

The knowledge I obtain from these conferences will enable me to render better service, both legislative and personal, to all of the people of our important Sixth Congressional District.

#### TEMPORARY PERSONNEL SERVICES

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a significant contribution to the small businessmen of our Nation by one of my constituents, William Olsten. As president of the Olsten Corp., one of the largest temporary personnel services in the country, Mr. Olsten is an expert on many aspects of the labor scene, with particular knowledge of temporary help. He has offered the benefit of his knowledge and experience to small businessmen as author of a booklet, recently published by the Small Business Administration, entitled "Pointers on Using Temporary-Help Services."

We are all aware of the precarious position that many small businesses occupy in our economy. They have limited capital and limited credit, limited resources and limited ability to rebound after even a mild slowdown. They suffer from a number of critical shortages, not the least of which is skilled manpower.

Rising payroll costs are aggravating a situation where there is already strong downward pressure on profits. What Mr. Olsten offers is an approach to personnel management that can check the inflating ratio of payroll costs to the total volume of a small business without sacrificing any of the productive capacity needed to keep the business healthy and growing.

"Almost every business needs extra help at one time or another," Mr. Olsten points out in the new SBA booklet, "in

order to cope with rush orders, employee absences, seasonal peaks or special tasks." The extra workload puts a strain on the businessman and his employees as well as the budget when overtime is required to meet the emergency.

Rather than undertake the prohibitive expense of staffing a small business to meet these peak periods, Mr. Olsten recommends the use of temporary workers who can satisfy production requirements when and where they are needed. Mr. Olsten notes that these workers may be obtained from temporary-help firms for part of a day or for extended periods, and they are available for a wide range of office, professional, and industrial jobs.

The advantage of using a temporary personnel service shows up in the cost for getting the work done, Mr. Olsten explains. It costs considerably less than keeping extra employees on regular payroll, and it is also more economical than hiring temporary employees directly. But he also points out that in some circumstances—because of employee morale or specific job requirements—it is advisable to meet work emergencies with overtime.

The most efficient use of the efficient management tool that temporary help represents lies in long-range planning, Mr. Olsten emphasizes. Production and personnel emergencies are always there, but they need not turn into wasteful crises. That can be avoided: "Study your production schedules. Note peak periods. Compare this year with previous years. A pattern will begin to emerge, and you'll be able to see where some extra help would have avoided problems and kept your costs down."

In the SBA booklet, Mr. Olsten also advises the small businessman on the important details of how to select a temporary-help firm and the mechanics of requesting and utilizing temporary employees so as to get the most out of the temporary work dollar. The booklet, distilling the experience and advice of Mr.

Olsten in the critical personnel area, is indeed a valuable tool for the small businessman.

We can also look beyond the small businessman to appreciate the benefits that temporary work holds out for the employee involved and the Nation as a whole. Temporary workers comprise a significant portion of the labor force, and the large majority of them are women. Typically, they are housewives—or recently widowed or divorced—who cannot or do not have the need to work at a permanent job. They enter the labor market for a number of reasons: to lead a more active and rewarding life; to supplement regular family income that may otherwise be inadequate; to help pay for large expenses such as hospital bills or college tuition; or to buy special items that they would otherwise not afford.

The fact that these women want to join the labor force and find temporary work the most convenient way is certainly a benefit to business and industry that needs their skills. Many of them worked regularly before getting married and need only a brief refresher course, provided free of charge by a number of temporary service firms, in order to bring their skills up to date.

A smaller, but important group of workers who benefit from temporary employment, includes senior citizens and those who retire early. As a supplement to social security or pensions, their earnings allow older people to live more comfortably. More important, temporary work gives them a feeling of being useful, and allows them to lead a more vigorous and active life when they don't want to retire completely. Employers also value older workers because of their dependability and the years of experience they bring to their temporary jobs.

A variety of skills and services are thus mobilized for the mutual benefit of temporary workers, businesses that use them and the entire economy of the country.

## SENATE—Friday, July 24, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

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

O God our Father, all the ways of our need lead to Thy throne and Thou satisfieth us early with Thy mercy. As we turn from the tumult and tension of our troubled times, in this quiet moment we pray that Thou wilt "take from our souls the strain and stress, and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace."

Grant us, Lord, not the peace of escape from our burdens, but the peace of work well done. Seal our lives against cynicism, doubt, and fear and all the little evils which blight the spirit and break fellowship with Thee and with one another.

Keep us young in heart and mind, growing in all that pertains to Thy kingdom. And may there come at eventide the realization of the prophet's words: *The work of righteousness shall be peace;*

*and the effect of righteousness, quietness, and confidence forever.*

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

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

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 17, 1970:

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

On July 18, 1970:

S. 1455. An act to amend section 8c(2) (A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to provide for marketing orders for apples produced in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio;

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

S. 3598. An act to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary

of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes.

On July 20, 1970:

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

S. 3215. An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes; and

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 17619) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN).

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 23, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

#### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the forbearance of the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young), who is to be recognized now, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of his remarks, there be a limitation of 3 minutes on statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business.

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

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Clay T. Whitehead, of California, to be Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

#### U.S. AIR FORCE—U.S. ARMY— U.S. NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force, U.S. Army, and U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Air Force, Army, and Navy nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

#### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Colston A. Lewis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

#### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE ARMY, IN THE NAVY, AND IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Public Health Service, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, in accordance with the

previous order, the Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young) for not to exceed 20 minutes.

#### ANOTHER PYRRHIC VICTORY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, nearly 300 years before the birth of the Saviour, Pyrrhus King of Epirus defeated the Roman legions at Asculum at heavy costs in lives to his own forces. His name has survived as the symbol of a victory won at a cost so excessive as to make the victory meaningless.

It is evident that in no war in the history of our Nation have we suffered so many pyrrhic victories as in this the longest war waged in the history of our country, and at that an undeclared and immoral war.

Furthermore, not in any war in which Americans fought was there such a policy followed as the body count indulged in by Pentagon officials from 1963 to the present time.

When General Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy were our Presidents, we had military advisers in Vietnam and no combat soldiers. President Johnson made the ruinous decision to expand the war in Vietnam by sending over combat troops to fight in an undeclared war and in a small country 10,000 miles distant from our shores and of no importance whatever to the safety of the United States. This was the gravest blunder ever made by any American President. Due to this, President Johnson, who had been elected by a tremendous margin in 1964, bowed out directly following the New Hampshire primaries.

Richard Nixon claimed in 1968 that he had a secret plan to end the war. Citizens believed him. He was elected our President. That plan is still his secret. Instead of ending the war, he has expanded and escalated it without consulting Congress or even all the members of his Cabinet. Without informing congressional leaders or seeking their advice and, it is said, without even informing his Secretary of Defense, he ordered the invasion or as he termed it intrusion into Cambodia. With approximately 30,000 soldiers and with our huge B-52 bombers accompanied by soldiers of the Saigon militarist regime, we invaded Cambodia whose neutrality we had guaranteed. Up to that time, Americans were not being killed in Cambodia.

In this morning's Washington Post there is a rather hideous picture of an alleged Communist soldier taken prisoner in Cambodia with his triumphant victor standing beside him. The prisoner of war has his head hooded and his hands manacled behind him.

Mr. President, those of us who fought in World War II never saw German prisoners of war manacled, with their heads hooded, or being tortured. The facts are that as a signatory to the Geneva agreement, we pledged humanitarian treatment to all prisoners of war. But, here we can tell from pictures of this sort that we are aiding and abetting the forces of the militarist regime of Saigon in the cruel torture of prisoners of war.



It happens that in 1943 in North Africa, on many occasions I saw German prisoners of war from the Africa corps. Never did I see any of them with their hands manacled or their faces hooded. Frequently they would march with their hands over their heads, but they marched in dignity. They were losing the war. They were prisoners of war, but they were humanely treated.

