childs) Boyden, whom he married in 1907; two sons, John C. of Yarmouth Port (who retired as Deerfield Academy admissions director in 1969, one year after his father) and Theodore C. of Atlanta, Ga. and a daughter, Miss Elizabeth Boyden of Deerfield, and two grandchildren.

Private family services will be today in the First Church of Deerfield. Burial will be in Laurel Hill Cemetery in Deerfield.

There will be a public memorial service tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. in the Deerfield Academy Memorial Building.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

QUORUM CALL

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

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

INCREASING THE LIMIT ON DUES FOR U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL POLICE ORGANIZATION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 733, H.R. 11350.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11350, to increase the limit on dues for U.S. membership in the International Criminal Police Organization.

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 the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$100,000"; at the beginning of line 8, strike out "unpaid balance of the dues for the calendar year 1970. There" and insert "unpaid balance of the dues for the calendar years 1970 and 1971. There"; and, on

page 2, at the beginning of line 3, strike out "\$23,000" and insert "\$55,000".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON). The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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. 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.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3526) to provide authorizations for certain agencies conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the foreign relations authorization bill now before the Senate serves to bring together legislation to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, U.S. Information Agency, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Peace Corps.

For these four agencies the committee recommends a total authorization of appropriation amounting to \$916,971,000, consisting of the following:

Sixty hundred forty-eight million dollars for the Department of State, including \$85 million to recover resettlement costs for refugees from the Soviet Union.

One hundred fifty-five million dollars for the U.S. Information Agency.

Thirty-two million dollars over the next 2 years for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, of which almost \$10 million will be used in fiscal 1973 for seismic research under the agency's direction.

Eighty-two million dollars for the Peace Corps.

The total authorization of \$917 million is \$43 million over the budget request and is \$135 million more than was appropriated for these agencies in fiscal 1972. The \$43 million increase over the fiscal 1973 budget request is accounted for by the committee's action to support an \$85 million authorization to assist in the resettlement of Jewish and other refugees from the Soviet Union.

The committee's action on all of these money items is spelled out in the report, and by and large, the administration fared rather well, given the serious reservations that a number of members of the committee have about our foreign affairs establishment.

Mr. President, as an indication of these doubts, the committee adopted a number of policy provisions. The bill we submit includes the following provisions:

It prohibits the use of funds for the purpose of maintaining or supporting U.S. forces in hostilities in Indochina after December 31, 1972, subject to an agreement for the release of prisoners of war and an accounting for those listed as missing in action.

It creates a commission to make a long-range, in-depth study of the governmental mechanisms and programs for the making and conduct of foreign policy.

It requires a 10-percent cutback within the next fiscal year of the number of U.S. Government personnel of certain agencies who are stationed abroad.

It prohibits distribution of U.S. Information Agency materials to the U.S. public.

It prohibits propaganda activity in behalf of foreign governments by U.S. agencies and requires attribution of all Government information prepared for distribution abroad.

It establishes a grievance procedure for Foreign Service personnel.

It requires that promotion within the Foreign Service be based on individual merit as determined by impartial selection boards.

It repeals the provision of law allowing the importation of chrome ore from Rhodesia in violation of a United Nations Security Council decision.

It establishes a Bureau of North American Affairs and a Bureau of South American Affairs in the Department of State.

It requires Senate approval of all persons chosen to use the title of ambassador or minister.

It encourages more candid testimony to congressional committees by witnesses from the foreign affairs agencies.

It transfers the principal responsibility for seismic research from the Department of Defense to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate should be aware that the Department of State and U.S. Information Agency authorization legislation contained in this bill represents a significant departure from the procedure followed in previous years. Heretofore, both the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency operated under a permanent authorization of appropriation. Such a procedure afforded the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Congress little opportunity to exercise significant legislative oversight of the activities of the principal agencies concerned with foreign policy or to make their views known on a regular basis about the operations and programs of these two foreign affairs agencies. Last year the committee recommended and the Congress approved legislation to correct this situation by re-

quiring periodic authorization of the activities of both the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency. The provision contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 will enable the authorizing committees to carry out their oversight functions more effectively and to request the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency to be more responsive to the authorizing committees and to the Congress as a whole.

Exercise of the oversight function has been well served by this new procedure. With respect to the objective of making these agencies more responsive to the legislative needs of the committee and the Congress, the evidence to date is less than encouraging. The committee still has several requests outstanding for information from the Department of State and the Information Agency. In fact, the hearing record itself is not yet complete because all of the information requested has not been supplied. This lack of responsiveness to requests for information on the part of the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency indicates a disregard for the letter and spirit of the law. Congress wrote into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 the following:

The Department of State shall keep the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to all activities and responsibilities within the jurisdiction of these committees. Any Federal department, agency, or independent establishment shall furnish any information requested by either such committee relating to any such activity or responsibility.

The committee initiated this provision of law because of the increasing difficulties it has had in recent years in acquiring information from the executive branch which it needed to fulfill its legislative oversight responsibilities. Despite the committee's and the Congress' best efforts, however, culminating in the legal requirement, the committee was notified in mid-March, for example, that the U.S. Information Agency's country program memoranda documents would not be made available to the committee or the Congress for the purpose of using these documents to review and evaluate the agency's current authorization request of \$200 million.

In view of this denial—based on a dubious claim of executive privilege—the committee voted 9 to 4 to reduce that agency's request by a total of \$45 million or about a quarter of the budget estimate. The report explains the committee's action in the following way:

The information contained in the Agency's Country Program Memoranda and other planning documents may provide a full and adequate justification for the \$200 million authorization. The Committee has no way of knowing. It was in effect asked to approve this request "in the blind." It could not do so. And in the absence of such information and justification, the Committee believes the taxpayers of the country ought to be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. President, the committee's decision to bring the authorizing legislation for the Department of State, U.S. Infor-

mation Agency, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Peace Corps together in a single bill represents an effort to focus attention on the size, the lack of central direction, and the proliferation of Government agencies involved in the field of foreign affairs. The four agencies covered by this legislation do not, of course, exhaust the list of foreign affairs agencies by any means and, in fact, one could reasonably claim that even the four taken together constitute a small part of the entire foreign policy apparatus of our Government. This apparatus is such that one wonders if the Department of State is capable at the present time of controlling or significantly influencing the foreign policy of the United States. Even at our overseas posts, it is evident that the sheer number of representatives from other agencies makes it impossible for the Department of State to be the servant of the President, or even the master of its own house, except on paper—and very thin paper at that. The committee report points out, for example:

Of the 21,814 U.S. civilian employees serving overseas on December 31, 1971, only 3,409 are engaged in regular State Department activities.

In addition to the civilian agency personnel ... as of September 30, 1971 there were 3,210 people from the Defense Department abroad serving as military attachés or connected with military aid programs. The proliferation of activities abroad by other agencies is illustrated also by overseas spending. Of the \$6,021,635,000 spent abroad by U.S. Government agencies in FY 1971, only \$153,577,000 or two percent was attributable to the Department of State.

This situation indicates that multiple Federal agencies have overseas missions of their own, often leaving the foreign service to provide administrative services rather than dealing with significant foreign policy subjects such as economic and military aid, trade, information and other subjects of vital concern. Those executive branch agencies which have a foreign-policy input in Washington—ranging from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Defense to the Department of Treasury—have their representatives abroad and their policy guidance frequently turns counter to that of the Department of State. In turn this condition means that many ambassadors spend as much time trying to straighten out interagency squabbles in the embassy as in attending to legitimate affairs of state.

Mr. President, in a nutshell there is something seriously wrong with the foreign affairs structure of our Government. As the report states:

The results of the Committee's study this year make it apparent that the present foreign policy machinery does not serve the Executive Branch, Congress, or the public.

And the report goes on to point out that:

Most significant foreign political, military, and economic policy issues are decided through the systems set up under the National Security Council and the International Economic Policy Council, whose personnel refuse to appear before Congressional Committees.

But in terms of resource allocation and foreign policy priorities, the report finds:

There is no single place in the Executive Branch for the systematic establishment of priorities for use of our nation's resources for foreign policy purposes. And, in Congress, because of the number of Committees involved in the authorization and appropriations processes, there is also no focal point for Congressional oversight. In effect, the apparatus for foreign policy is like a bureaucratic no man's land, with every agency pursuing, to a significant extent, its own objectives without effective control by either Congress or the Executive Branch.