Mr. President, believe it or not, one dark morning when it was hardly daylight, I was walking along alone, the safety catch on my .45 revolver was still on. Suddenly out of an alley seven big German soldiers came to surrender to me. Fortunately they surrendered to me. I did not order them hooded or manacled.

I was happy, almost unbelieving that they had surrendered. I proceeded along until I came across an American MP and, with a sigh of relief, I delivered the prisoners to the proper authority. We never thought of torturing prisoners in those days.

Now, President Nixon terms our Cambodian invasion the "greatest military success of this war." Here is another pyrrhic victory. At the same time our B-52 bombers are bombing Laos and American Army officers in disguise are in every area in Laos, President Nixon has expanded our involvement so now Pentagon terms this as an Indochinese war.

We Americans, without any declaration of war by Congress, have taken up where the French, seeking to expand their lush and oppressive Indochinese colonial empire, were compelled to quit when their garrison at Dienbienphu was overrun and captured May 7, 1954.

Pentagon officials have supplied statistics on bodies of Cambodians, Vietcong, and North Vietnamese allegedly killed and rice, ammunition, and weapons reportedly captured. The facts are, Mr. President, before this so-called "quick, surgical strike" into Cambodia, the Vietcong were said to have some guerrilla hideouts along the border areas in the jungles and were said to use paths along the so-called Ho Chi Minh Trail bordering on Laos and Cambodia with South Vietnam.

At the present time, Cambodia, instead of being a neutral area, is occupied by guerrillas of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front and by North Vietnam soldiers. They control eight provincial capitals, ruling all the northeastern provinces and virtually all approaches to the national capital of Phnompenh. Our action has resulted in Prince Sihanouk, long a neutralist, now in Peking becoming a confirmed ally of the Communists. Prince Sihanouk apparently enjoys the support of most of the peasants in Cambodia. The likelihood of a civil war engulfing Cambodia is high. Furthermore, open hostilities are occurring daily between the ill-equipped Cambodian ground forces and our friendly forces of South Vietnam.

For more than 1,000 years, the Vietnamese and the native habitants of Cambodia have been hostile. Those South Vietnamese soldiers who are too friendly to fight alongside Americans, have enjoyed killing Cambodian men, raping

Cambodian women, and looting Cambodian villages.

In an effort to offer quantitative proof of the great American victory, military and administration officials quote at will the statistics already too familiar to Americans. What they do not mention is that senior commanders on the scene have estimated that allied forces found only 30 to 50 percent of the material the Communists had stored in the border sanctuaries. The strange variety of materials captured indeed suggests that much was missed.

It is to be noted, for example, that nearly half of the ammunition found by American troops in the so-called fishhook area was .51 caliber antiaircraft rounds, yet in the past, this has been a relatively small item in the Communist arsenal. Of all the rifles captured, only about 2,000 were AK-47's, the basic individual weapon used by the Communists.

In fact, the whole cache-counting syndrome is a waste of time, for, as one officer said: "It can all be replaced with one boatload."

The facts are that most of the Communist forces had foreseen an invasion of the border areas as soon as Prince Sihanouk's neutralist government was overthrown, and had already begun moving out of the area. The bulk of the enemy forces were able to escape with their basic armaments intact. The President claimed on April 30 to be invading the sanctuaries in an effort to capture the main Communist headquarters, COSVN, and yet no mention was ever made thereafter of the results of this move. In fact, COSVN, too, escaped virtually unscathed.

It is also interesting to note that several weeks ago Vietcong forces captured two trains bound for Phnompenh and in one easy blow captured an amount of rice equal to one-fifth of that taken from the sanctuaries in 6 weeks of work by American forces.

It is now evident that as a result of the invasion of Cambodia the war in Vietnam has become the war in Indochina. It is being called that. It has expanded and extended into practically all areas of that part of Southeast Asia. This is done under the authority of President Nixon who said that he had a secret plan for ending the war in Vietnam.

The President says that all American forces have been withdrawn. However, American planes flown by American pilots are still bombing deep inside Cambodia. Thousands of South Vietnamese troops are still operating inside Cambodia, and there is no hint as to when they may leave. The administration claims strong support from Thailand, the country whose own security would be most affected by a Communist victory in Cambodia, and the Thais have made indirect references to sending a few troops. Yet more than 3 months after the Lon Nol government asked for help from its neighbors, Thailand has supplied exactly 10,000 pairs of black socks, 5,000 raincoats, 20,000 mosquito nets, and five American-built, propeller-driven T-28 light planes. It is quite obvious that the

rest of Southeast Asia does not see the situation in the same light as the Nixon administration.

Mr. President, despite all these facts, the administration continues to talk of a great military victory in Cambodia. It is apparent that because of the American and South Vietnamese action, regardless of whatever shortrun tactical gains may have accrued, Cambodia has been turned into a new battlefield and its former ruler, a neutralist, has turned to Communist China and has brought in that powerful nation as a friend of the unfortunate Cambodian people.

Before the American invasion, Cambodia was a neutral country which was, despite undeniable Communist presence in a few border regions, maintaining a delicate and precarious position outside the terrible war in Vietnam. Now the prospects are for a protracted war in Cambodia and a long-term enemy presence in a large part of the countryside which will likely result in a bloody civil war.

Mr. President, it is so-called victories such as this which have cost the people of Southeast Asia and the United States so much over the last 6 years. As long as the Nixon administration and the high command in Saigon insist on using the tired rhetoric of military success to cover up defeats and until the administration ceases to dream of a conventional military victory in a war that cannot be won, the prospects for an end to the senseless waste in Southeast Asia are dim indeed.

#### YANKEE, GO HOME

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a Gallup poll, or survey made by the U.S. military command in South Vietnam completed recently and, then suppressed on order from Ambassador Bunker and top U.S. Army officials in Saigon shows 65 percent of the people in all South Vietnam want all Americans out of the country. The American Broadcasting Co. reported that 30 percent had no opinion but 5 percent mostly in Saigon, wanted Americans to stay.

#### CONSUMERS BEING SHORT-CHANGED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the failure of Federal bureaucrats to implement consumer protection laws is shocking and inexcusable. Officials of the National Commission on Product Safety created by Congress recently reported that amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act passed in 1967 have not "saved a single life, ameliorated a single burn injury, or reduced pain or disfigurement."

Fires involving fabrics cause more than 3,000 deaths and up to 250,000 injuries in our country every year. Many elderly patients killed in the tragic nursing home fire in Marietta, Ohio, last January would be living today except for the flammable carpeting in that institution. Nevertheless, officials of the Commerce Department have failed to take steps to apply even the weak existing flammability standard to dangerous

flammable blankets, bedding and other interior furnishings. Not until recently were special standards set for children's clothing.

The report also accuses the Food and Drug Administration of intolerable delays noting it took 2 years to propose a ban on the highly dangerous poison carbon tetrachloride, a home drycleaning agent. The fact is the FDA's Bureau of Compliance has but one full-time employee responsible for enforcing the banning or labeling of thousands of potentially hazardous products. It is high time that Federal agencies take swift action to enforce laws and protect consumers from unsafe, untested merchandise.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 27, 1970

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

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

#### S. 4118—INTRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this Nation's farmers urgently need some assurance that a farm bill will be enacted this year, so I am introducing a bill today which is identical to the one reported favorably by the House Committee on Agriculture.

I recognize this bill is far from perfect and that it does not enjoy the support of farm organizations generally and, in addition, recognize the critical importance of passing farm legislation this year.

I have great respect for the House Committee on Agriculture and the leaders of that committee—the chairman, Mr. POAGE, and the ranking Republican member, Mr. BELCHER.

Having served on the committee for 8 years, I am also aware of the difficulties in reaching an agreement on any farm legislation—particularly in the House because that body is dominated by Members from urban and suburban areas.

In my home State of Kansas, and the surrounding States, the wheat that was planted last September and October has been harvested.

The wheat producer must plant his next winter wheat within 60 to 80 days from now. Before planting he must plan and prepare his ground as a seedbed for the crop and comply with the farm program. The present wheat program expires December 31 of this year. How can he plan his crop without knowing the provisions of the farm legislation with which he must comply?

I wish to emphasize the urgency of the passage of a farm program as soon as possible.

As initially indicated, this bill may not be perfect, and I would assume changes will be made by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, it deserves serious consideration.

It is my hope that introduction of this bill will assure Members of the House and farmers throughout America that the Senate is aware of the need for quick action on farm legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the principal provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1970.

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

The bill (S. 4118) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

#### PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970

##### TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

Places an annual payment limitation of \$55,000 per farmer for each of the three major commodity programs, wheat, cotton and feed grains.

##### TITLE II—DAIRY

1. Extends and amends the authority for the Dairymen's Class I Base Plan in federal milk market order areas. It specifically guarantees competitive access to Class I Base Plan markets by established producers outside the market order area. Appeal procedures under present law remain unchanged.

2. Suspends the operation of the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm-separated cream and permits the Secretary to set lower support prices on butter.

3. Extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by CCC to the Armed Services and Veterans Hospitals.

4. Extends the Secretary's authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who through no fault of their own have their milk contaminated by and condemned because of the presence of pesticides and residues.

##### TITLE III—WOOL

1. Extends the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, through December 31, 1973.

2. Continues the present incentive price of 72 cents per pound for shorn wool and 80.2 cents per pound for mohair for each year of the extension.

##### TITLE IV—WHEAT

1. Suspends both the marketing quota program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

2. Provides domestic marketing certificates to farmers participating in the set-aside program in an amount equal to U.S. food consumption (about 530 million bushels annually).

3. Sets the face value of these domestic certificates at the difference between the wheat parity price (currently \$2.82 per bushel) and the average price received by farmers during the first five months of the wheat marketing year (which starts on July 1.)

4. Provides for a "preliminary" payment to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. This payment would be the amount estimated by the Secretary to be 75 percent of the value of the domestic certificate. The balance of the payment (if any) would be paid in December. If the Secretary's estimate

were too high, no refunds by farmers would be required.

5. Continues the cost of certificates to wheat processors at 75 cents per bushel.

6. Authorizes the Secretary to set non-recourse loans to participating farmers from zero to 100 percent of the parity price for wheat.

7. Establishes a "set aside" program under which wheat farmers, in order to be eligible for loans, certificates, and payments under the program, must set aside or divert from the production of wheat and other crops an acreage determined by the Secretary.

8. Authorizes payments to participating farmers for any additional set-aside acreage and for permitting public recreational access.

##### TITLE V—FEED GRAINS

1. Establishes a voluntary feed grain (i.e. corn, grain, sorghum, and barley) program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

2. Provides that price support payments to participating farmers on one-half of their feed grain base will be the difference between not less than \$1.35 per bushel (for corn) and the average market price for the first five months of the marketing year (which starts on October 1 on corn and grain sorghum and July 1 on barley). In no event, however, would these payments be less than 32 cents per bushel for corn (with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley).

3. Authorizes the Secretary to set non-recourse loans at zero to 90 percent of feed grain parity prices.

4. Authorizes additional set-aside and public recreational access payments.

5. Establishes a "set-aside" program under which participating farmers would be required to set aside or divert feed grain or other cropland in order to become eligible for feed grain loans and payments.

6. Provides for a "preliminary" payment of 32 cents per bushel on corn to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. If the difference between the average market price and \$1.35 were more than 32 cents during the first five months of the marketing year, an additional payment would be made. In no event would refunds by farmers be required.

##### TITLE VI—COTTON

1. Provides a guaranteed support of 35 cents per pound (middling one inch basis) on the estimated production from 11.5 million acres for the 1971 crop and an equivalent amount for the 1972 and 1973 crops.

2. Makes assistance available to participating cotton farmers through loans and payments. The loan would be 90 percent of the estimated average world price. The payment would be the difference between 35 cents and the average market price for the first five months following the beginning of the marketing year (which begins August 1), but in no event less than 15 cents per pound. No refunds by farmers would be required in the event market prices were greater than 20 cents per pound.

3. Authorizes payments to participating farmers on acreage made available to the public for recreational purposes.

4. Provides for a set-aside of cropland (not to exceed 33 1/3 percent of the cotton allotment) as a condition of eligibility for benefits under the program.

5. Establishes a voluntary program under which marketing quotas, penalties, and acreage restrictions would be suspended for three years.

6. Requires participating farmers to plant cotton to receive payments, with two exceptions: (a) if unable to do so because of natural disaster or other condition beyond producers' control; (b) if not less than 90 percent of allotment is planted.

7. Allows the sale of cotton allotments within a State, permits the lease of allotments within a State, and provides for the release and reapportionment of allotments during the 3-year life of this legislation.



## TITLE VII—PUBLIC LAW 480

1. Extends without change the provisions of P.L. 480 (the "Food for Peace" program) which authorizes donations and long-term dollar credit and foreign currency sales of U.S. farm commodities to underdeveloped nations. Under the Act most foreign currency sales are scheduled to end by December 31, 1971.

## TITLE VIII—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

1. Continues the "Cropland Conversion" and "Greenspan" (long-term land retirement programs) at an authorized appropriation level of \$10 million annually for each program.

2. Continues the current exemption from marketing quotas for boiled peanuts.

3. Permits farmers or other land owners who do not desire to hold an allotment on any crop under a government program to voluntarily relinquish it. (This would be a permanent provision.)

4. Establishes an indemnity program to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticide residues.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 8 minutes.

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

## CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON BUDGET REQUESTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last weekend President Nixon charged the Congress with contributing to inflation by increasing the Executive's budget requests. The President is picturing Congress as the "big spender." I think he is getting away with murder. I do not think Congress is as big a spender as the President himself. The President hinted that Congress was being irresponsible in the appropriations it has passed. He said:

There is a persistent and growing tendency to approve increases in expenditures without providing the revenue to pay the costs.

Mr. President, in trying to pin the "big spender" label on the Congress President Nixon was both unfair and historically incorrect. The Congress has, and I am confident it will continue to be, the force in the Federal Government which is preventing irresponsible spending. Since 1946, for the past 25 years, the Congress has in every year made substantial cuts in appropriations below the President's budget requests. This includes every single Eisenhower budget submitted to a Democratic Congress, and that was seven times, and seven times Congress cut the Eisenhower budget, and the Nixon budget last year which the Congress cut.

For a look at who is the "big spender" we need only examine the President's budget requests last year and compare them with the amount Congress appropriated. Congress cut President Nixon's appropriations by \$5½ billion. Yes \$5½ billion. Of the 14 appropriations bills sent to Congress we cut 10 of them. We cut the Treasury bill, the Post Office and executive offices bill, the independent offices and HUD bill, the Interior bill,

State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary bill, the legislative branch bill, the military construction bill, the District of Columbia bill, the Defense Department bill, the foreign aid bill, and the supplemental appropriations bill.

And what about this year? The President apparently believes we will spend more than he requested. Well I would like to reassure him that it just is not so. This Congress will cut the President's overall appropriations requests. As of today, the only fiscal 1971 appropriations bill to pass Congress and be sent to the President is the District of Columbia appropriations bill. We cut that bill by a whopping 22 percent. And we will cut others.

It is true that we have been adding to such bills as education and housing. These additions, however, will be more than balanced by cuts in other areas especially the military. I remind President Nixon that the Armed Services Committee has already cut the military authorization bill by \$1.3 billion. And I believe that is only the beginning. I am convinced that bill will be even further reduced when it comes onto the floor.

What we are faced with here is a difference in emphasis. The Congress has taken a more radical turn than the White House. It has turned away from unnecessary military expenses and extravagant programs and toward more emphasis on human resources. What we are discussing here is the difference between hospitals and the C-5A, between food programs for our children and the ABM. The Congress hopes to hold the line on spending while continuing its massive attack on domestic problems.