In view of these findings, Mr. President, the committee recommends that the Congress endorse the following statement:

The Congress finds that during the last quarter of a century there has been a proliferation of agencies of the United States Government with respect to the formulation, management, and conduct of, and the collection of information relating to, the Nation's foreign policy. This proliferation has resulted in the diminution of both the President's and the Congress' respective powers with respect to the formulation and implementation of foreign policy, the less effective coordination and control of such policy, the distortion of traditional policymaking processes and the waste of the taxpayers' money through overlapping of functions and duplication of effort. It is the purpose of this act to establish a study commission which will submit findings and recommendations to provide a more effective system for the formulation and implementation of the Nation's foreign policy.

The specifics of the study commission proposal are contained in title VI of the bill. Briefly, the commission would be composed of 12 distinguished members, two from the Senate, two from the House, two from the executive branch and six from private life. The mandate given the commission is a broad and far-reaching one:

The Committee intends that the Commission shall study all aspects of the governmental system for making and conducting policy as well as current programs and activities relating to our foreign policy. The Committee expects the Commission to give special consideration to Congress-Executive Branch relationships, including, but not limited to, the issues of executive privilege, access to information, the security classification system, and more effective ways to further the intentions of the drafters of the Constitution concerning the coordinate relationship of the Congress and the President in the formulation of foreign policy. With respect to the Executive Branch, it is the Committee's intent that the Commission shall consider the activities of all agencies and offices within the Executive Branch which have an impact on foreign policy or the conduct of our affairs abroad, including all interagency arrangements for the control and coordination of all matters relating to foreign policy.

The Commission is given 2 years to carry out this mandate and is required to report to the President and the Congress no later than June 30, 1974. The committee believes this ought to be sufficient time for the Commission to conduct a comprehensive, in-depth study of the organizational and administrative ills facing our Nation's foreign policy structure, and to develop the kind of recommendations that will serve to cure them.

Mr. President, perhaps the most convincing testimony to the need for a thorough review of the Nation's foreign policymaking processes is that which arises from the lessons and experiences of Vietnam—a foreign policy failure of monumental proportions. And just as we must act to correct the procedures that helped produce this failure, so too must we act to end the failure itself.

To bring this failure to an end, the committee voted 9 to 1 in favor of the Case-Church amendment, which is title VII in the bill now before us. This proposal would prohibit the expenditure or obligation of funds to continue U.S. participation in the war in Indochina after December 31, 1972, subject to the release of prisoners held by North Vietnam and its allies and an accounting for all Americans who have been held or known to those governments. Consideration of this amendment presents every Member of the Senate with an opportunity to indicate whether or not he favors continued U.S. involvement in the Indochina war.

Cast in its simplest terms a vote against this amendment will be a vote to continue the war. The central issue is whether there is any justification in terms of our Nation's interest at this point in time for the continued use of American military forces in Southeast Asia. The burden of proof rests upon those who would continue the war. It is up to them to justify to the American people why additional billions should be spent and why additional lives should be risked.

The evidence which supports the case for ending American involvement is unambiguous: 55,000 American dead, 300,000 wounded, hundreds of Americans imprisoned and missing, the devastation of a vast region of Southeast Asia, more than a million Asian dead, a war debt approaching \$200 billion, an economy racked by inflation and unemployment, a society rent apart by social discord, and a government whose prestige and credibility has been seriously eroded.

What possibly can be accomplished that would justify the continued drain of our resources and weakening of the strength of our Nation?

The responsibility for the policies which have brought us to where we are today in Indochina is one which must be shared by both the legislative and executive branches of our Government. The fact that the initiative for precipitating, enlarging and continuing direct U.S. involvement in the war came from the executive branch under successive Presidents obscures but does not alter the fact that the legislative branch has authorized and appropriated every dollar which this war has cost. It is clear that in the absence of affirmative action by the Congress to prohibit further expenditures, the war—under one guise or another—will go on. Until now the Congress has refused to take upon itself the responsibility for terminating American involvement. We in the Senate should delay no longer in facing up to this responsibility.

It will be argued that vague and fearful consequences could flow from the adoption of this amendment—the “en-

slavement” of South Vietnam, a “blood-bath,” the “destabilization” of Southeast Asia, a wave of reaction and recrimination here at home and a loss of face by the United States. There is no more certainty that any of these debatable consequences will flow from the adoption of this amendment than there is that its defeat will assure the realization of objectives which appear as far from realization under this administration as they were in preceding administrations. On the other hand, we can be certain that if funds for the war are not cut off, the very real costs which I have already enumerated will continue to mount. This is the certain responsibility which we in the Congress will incur if we continue to authorize the war. If we should end this war, I believe the American people and our friends abroad will approve our action.