It is my belief that the administration should be out in front of the move to reorient our Nation's priorities. I think it unfortunate that the President continues to place such emphasis on unnecessary and extravagant programs. It is ironic that while the President is accusing Congress of contributing to inflation he supports projects that, because they contribute to no specific human need, are particularly inflationary.

President Nixon's intentions are good. He is as concerned as we all are with the economic health of the Nation. It is a fact he has joined the reorientation of our priorities. I only wish he had gone further.

But there is one thing I think must be made perfectly clear. In reorienting our priorities the Congress has not become a bigger spender than the Executive. In the last quarter of a century the Congress has consistently reduced the President's requested expenditures. I am so sure that the Congress will again do a responsible job for the taxpayers of this country that, if it does not, I will contribute \$1,000 to the campaign of my Republican opponent in this fall's Wisconsin election. Should the Congress not complete work on the budget until after the November 3 election, and if the Congress fails to cut the budget, I will contribute the \$1,000 to my opponent's favorite charity.

I do not make this commitment as a long shot or a risk. I am not taking a risk. I do so to make the point that I am con-

fident Congress will cut back the President's request for appropriations. I wish to emphasize that the President was dead wrong when he implied Congress was this Nation's big spender.

The President's remarks are beginning to frame the Congress as a villain in the eyes of the public. Even that completely honest and sensitive cartoonist for the Evening Star, Gib Crockett, has accepted the misconception. In a cartoon this week he portrays Congress as a Sugar Daddy buying gifts for his miniskirted girlfriend—Miss Inflation. A minister with an unmistakable resemblance to President Nixon is shaking his finger, as Miss Inflation tells her Sugar Daddy to "Pay no attention, Daddy—let's keep going." Congress has all kinds of goodies to offer, but the President is depicted as refusing every request for extravagance and trying to caution Congress to hold down spending or inflation is going to pull us down.

Mr. President, through my willingness to contribute \$1,000 to my opponent if Congress fails to cut the budget, I am trying to clear up this misconception and it has been reflected in newspaper articles throughout the country, including those by some of the best informed commentators in the country.

I have sent President Nixon a letter telling him of my commitment to contribute to my opponent if his requests are below congressional actions. I hope it will move him to reexamine the role Congress has played in the last quarter century. We have cut back, not increased Presidential requests for appropriations. And we will do so again this year. Of course, we may not cut spending where the President wants it cut but overall we will cut it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to President Nixon be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 23, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: While I respect your right to challenge the Congress in its actions, I also respectfully submit that the Congress has done a responsible job in considering fiscal proposals from the Presidents.

In each of the last 25 years, the Congress has reduced the Presidents' budgets. It has always appropriated less than the Presidents have requested. I am sure this Congress will do so again.

I am so positive that I am proposing this: Should the Congress appropriate more than your budget request, I shall contribute \$1,000 from my own pocket to the campaign fund of my Republican opponent in this year's Wisconsin general election.

My feelings are strong that the Congress is responsible fiscally. That is why I make this offer. I await your reply.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President,

I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 7 minutes.

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

**SCHOOL DESEGREGATION**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in its July 22 edition, the Richmond News Leader published an open letter to the Supreme Court, together with several editorials and a sampling of national comment on the subject of school desegregation.

I agree wholeheartedly with the views expressed in the open letter and the views expressed in the editorials.

In the open letter, the newspaper makes the point that education is the proper function of the schools and that classrooms should not be made laboratories for sociological experiments. I have many times made the same point in comments on the floor of the Senate.

The purpose of this open letter to the Supreme Court is to attempt to bring before the Court some of the many problems involved in recent court decisions.

The Richmond News Leader is attempting to bring about an understanding on the part of the Court that many of its decisions are destroying the public school system. The purpose of the open letter is to attempt to have the Court realize many of the practical problems involved in some of its decisions. I feel that this open letter to the Court is a fine public service. I hope it will be effective. I hope that the Court will pay some attention to the views expressed by this outstanding Virginia newspaper.

Mr. President, I know well the executives of the Richmond newspapers. I know how much at heart they have the welfare of the citizens of that community. I know how deeply they want to be helpful to the parents and to the children in the Richmond public school system.

The open letter points out that the freedom of choice plan now in effect for the schools of the city of Richmond has been effective. It has resulted in substantial desegregation without disrupting the educational process.

In my view, freedom of choice is the logical method for the assignment of pupils to public schools. Under freedom of choice, the rights of parents and students of all races are properly safeguarded.

The open letter also notes that compulsory integration, which would be accomplished by extensive busing of students, is a form of reverse discrimination.

The letter comments that "under compulsory integration, all children in Richmond—particularly minority children—would be denied admission to a school by reason of their race." I am convinced that this is correct, and that the same kind of reverse discrimination will occur

wherever compulsory busing is forced upon a school district.

The open letter also includes the observation that compulsory busing plans are expensive. It estimates that as much as \$4 million might be required to carry out a court-approved plan requiring the busing of Richmond schoolchildren. It is this busing requirement, this busing of children from their own neighborhoods all the way across the city to another area, an area unknown to the children, which the Richmond newspapers are protesting, and it is what the people of Richmond of all races are protesting.

This \$4 million, if it is to be spent, might better be used to improve the educational facilities of the city. And the same holds for any other community required to make a large outlay for the purchase and operation of buses.

Another point made in the open letter is that "if compulsory busing were required under an integration plan imposed by the courts, the role of the school in the community would be destroyed."

I think this is an important observation. Schools should be an intimate part of the communities they serve. Children should have the sense of security and identity that neighborhood schools provide. Parents should have easy access to the schools their children attend.

I might say, Mr. President, that I believe parents of all races want their children to go to school as near their homes as possible. They do not want their young children to be sent any farther away from home than is necessary to obtain an education.

Freedom of choice is a fair method for the assignment of pupils. Compulsory busing is an unfair method.

As the News Leader observes:

Children bused to achieve an arbitrary racial mix would be denied the same protection of the law granted those children who would not be bused to achieve an arbitrary racial mix.

All Americans—black and white, in the South and outside the South—pay taxes that support public schools. They have the consequent right to select which schools their children will attend.

	Per pupil cost	Student teacher ratio	Average teacher salary	High school dropout rate (percent)	High school graduates entering college (percent)
Richmond	\$701	19.8	\$7,919	6.4	47
Virginia	619	21.2	7,328	4.5	51
U.S.	696	23.2	7,952	21.5	(1)

(1) Unavailable.

In view of the large number of students from low-income families in Richmond's schools, the drop-out rate is remarkably low. For the same reason, the percentage of high school graduates entering college is spectacularly high; moreover, a high percentage of Richmond high school graduates are awarded advance placement in college.

Richmond's school system is a nationally recognized pioneer in economics education, in technical education, and in foreign language instruction.

**NO OFFICIAL SEGREGATION IN CITY**

In 1948 the Court held racial covenants in property deeds to be unconstitutional. It is wrong to cite these covenants as evidence of officially sanctioned segregation now.

Mr. President, I feel that the Richmond News Leader has rendered a fine public service in publishing its open letter to the Supreme Court, together with three excellent editorials and an interesting collection of comments from Negro leaders, the press, government leaders, the Federal courts, and others.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the open letter to the Supreme Court, together with the editorials and commentary published by the Richmond News Leader, to which I have referred, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

**AN OPEN LETTER TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**  
JULY 22, 1970.

**MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT:**  
This newspaper, seeking to reflect the sense of the people it serves, respectfully requests the Supreme Court to consider what is happening to the nation's public schools as a result of school integration compelled by the Federal judiciary. And it respectfully requests the Court to consider what would happen to public education in Richmond if compulsory busing were required to replace freedom of choice.

On June 30 Judge J. Braxton Craven, Jr., of the Fourth Circuit Court said in a dissenting opinion about a desegregation plan for Clarendon County, South Carolina, "It is true that constitutional principles may not be allowed to yield to community opposition. . . . It is equally true, however, that judges, in fashioning remedies, cannot ignore reality."