By enacting the Case-Church amendment the Senate would be writing into law what I believe to be the preponderant sentiment of the American people—to end the killing, to determine the fate of those missing and to recover our prisoners. It would have been and still would be preferable for the executive branch to join with the Congress in a coordinated effort to realize these objectives. Unfortunately, the executive branch by its recent actions has demonstrated its continued adherence to an additional objective—the continued defense of the Government of South Vietnam. This is not only a discredited objective but it is also one which on the basis of experience renders impossible the realization of the others. The United States has already done all that it could reasonably be expected to do for the Government of South Vietnam. Thus, there appears to be no alternative but for the Congress to define in law, using the power of the purse, those specific and limited objectives which it believes to be valid. The enactment of the Case-Church amendment would represent a fulfillment of the Senate's responsibility to the people and of its responsibilities under the Constitution as a coordinate branch of government. Let us assume this responsibility so that at last an end can be written to this tragic war.

THE CASE-CHURCH AMENDMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and I have circulated among our colleagues a letter of explanation concerning the Case-Church amendment to the State Department-USIA authorization bill. We enclosed with the letter the text of the amendment and the pertinent part of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations which relates to it.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and enclosures be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1972.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Our amendment to the State Department-USIA Authorization bill is designed to give the President's program of

Vietnamization the best possible chance for success. We commend the President for his policy of troop withdrawals; we also believe that it is necessary to place a date certain on American military participation in the war. Unless a definite deadline is fixed, we believe South Vietnam will permit us to carry the burden of its defense indefinitely.

The Senate passed the Mansfield amendment three times last year. But, because it lacked any enforcement provision, the President chose to disregard it.

We think, then, that it is time to give effect to the policy approved three times last session by utilizing Congress' power of the purse. Case-Church does this. It allows time for the orderly withdrawal of the balance of our military forces from Indochina and for South Vietnam to assume the responsibility for its own defense; it takes effect on or after December 31, 1972, provided there is a satisfactory agreement to release our POWs and an accounting for our MIAs is given. Overall, the amendment, if enacted, would be a powerful incentive for Hanoi to release our men.

A copy of the Case-Church amendment, approved by the Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 9 to 1, is enclosed, along with the pertinent part of the Committee Report. We hope that you will find it possible to vote with us to keep this measure in the bill.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.
FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator.

TITLE VII—TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES IN INDOCHINA

SEC. 701. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized or appropriated in this or any other Act may be expended or obligated after December 31, 1972, for the purpose of engaging United States forces, land, sea, or air, in hostilities in Indochina, subject to an agreement for the release of all prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government and an accounting for all Americans missing in action who have been held by or known to such Government or such forces.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1972—S. 3526

TITLE VII. TERMINATION OF HOSTILITIES IN INDOCHINA

Section 701, hereafter referred to as the Case-Church amendment, would bring about a total withdrawal of all American military forces from Indochina, provide an inducement for the release of American prisoners of war and an accounting of those Americans missing in action, and reinforce Title VI of Public Law 92-156 (known as the Mansfield amendment). It is also designed to give the President's program of Vietnamization the best possible chance for success.

The Case-Church amendment utilizes Congress' power of the purse. It prohibits the expenditure or obligation of funds for the maintenance or support of United States military forces in or over North or South Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, on or after December 31, 1972. This means that, beyond this explicit date, the purse strings will be drawn shut and there will be no financing of American armed forces for the purpose of engaging any further in the war on the Indochina peninsula, once an agreement is reached for the release of U.S. prisoners of war now held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with that Government as well as an accounting for all Americans missing in action who have been held or known to be held by the North Vietnamese or its allies. The Committee is convinced that

the best way to get American prisoners home, other than through a negotiated settlement, is to bring all of our troops, airmen, and sailors home. That is the objective of this provision.

Case-Church, on the other hand, does not prohibit the furnishing of military assistance nor the maintenance of traditional Military Assistance Advisory Groups (MAAGs) in the countries of Indochina. U.S. monies and materiel can be provided the various governments of Indochina, but participation by U.S. personnel shall be limited to small numbers of technicians responsible for the distribution and end-use checking of said monies and materiel only. Advisers of any kind are barred from involvement throughout Indochina, as they are already in Cambodia by Section 7 of Public Law 91-652 (known as the Cooper-Church amendment). There shall also be the normal diplomatic complement of military attaches.

The Case-Church provision, approved by a vote of 9-1, is the latest attempt by the Committee to bring about an orderly and rapid termination of our military involvement in the war in Indochina. It follows on the two Cooper-Church amendments which are now law. These bar the introduction of U.S. ground combat troops into Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia, plus American military advisers in Cambodia. It follows the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. It follows the Mansfield amendment which passed the Senate three times last year and was enacted into law, setting a government policy to terminate U.S. military operations in Indochina by a date certain and withdrawing all our forces contingent upon the release of all American POWs. Another Cooper-Church amendment to end U.S. military involvement in Indochina was deleted from the Foreign Assistance Authorization bill by the Senate last October 28th by one vote.

The Case-Church provision is an example, too, of the Committee's efforts to restore the proper Constitutional balance between Congress and the Executive branch in matters of war and peace. In 1969, the Senate voted for the Commitments Resolution; on April 13, 1972, the Senate passed the War Powers bill, making explicit what the President can and cannot do vis-a-vis the Constitution in engaging the armed forces of the United States in hostilities.

The Committee believes that for American national interest to be served and for the President's policy of Vietnamization to succeed, America's allies in Indochina must be put to the test of defending themselves against hostile forces without U.S. military involvement and back-up support. Such a time is now, and five years or 20 years from now.

After so many years of U.S. participation in the Indochina war, it is the strong view of the Committee that the United States has fulfilled its commitment in arming and assisting as well as in engaging in combat for another country. In fact, the United States has done everything legitimately possible for South Vietnam to help it stand as a nation on its own two feet. If it is unable to do so now, neither the bombing of North Vietnam, the use of more devastating military tactics, or the continued presence of Americans will enable it to do so. If the South Vietnamese are to become self-reliant on the battlefield, then 1972 is the year for total American military withdrawal and for a total take-over of the war by the peoples of Indochina themselves.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this body will soon be voting on the State Department-U.S.I.A. authorization bill which includes a proposed grievance system for Foreign Service employees.

While not commenting on the merits

of such a system, I would like to point out a letter I received from Mr. David Abshire, Assistance Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, who offered his analysis of section 109 of the authorization bill.

I also will not offer comment on the objections to the proposed grievance system offered by Mr. Abshire. However, I think it worthwhile to have these views available to any Senator who might wish to consider them.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Abshire's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 27, 1972.

HON. GALE W. MCGEE,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: The Department of State appreciates this opportunity to comment upon the proposed grievance system for Foreign Service employees which would be imposed on the foreign affairs agencies by Section 109 of the Bill providing authorization for their appropriations, S. 3526.

After consultation with experts inside and outside the Government, the Department last August established a completely revised and expanded grievance system for the officers and employees of the Foreign Service known as the "Interim Grievance Procedures." The system is working and is working well. Employees are using it. Cases are moving with dispatch. Decisions are providing meaningful redress.

The Chairman of the Interim Board is the distinguished former Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Mr. William E. Simkin. The other two public members are retired Ambassador William R. Tyler and Alexander B. Porter, permanent umpire for the Reynolds Metals Corporation and the United Steel Workers. All nine members of the Board were subject to the approval of employee organizations before they were appointed.

Since the Board began its work last December it has received 51 cases from the three foreign affairs agencies (State, USIA and AID). Nine have been referred back to the employing agency for further informal review. Six have been dismissed or withdrawn. The Board presently has 20 under active consideration. Of the 16 complaints which have been decided on the merits by the Board, 13 findings have been all or in part in the complainant's favor and 3 have been in favor of management.

While we believe this interim system is an excellent one, we are committed under Executive Order 11636 to sit down with our employees and develop a definitive grievance procedure. We will do this as soon as elections under Executive Order 11636 can be held. Meanwhile, the experience we are getting under the interim procedures is invaluable.

The Department's objections to the proposed legislation however are not based solely on the fact that we have a sound and effective interim grievance procedure and an appropriate framework—involving both the Department's management and its employees—for developing definitive procedures. The Department's objection is also based on the contents of the Senate Bill. The Bill as drafted is unworkable and would seriously impair the effectiveness of the Department and the Foreign Service.