Through this open letter we invite the Court's attention to some realities that exist in, and relate to, the City of Richmond:

**GOAL IS GOOD EDUCATION**

The Court has held that education "is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments." The people of Richmond agree. They are concerned that the quality of education in the Richmond public schools would decline if children were assigned to schools solely on the basis of race.

**RICHMOND SCHOOLS ARE GOOD**

According to the Virginia Education Association, in the 1968-69 school year (the last year for which complete figures are available) Richmond's public schools ranked as follows:

Indeed, many Richmond neighborhoods already are integrated. The fact that few Negro and white parents have chosen to send their children to distant schools within the City demonstrates their confidence in the neighborhood school system. The Supreme Court never has ruled that racial imbalances resulting from residential living patterns are unconstitutional.

**FREEDOM OF CHOICE HAS WORKED**

Since 1966 the City has operated under a freedom-of-choice plan with no geographic zones. This plan was authorized by a 1965 consent decree issued by the Federal District Court, and upheld by both the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court. Under that plan, parents had the



choice of sending their children to any school within the corporate boundaries of the City.

Under freedom of choice, Richmond's schools have been integrated:

In 1961, without freedom of choice, only 630, or .01 per cent, of 34,956 school-aged children in the City attended integrated schools.

In the 1967-68 school year—the second year of freedom of choice—19,504, or 44.6 per cent, of the City's school population attended integrated schools by choice of their parents.

In the 1969-70 school year, 21,156, or 50.2 per cent, of the City's school children attended integrated schools.

In fact, in the 1969-70 school year, every white child attending a regular public school in Richmond attended an integrated school.

#### COMPULSORY INTEGRATION *Is reverse discrimination*

In *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Court held that no child could be denied admission to a school by reason of his race. Yet, under compulsory integration, all children in Richmond—particularly minority children—would be denied admission to a school by reason of their race.

Under freedom of choice, no child in Richmond has been denied admission to a school by reason of his race. In 1969, the Court defined a unitary school system as one "within which no person is to be effectively excluded from any school because of race . . ."

#### *Results in resegregation*

Washington, D.C., offers the most telling example. Between 1950 and 1967, the number of white children in Washington's schools decreased from 46,736 to 11,784. During the same period the number of Negro school children increased from 47,980 to 139,364. Two years after the school population reached racial parity, the number of Negro enrollment had climbed to 75 per cent. Of 157,565 school-aged children in Washington schools during the past school year, only 8,449 were white.

Similar resegregation can be predicted for the City of Richmond if the enrollment of each school were forced to reflect the racial ratio of 60 per cent black 40 per cent white of the over-all school population. A local study of resegregation in the City's Northside showed that whites will stay in schools that are not more than 40 per cent black. The record of John Marshall High School, on the City's Northside confirms this finding. In the 1967-68 school year the school's enrollment was 42 per cent Negro. In the 1968-69 school year, the Negro enrollment increased to 51 per cent. In the past year, the school's Negro enrollment reached 60 per cent.

#### *Makes schools social labs*

Even today, 16 years after the *Brown* decision, experts disagree on the value of integrated education. Richmonders accept integration when it occurs naturally. They oppose court-ordered artificial race mixtures, which, by uprooting children of both races, do more harm than good.

The parents of Richmond regard as racist the premise that a Negro child cannot learn unless he is in a classroom with whites. That is an arrogant variation of the notion that a white child will suffer from being in a classroom with blacks. Both notions are perverse.

#### *Has altered role of schools*

Under Richmond's freedom-of-choice plan, this City's schools have been almost free from violence.

This has not been the case elsewhere. Studies by the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, the House Subcommittee on General Education, and a private research corporation have disclosed that almost no school above the elementary school level in

the nation was free from violence or disruption—most of it racially motivated—during the past school year. Another study by the U.S. Office of Education early this year failed to find a single integrated high school—anywhere—that was not torn by racial conflict.

In such urban areas as Chicago, New York City, and Washington, D.C., racial animosity in the high schools is so intense that only the presence of large numbers of police can assure order. This has turned many schools into custodial, rather than educational, institutions.

#### COMPULSORY BUSING

##### *Would damage city financially*

When compulsory busing plans have been adopted elsewhere, blacks and whites have voted against the busing plans by moving away. The pattern is not a product of race: Middle-income families of both races are leaving the City even now.

In the current fiscal year, \$27.3 million has been appropriated for Richmond schools—by far the largest item in the budget. The taxpayers of Richmond support their public schools. Yet if a court-approved plan required the busing of Richmond school children, many of those taxpayers—desperately needed by the City—would leave instead of underwriting the possible \$4 million initial outlay for the purchase of buses.

##### *Could delay school opening*

Virginia law requires that public schools be open 180 days each year. Delay in opening Richmond's schools, until enough buses could be acquired, would force local children to attend school well into next summer—if not all summer—to meet the 180-day requirement. This would cause many hardships to them and to their families.

As the Richmond case now stands, \$16 million in badly needed school construction has been halted by order of the District Court. Further construction postponement will mean increased costs to the City and will result in further overcrowding in the schools.

##### *Is impractical and inconvenient*

In the past, the neighborhood school has functioned as a community institution. If compulsory busing were required under an integration plan imposed by the courts, the role of the school in the community would be destroyed. Extra-curricular activities would be curtailed. Children—especially those in kindergarten and elementary schools—would lose the sense of security and identity that their neighborhood schools provide.

Parental contact with schools, and influence on them, would be lost. Parents wishing to talk personally with teachers about their children's education would be severely inconvenienced. When a child became sick at school, his parents would face great difficulty in getting him home.

Many Richmond parents feel that compulsory busing would expose their children to needless risks during peak traffic periods. They also feel that compulsory busing would force their children to spend many hours aboard buses—hours that could be better spent in extra-curricular activities, in the classroom or studying at home.

##### *Is opposed by parents*

In a recent referendum in Denver, seven out of ten voters rejected compulsory busing. A more recent nationwide Gallup Poll showed that eight out of nine Americans oppose compulsory busing.

Negro parents and their children have organized boycotts and demonstrations against compulsory busing plans in many communities across the nation.

Many parents do not mind transporting their children by bus to school voluntarily, but they do object to compulsory busing to achieve an artificial racial mixture in the schools.

#### FREEDOM OF CHOICE IS FAIR

Children bused to achieve an arbitrary racial mix would be denied the same protection of the law granted those children who would not be bused to achieve an arbitrary racial mix.

All Americans—black and white, in the South and outside the South—pay taxes that support public schools. They have the consequent right to select which schools their children will attend.

Under Richmond's freedom-of-choice plan, that right was assured. Under all other plans proposed to the District Court, it would be lost.

The parents of Richmond ask that the Court make explicit the right of a parent to have his children educated in the public schools of his choice.

We beg the Court to do so with all deliberate speed.

Respectfully,

THE RICHMOND NEWS LEADER.

#### AN APPEAL TO THE COURT

On the page opposite today, this newspaper appeals publicly to the Supreme Court of the United States to make explicit "the right of a parent to have his children educated in the public schools of his choice." We are asking Richmond area residents to sign the open letter, and to return it to us at Box 1-H, Richmond 23201, by August 7. Signed letters will be forwarded to the Supreme Court. Copies of the open letter, together with copies of this page, will be available to the public free of charge in the main lobby of Richmond Newspapers, Inc. Copies will be sent to the President, the Vice President, the Cabinet, all members of Congress, every governor, and every member of the Federal judiciary. Copies also will be sent to syndicated columnists and major daily newspapers. It is our hope that other newspapers will undertake similar projects.