Under the proposed legislation a Foreign Service employee could bring a complaint objecting to—almost literally—anything. Ac-

cording to the language contained in the Bill's definition of a grievance, a complainant could bring an action against any assignment which is proposed for him. He could bring an action against an assignment which has been given to another employee which the grievant thinks he should have had instead. Similarly grievants could bring actions for their own failure to be promoted and also against the promotion of someone else. Complaints could be brought against almost any form of oral or written criticism of the complainant, or indeed, against oral or written praise of any other employee.

Since exceptions formerly expressed in a similar bill, S. 2659, do not appear in the proposed legislation, there is a danger that complaints might even relate to the substantive aspects of the President's foreign policy and to general management policies of the foreign affairs agencies. Grievance procedures for individuals are singularly inappropriate for both of these subjects. The consultations with recognized employee organizations required under Executive Order 11636 are specifically designed for collective comment by employees on the content of personnel policies.

Once a complaint is filed the whole machinery would inevitably be brought into play, since a formal hearing would be required in every case. Many man-hours would be required for the complainant and management to prepare for and participate in these hearings. The complainant has the right of unlimited interrogatories and depositions of any one under the control, supervision or responsibility of the Department, without the need of Board approval. A multiplicity of Departmental witnesses for both the complainant and the defendant could be expected. Indeed, it might be said that the Department of State would no longer be a department of diplomats, but a department of litigants.

The burden on management and personnel officials would be further increased by this Bill since it would make the procedures available to litigate alleged grievances of former Foreign Service personnel (or their survivors dating back to 1924.)

Under the Bill, sitting in judgment of the Department for its current and historical decisions will be a Board totally outside the Department. The Board will consist of a series of adversary three-member panels with management naming one member, the organization which has won the right to represent employees naming a second member and, if these two cannot agree on the third, the choice is given to the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Given the adversary relationship of the other two Board members, the Judge's appointee will probably be the decisive figure on the Board. Because of the extraordinary scope of the Board's authority the practical effect of this legislation would be to give the Judge's appointee a paramount role to that of the Secretary of State in much of the direction of the Foreign Service.

The Board would be given the power to order the Department to suspend any action which is related to, or may affect, a grievance pending before the Board. Under this authority the urgent dispatch of an officer abroad could be held up if another officer desired the assignment and filed an action with the Board. The promotions of hundreds of officers could be held up on the complaint of a single individual. An Ambassador could be required to retain an officer on his staff whom the Ambassador had found completely unsuitable. There are no exceptions to the Board's power in this regard.

The Bill gives the Board plenary authority to direct the Secretary to grant such relief as it deems proper, with the sole exception that in the case of a grievance relating to

promotion, assignment or selection out the Secretary could decline to accept a recommendation of the Board if—and only if—in a fully documented statement personally signed by the Secretary and furnished to the grievant, he determines that "the foreign policy or security of the United States will be adversely affected." While this language purports to give the Secretary some discretion, it is in fact a serious and undesirable invasion of necessary management discretion.

In cases related from the beginning to promotion or assignment, the Secretary could be forced by the Board to make unwise assignments or recommend promotion to the President of persons other than the best qualified if the Secretary could not justify a refusal on the narrow grounds of an adverse effect on the foreign policy or security of the United States. Even this limited authority of the Secretary with respect to assignments and promotions recommended by the Board would disappear if the initial grievance was unrelated to promotion, assignment or selection out. Thus, for example, if the Board in one of these latter cases determined a particular assignment to be appropriate recompense, the Secretary would be powerless to deny the assignment even if he determined that the security of the United States would be seriously impaired thereby.

Another of the serious deficiencies of the Bill is that by not requiring any precondition to the filing of a grievance with the Board and at the same time requiring a hearing in "any case filed with it," the Bill would virtually preclude the informal resolution of grievances. Procedures for the informal consideration of grievances are required by the Civil Service Commission for other federal employees, and are included in most collective bargaining agreements in the private sector. The Department sees no justification for the elimination of this feature which is generally regarded as serving the interests of both employees and management. It has proven its value to the Foreign Service in our experience under the interim grievance procedure. The requirement of a hearing in every case would place an impractical burden on the Board and, as can be testified to by members of the Interim Board, would actually inhibit the just resolution of many grievances.

Also the requirement that hearings should be open unless the Board for good cause determines otherwise is, in the Department's opinion, a reversal of priorities. To protect the personal privacy of all employees—the grievant, the accused, and witnesses, to promote candor in testimony, and to permit expeditious handling of grievances, the hearings should be closed. This is consistent with current Civil Service practice.

One final comment on the substance of the Bill. It would permit an employee by the simple act of filing a grievance to, for example, divest the Civil Service Commission from jurisdiction in discrimination cases, divest the Board of the Foreign Service from jurisdiction in separation for cause proceedings, or, indeed, divest the grievant of his substantial rights in seeking disability retirement. Our interim grievance procedures avoid this problem of "shopping" among remedial procedures by excluding from the jurisdiction of our Board those matters (such as sex or race discrimination) where other established procedures adequately protect employee rights.

While the foregoing are our major concerns, there are a number of technical deficiencies which we have not commented upon, but which we shall be glad to point out if you wish.

This, in summary, is why we oppose the proposed legislation. If any legislation is to be enacted at this time, we believe it should

be limited to a brief statement of general principles within which the employee-management relations system can work out definitive procedures.

Sincerely yours,
DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 13361.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13361) to amend section 316(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. CHILES, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. TALMADGE. 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. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now again be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with statements limited therein to 3 minutes, and that that period be limited to not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

ORDER ON PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately after the recognition of the two assistant leaders under the standing order, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning busi-

ness for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR H.R. 11589 TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE ON TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business on Tuesday next, the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar Order No. 727, H.R. 11589, to authorize the foreign sale of certain passenger vessels, and that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until H.R. 11589 has been disposed of.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANTICIPATION OF CLOSED SESSION ON TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, following the disposition of H.R. 11589 on Tuesday it is anticipated that the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) will make a motion that the Senate go into closed session.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and this very well may be the final quorum call of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS UNTIL 5 P.M. TODAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be authorized to file committee reports until 5 p.m. today.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR McGEE TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M. TODAY TO SUBMIT AN AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) may have until 5 p.m. today to submit his amendment—dealing with the restoration of funds authorized by USIA—for printing.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for Monday is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. After the two assistant leaders have been recognized under the standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 3526. The pending question at that time will be on the adoption of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), to restore the full authorization for the USIA. There is a time agreement on that amendment limiting debate not to exceed 4 hours. The agreement also provides that no amendment to the amendment may be offered.

I would judge that the rollcall vote on the adoption of that amendment will not occur before 1:30 p.m.

Upon disposition of that amendment, the Senate will then temporarily lay aside the unfinished business on Monday, and will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14582, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes. There is a time limitation for debate on that bill of 3 hours, and a time

limitation on any amendment, debatable motion, or appeal of 30 minutes. At least one rollcall vote thereon can be expected.

On Tuesday, for the further information of Senators, the Senate will take up the bill to authorize the foreign sale of certain passenger vessels, H.R. 11589. There is a time agreement allotting 2 hours for debate on the bill, 1 hour on any amendment in the first degree, and one-half hour on any amendment to an amendment, debatable motion, or appeal. A rollcall vote or rollcall votes are anticipated thereon.

Following the disposition of the ship sales bill on Tuesday, a closed session will occur, the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) having indicated to the joint leadership that it is his intention to move for a closed session during the day. If that motion is seconded, as presumably it will be, the Senate will go into closed session. There could be rollcall votes during that closed session. And Senators are therefore alerted to that possibility.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AT 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 11:30 a.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1972, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1972:

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Lael J. Abbott, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending John J. McCamley, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Apr. 17, 1972.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named staff noncommissioned officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law: William D. Rusinak

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, April 28, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The just shall live by his faith.—Habakkuk 2: 4.

Creator and Ruler of the world, the Father of all people, we pray for our beloved country—that she may be established upon moral virtues and religious faith, that all ill will, injustice, and selfish greed may be swept away by Thy spirit and that honor, justice, and working for the good of all may flourish among us.

During these days inspire us with the assurance that Thou art with us and with that confidence may we learn to love, to forgive, and to have greater faith in Thee and in our country.

Bless Thou the fellowship we enjoy together this day.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

GENERAL PHILLIPS OF WYOMING

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Wyoming citizens were pleased to notice yesterday the announcement that Defense Secretary Laird has named Air Force Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips to become the Director of the National Security Agency effective August 1. Sam Phillips, the former director of the Apollo lunar program when American astronauts first set foot on the moon, is now the commander of the Air Force space and missile systems organization.

He is a native of Wyoming, and his efforts as a young man to educate himself, to pull himself up by his own bootstraps to the career of national leadership he enjoys today, is legendary in