Perhaps this letter is a forlorn endeavor. Surely no one who signs it should expect it to accomplish any miracles. Nor by this letter do we suggest, or countenance, defiance of the law. But freedom of choice is a defensible doctrine. It stands firmly in the tradition of American liberty. We believe the Supreme Court ought to know that under freedom of choice, integration has gone forward in Richmond's schools—albeit at its own insistent pace. We believe the Supreme Court ought to know that under freedom of choice, the high quality of education in Richmond's schools has been maintained. And we believe the Supreme Court ought to know that the people of the Richmond area support liberty—for all races—and oppose force.

The Supreme Court ought to be informed about these things, because the Supreme Court has wrought the Orwellian changes in pupil assignments in the past 16 years. Only the Supreme Court can call a halt to further manipulation of the nation's school children. No matter what the decision in the Richmond case, Federal District Judge Robert R. Merhige, Jr., ultimately will be bound by decisions on school integration handed down by the Supreme Court. Until the Supreme Court clarifies the contradictory and confusing points in many Federal court decisions, it would be impractical for Judge Merhige to do anything in the Richmond case. Pending such a clarifying decision from the Supreme Court, Judge Merhige should reinstate the City's freedom-of-choice plan.

The South has been to Appomattox before. It has experienced adversity and defeat; it knows the name of the game. But no hardship visited on it by the egalitarians—not even the relegation of freedom of choice to the legal ash heap—will warrant the South's retaliating against children, black or white. Richmond area parents want the best possible education for their children; they do not

want incipient race war in the public schools. Those parents understand that unlike claims for equal treatment, demands for compulsory association are neither legitimate nor truthful. They remain convinced that reason will prevail. And they sincerely hope that through full airing of the arguments, the Supreme Court will turn away from anti-rational pro-custean theories that threaten to tear the social fabric of this nation apart.

#### A TRAGIC FAILURE

On the right side of the editorial page today, a number of persons, representing a cross-section of the population, express their disillusionment with integration as a first-priority national goal. The impact of their disillusionment is even greater because most of these persons in the past have been fervent advocates of compulsory integration.

Yet they are not afraid to say that their former dedication to integration was misplaced, and that compulsory integration has not worked. *Newsweek* columnist Stewart Alsop appraises the situation on the basis of reality, not idealism, when he calls forced integration a tragic failure. The depth of that failure can be seen in the opposition to forced integration by many prominent Negro leaders.

During the past 16 years since the *Brown* decision, the goals of the Negro race have changed dramatically. At first, the Negro sought integration as a means of social and education uplift, and as a means of bringing about social acceptance on a basis of equality. Now, through forced integration, Negroes find their racial culture and their racial identity threatened, and increasing numbers of them no longer want integration. They want their own schools, in which their culture can be preserved, and they want to exercise control over those schools.

Negro leaders have not hesitated to articulate the change in direction desired by their followers. Negro discontent with integrated schools became explicit when civil rights leader Roy Innis, who has fought long and hard for the cause of integration, said, "Integration is dead." In place of integration, he suggests a return to separate-but-equal schools. He proposes the establishment of two school districts in each urban center, one predominantly white, one predominantly Negro. The majority race in each district would have full control over the schools, and children of both races could attend schools in either district if they wished. In other words, many Negroes, like this newspaper, believe in freedom-of-choice.

Innis' plan for improving the schools where they are by eliminating the racial factor altogether has been well received in the South; it is possible that his suggestion will be implemented in a pilot program in Mobile, Alabama. Predictably, liberal politicians in the North have given him a cold shoulder, because Innis' plan would eliminate the influence of white liberals on the civil rights movement.

The views of a growing number of Negroes in positions of leadership and influence cannot be ignored, for these views are held by a growing number of Negroes. In homogenization through integration, they fear the loss of their identity as a race; they now recognize the importance of maintaining a pluralistic society in which cultural diversities can be preserved.

These Negro leaders represent, not a separatist point of view, but a valid line of reasoning that bi-racialism or co-existence, not integration, offer the Negro race the best future in America. If the courts, the Congress, and the Federal government ignore their appeal to reason, the results could lead to ultimate tragedy for all Americans. Negro and white.

#### THE PRINCIPLE OF BUSING

In the controversy currently raging about the possibility of cross-city busing for Richmond's school children, the point inevitably is made: About 9,000 children in the city's public schools rode buses to reach their schools during the past school term. The question then comes up: What's the difference, and why worry?

In principle, there is a great deal of difference. During the past four school years, when a freedom-of-choice plan was in effect in Richmond, parents had the right to select what schools their children would attend. If they chose schools too far away from their homes to permit the children to walk to school, they bought school bus tickets, and the children rode buses. In some instances, even when children attended the schools closest to them, those schools still were too far away for the children to walk. A number of other Richmond children rode buses to private schools—again by choice of their parents.

Under court-ordered plans that require city-wide busing to achieve certain levels of integration, however, the Federal court seizes all control over a child's education. The court determines what school each child will attend, and how he will reach it. The parent no longer can exercise even the smallest degree of control over his child's education.

The difference, quite simply, is that free choice gives way to compulsion, by court decree. If a parent uses his freedom of choice in a way that requires his child to ride a bus, that is his own business, and outside the state's domain. But if a Federal court approves a plan requiring that any child be bused—not to gain an education, but to achieve a certain racial mix—that plan can be implemented only through compulsion, and only the state has freedom of choice.

The principle of free choice transcends any sociological hogwash about the value of integrated education, or the arrogant notion that a parent lacks the ability, experience, and knowledge to decide for himself what is best for his own child. Once robbed of free choice, parents lose a vital influence on their children's education, as well as their status of authority in the household. These facts should not be overlooked in any attempt to obscure the important difference between free choice and compulsion on the question of busing.

#### INTEGRATION IS DEAD: FOCUS TURNS FROM FORCED MIXING TO QUALITY EDUCATION

(This compendium of quotations, gathered from many sources, illustrates the extent of growing disenchantment with the goal of compulsory integration as an end in itself.)

##### NEGRO LEADERS

Roy Innis, head of the Congress of Racial Equality:

"Integration is dead. Its epitaph has been in the coming for a hell of a long time. Integration came to be viewed by the civil rights aristocracy not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself." (March, 1970).

James Farmer, former head of Congress of Racial Equality, now Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Our objective should be to provide a high-quality education. The real problem is not integration or segregation. It is the quality of education. Busing is not relevant to high-quality education. It works severe hardships on the people it affects. In the South, I found blacks complaining of being bused to schools." (October, 1969)

Ben Holman, head of the Justice Department's Community Relations Service:

"Of course it's true. I started out at 14 picketing for integration, but it's just not going to work. We've got to admit publicly that we've failed, so we can stop pursuing

this phantom, and concentrate instead on gilding the ghetto—a massive diversion of manpower and money to the central city schools." (February, 1970)

Julius Hobson, a black militant leader in Washington, D.C.:

"Of course—integration is a complete failure . . . What we've got is no longer an issue of race but of class, the middle class against the poor, with the Federal government standing idly by . . . The schools in Washington have deteriorated to a point almost beyond repair—if I could afford it, I'd send my own children to a private school. . . . I have an opinion I hesitate to voice, because it's too close to George Wallace, but I think it's time we tried to make the schools good *where they are* . . . the integration kick is a dead issue." (February, 1970)

Dan Watts, editor of the black militant publication, *The Liberator*:

"There's more race hatred in New York today than there is in Mississippi, and it all goes back to the schools. It's a traumatic experience, anyway, for a black kid to be bused clear across town . . . we've got to move away from integration and toward co-existence." (February, 1970)

Mrs. Thelma Miller, head of the New York City district of the New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers:

"Let's stop kidding ourselves about integration. Let's make all schools equally good for all children. Then nobody will mind what school his child attends. People who advocate busing for integration are still living in a dream world." (March, 1970)

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, of Harlem:

"Young and old alike have become disillusioned with the idea of integration. Many young people in the ghetto do not want to mix with whites or to be bused from their neighborhoods or go to white schools." (February, 1970).

William Cousins, Jr., City Alderman and lawyer, Chicago:

"Since integration seems so remote and unattainable, the best approach at this time is to emphasize improving education in the schools our children now attend—and increasing our community control over those schools." (March, 1970).

##### THE PRESS

Columnist Stewart Alsop, *Newsweek* magazine:

"Surely it is time to face up to a fact that can no longer be hidden from view. The attempt to integrate this country's schools is a tragic failure.

"Among those who know the realities, that ugly truth is almost universally recognized." (February, 1970).

Vermont Royster, editor and senior vice president of the *Wall Street Journal*:

"There are many things wrong with the forcible transfer of children from school to school to obtain the 'proper' racial mix. It is, for one thing, wasteful of time, energy, and money that could better be applied to making all schools better.

"To this practical objection there is also the fact that in concept it is arrogant. The unspoken idea it rests upon is that black children will somehow gain from putting their black skins near to white skins. This is the reverse coin of the worst segregationist's idea that somehow the white children will suffer from putting their white skins near to black skins.

"Both are insolent assertions of white superiority. Both spring from the same bitter seed." (February, 1970).

The *New York Times*:

"Racial fears and resentment are steadily eroding relations between white teachers and administrators and black students in many, possibly most, high schools here. In a few schools this erosion has gone so far as to



create conditions of paralyzing anarchy in which large police detachments have been deemed necessary to keep classrooms functioning and put down sporadic outbursts of violence by rebellious students. . . . The widening gulf between white adults and black youths in the schools convinces increasing numbers of blacks and whites that the fading promise of school integration can never be more than a hollow piety." (February, 1970.)

William Raspberry, Negro columnist for the Washington Post:

"It may be that one reason why the schools, particularly in Washington, are doing such a poor job of educating black children is that we have spent too much effort on integrating the schools and too little on improving them. . . . Integration was simply a means to an end. Much of the confusion today stems from the fact that the means has now become an end in itself." (February, 1970.)

#### GOVERNMENT LEADERS

Former President Lyndon Johnson, in a letter to 19 Senators who had protested HEW guidelines drawn up contrary to anti-busing provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

"The guidelines are not designed to compel desegregation beyond that inherent in a fairly working free choice plan, to strike down freedom of choice, or to achieve 'racial balance'. . . . In short, the guidelines do not abandon freedom of choice, they seek to guarantee it in fact." (May, 1966.)

Columnist Joseph Alsop, *The Washington Post*:

"The terrible fact is that that the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* has wholly lost the majority support it unquestionably had in 1954." (February, 1970.)

George Romney, secretary of Housing and Urban Development:

"Busing is not the basis for overcoming the vital problems resulting from separation of our people in most communities. It is a superficial compromise. . . . I believe that every American school child is entitled to the opportunity to attend a quality school within a reasonable distance from his home." (March, 1970.)

Attorney General John N. Mitchell:

"[Every citizen has] the right to reject unreasonable requirements of busing and to send their children to neighborhood schools. [This right] is just as important as the right to all our citizens to be assigned [to schools] without regard to their race." (June, 1970.)

Senator Abraham Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"Let us not kid ourselves. Whenever we go across this land, when blacks move in, the whites move out, and if they have children, they move as far away as they can. What shall we do? Shall we chase the whites with buses, with helicopters, or with airplanes, to try to get an equitable distribution?" (February, 1970.)

Congresswoman Edith Green, chairman of the House Select Subcommittee of Education:

"We simply cannot afford to let our classrooms turn into battlefields. We really have to go back to quality education and put out emphasis on that." (March, 1970.)

President Richard M. Nixon:

"One of the mistakes of past policy has been to demand too much of our schools: They have been expected not only to educate, but also to accomplish a social transformation. Children in many instances have not been served, but used—in what all too often has proved a tragically futile effort to achieve in the schools the kind of multi-racial society has failed to achieve for itself.

"If we are to be realists, we must recognize that in a free society there are limits to the amount of government coercion that can reasonably be used: that in achieving

desegregation we must proceed with the least possible disruption of the education of the nation's children; and that our children are highly sensitive to conflict, and highly vulnerable to lasting psychic injury. . . . If our schools fail to educate, then whatever they may achieve in integrating the races will turn out to be only a pyrrhic victory. (March, 1970.)

#### OTHERS

John Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition and former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare:

"We should proceed to upgrade the schools where they are now, and not sit around waiting for integration that may never happen." (February, 1970.)

Rhody McCoy, Negro administrator of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district in Brooklyn:

"Integration has never worked. What kind of a hypocrite am I to tell black children to do their thing in school and college so that they can take their rightful place in society? Where is that place?" (March, 1970.)

James L. Flournoy, a prominent Negro attorney in Los Angeles:

"More and more black people these days are changing their views on integration. Just a few years ago, most of them wanted integrated schools and were willing to accept busing as the only way to achieve this goal. But now they are more concerned over the quality of education their child will get. Blacks are saying that they would rather have better schools in their own neighborhoods.

"Black parents are urged to take more interest in their schools, and in such activities as the Parent-Teachers Association. But they can't do this if their children attend schools halfway across town."

John March, director of public relations for the board of education in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:

"The climate has changed. The most militant, outspoken blacks are not interested in integration. They want separation. You wonder how you can justify busing under these conditions.

"This puts the school boards right in the middle. We are under pressure from the State Human Relations Commission to desegregate. But the militants don't want it. The children even segregate themselves in our high-school cafeterias. We have separate black and white areas that the blacks are mostly responsible for creating. The old rules just don't seem to work any more."

Dr. Alan Westin, of Columbia University:

"We've got to make sure that we don't sell out integration where it's been successful—in Teaneck, N.J., where I live, for example. But that's admittedly an atypical situation. Where integration has failed, the answer may be some sort of biracialism" (February, 1970.)

William Tinderrhughes, associate superintendent of schools in Baltimore:

"There has been a very definite change in thinking about busing for integration in recent years. A few years ago, there was demand for busing. But not now. Parents now are more concerned with the quality of education that their children are getting." (October, 1969.)

Dr. Ernest Van Den Haag, professor of social philosophy at New York University, in testimony before a House subcommittee on education:

"This legislation before the committee assumes fundamentally that academically and socially effective classroom groups can be formed by putting black and white students together in larger numbers in a single classroom regardless of their wishes, and that this will improve their education and decrease the differences as well as hostilities which now exist between them.

"Yet such an enforced congregation of two

identifiable racial groups, one deprived in relation to the other, does not diminish, but rather increases the divisive forces which now exist between these students, and the consequent increase in classroom tension leads to a substantial decrease in the educational accomplishment of both groups and multiplies the disciplinary problems which detract from the essential student attention required for effective study. If such integration is compelled, as this bill proposes to do, it will injure rather than assist the future educational accomplishment of the nation's schools." (June, 1970.)

Alexander Bickel, professor of law and legal history, Yale University:

"To dismantle the official structure of segregation, even with the cooperation in good faith of local authorities, is not to create integrated schools, any more than integrated schools are produced by the absence of an official structure of school segregation in the North and West. The actual integration of schools on a significant scale is an enormously difficult undertaking, if a possible one at all. Certainly it creates as many problems as it purports to solve, and no one can be sure that even if accomplished, it would yield an educational return." (February, 1970.)

Dr. John W. Letson, superintendent of schools in Atlanta, Georgia:

"Many of the court orders are self-defeating. This is because of resegregation, which has been Atlanta's experience. Resegregation is evidence to me that someone should take a look at what we are doing: going blindly down a programmed alley to accomplish something when all the evidence suggests that we are not accomplishing it. Why go through all this turmoil and wind up with an all-black city?" (March, 1970.)

Robert Finch, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"You don't solve [de facto integration] by busing—I mean by hiring more buses.

"That's not the best use of your resources. But beyond that, it's not the best educational experience, because to haul young children for an hour or more—across long distances, as you have, particularly in the Los Angeles situation—means that they can't get any tutoring after school, the parents have great difficulty getting to the teacher to talk about their child. . . . It's not good educational policy. So I feel very strongly that those decisions are moving in the wrong direction." (March, 1970.)

#### THE FEDERAL COURTS

Judge John Parker, chief judge of the Fourth Circuit Court:

"[The Supreme Court] has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any persons on account of race the right to attend any schools that [the State] maintains. [The Constitution] does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation." (1955.)

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, in a ruling upholding freedom of choice:

"The present suggestion that a Negro's right to be free from discrimination requires that the state deprive him of his volition is incongruous." (April, 1965.)

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, ruling in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, N.C., case:

" . . . All schools in towns, small cities and rural areas generally can be integrated by pairing, zoning, clustering or consolidating schools and transporting pupils.

"Some cities, in contrast, have black ghettos so large that integration of every

school is an improbable, if not an unattainable, goal.

"Nevertheless, if a school board makes every reasonable effort to integrate the pupils under its control, an intractable remnant of segregation, we believe, should not void an otherwise exemplary plan for the creation of a unitary school system." (May, 1970).

Federal District Judge Ben C. Connally, in approving an equi-distant zoning plan for Houston, Texas, that took note of barriers such as expressways and canals:

"A child is not required to swim or fly to school." (June, 1970).

Chief Justice Warren Burger, United States Supreme Court:

"These school cases present widely varying factors: Some records reveal plans for desegregating schools, others have none or only partial plans; some records reflect rezoning of school districts, others do not; some use traditional bus transportation such as began with consolidated schools where such transportation was imperative, others use school bus transportation for a different purpose and unrelated to the availability of a school as to which such transportation is not required.

"... From what is now before us in this case it is not clear what issues might be raised or developed in argument; as soon as possible, however, we ought to resolve some of the basic practical problems when they are appropriately presented, including whether, as a constitutional matter, any particular racial balance must be achieved in the schools; to what extent school districts and zones may or must be altered as a constitutional matter; to what extent transportation may or must be provided to achieve the ends sought by prior holdings of the Court." (March, 1970).

**SECTION 202 MUST BE SAVED**

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, approximately 2 weeks ago the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) joined me in a bipartisan effort to make a last ditch effort to save the section 202 housing for the elderly program.

Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), this effort was successful.

Today there are numerous examples of outstanding 202 projects in practically every State.

In my own State of New Jersey, there are eight successful projects with nearly 1,600 units. Two additional projects, which will have more than 300 units, are now under construction in Hazlet and Wildwood.

With the \$25 million provided in my amendment, many more desperately needed units can be constructed.

But, the battle is still not won because the House bill appropriates no money for 202. The fate of this amendment will be determined next week when House and Senate conferees meet to resolve differences in the two bills.

The reasons for continuing the 202 program are compelling. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging, I have been informed time and time again by expert witnesses, elderly persons, and Government officials that section 202 has been one of the most successful housing programs ever passed by Congress.

During its 10 years of existence, there has never been a default. Approximately 43,000 units are now completed or under

construction. It is estimated that about 45,000 older Americans occupy these completed units.

Moreover, the program has enabled persons living on limited, fixed incomes to have comfortable housing and at reasonable price.

In the 1969 Housing Act, the Congress enthusiastically supported the extension of the 202 program by authorizing \$150 million for this purpose. This strong mandate, I believe, should be fulfilled.

Today millions of older Americans are in a "no-man's land" with regard to housing. Many have been forced to sell their homes because of prohibitive property taxes and other rapidly rising costs. Yet, high cost apartments make it impossible for them to locate suitable alternative housing.

In the name of millions of older Americans in urgent need of pleasant, reasonably priced housing, I urge the conferees to accept the Senate amendment.

This proposal, I might also add, has the enthusiastic support of numerous organizations concerned about housing for older persons, including:

- American Association of Homes for the Aging.
- National Jewish Welfare Board.
- National Council of Senior Citizens.
- National Retired Teachers Association-American Association of Retired Persons.
- National Council on the Aging.
- National Farmers Union.
- Episcopal Church Ministry to the Aging.
- National Conference of Catholic Charities.
- U.S. Catholic Charities.
- American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.
- United Automobile Workers.
- Teamsters Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a listing of 202 projects in the various States be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**APPROVED SECTION 202 SENIOR CITIZENS PROJECTS AS OF OCTOBER 1969**

(Addresses included only for projects completed and under construction. Location and mailing address for projects are not necessarily the same)

	<i>Number of units</i>
<b>ALABAMA</b>	
Approved:	
Gadsden: Holy Comforter House, Inc.	200
Birmingham: Birmingham Building Trades Towers	241
Under construction:	
Montgomery: John Knox Manor, Inc., 1877 Llanfair Rd., Montgomery, Ala.	151
<b>ARIZONA</b>	
Completed:	
Phoenix: Citizens Towers, 1405 South 7th Ave., Phoenix, Ariz.	153
Phoenix: Kivel Manor, 3040 North 36th St., Phoenix, Ariz.	120
<b>ARKANSAS</b>	
Completed:	
Little Rock: Parkview Towers, 1200 Commerce St., Little Rock, Ark.	136

	<i>Number of units</i>
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>	
Completed:	
Altadena: Friends Retirement Association, 2691 North Lincoln Ave., Altadena, Calif.	25
Berkeley: Strawberry Creek Lodge, 1320 Addison St., Berkeley, Calif.	150
Compton: St. Timothy Manor, 415 415 South Oleander, Compton, Calif.	21
Fresno: Twilight Haven, 1717 South Winery, Fresno, Calif.	32
Menlo Park: Peninsula Volunteer Properties, 817 Partridge Ave., Menlo Park, Calif.	30
Norwalk: Soroptimist Village, 12657 Foster Rd., Norwalk, Calif.	46
San Diego: St. Paul's Manor 2635 2d Ave., San Diego, Calif.	65
San Diego: Luther Tower, 1455 2d Ave., San Diego, Calif.	202
San Francisco: Jones Memorial Homes, Inc., 1640 Steiner St., San Francisco, Calif.	32
San Mateo: Pilgrim Plaza, 120 North San Mateo Dr., San Mateo, Calif.	56
San Mateo: Park Towers, 700 Laurel Ave., San Mateo, Calif.	200
Santa Cruz: Garfield Park Village, 721 Bay St., Santa Cruz, Calif.	48
Santa Monica: Santa Monica Christian Towers, 609 Arizona St., Santa Monica, Calif.	150
Vallejo: Ascension Arms, 301 Butte St., Vallejo, Calif.	75
Pasadena: The Concord, 275 Cordova St., Pasadena, Calif.	150
Long Beach: Long Beach Brethren Manor, 3333 Pacific Pl., Long Beach, Calif.	297
Palo Alto: Adlai Stevenson House, 455 Charleston Rd., Palo Alto, Calif.	120
San Diego: Grace Towers, 3955 Park Blvd., San Diego, Calif.	169
San Diego: St. Paul's Manor, 2728 6th Ave., San Diego, Calif.	87
Stockton: Casa Manana Inn, 3700 North Sutter St., Stockton, Calif.	163
Half Moon Bay: Ocean View Plaza, 1001 Main St., Half Moon Bay, Calif.	50
Los Angeles: Pilgrim Tower, 1233 South Vermont Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.	112
Oakland: Westlake Christian Terrace, 251 28th St., Oakland, Calif.	202
Los Angeles: Fairmount Terrace, 4000 Fairmount, Los Angeles, Calif.	109
Costa Mesa: Bethel Towers of Costa Mesa, 666 West 19th St., Costa Mesa, Calif.	270
Santa Monica: Westminster Towers, 1220 2d Ave., Santa Monica, Calif.	285
Santa Cruz: Garfield Park Village, 721 Bay St., Santa Cruz, Calif.	47
Napa: Rohlf's Memorial Manor, 2400 Fair Dr., Napa, Calif.	100
Under Construction:	
Oakland: Satellite Senior Homes, Inc., 1512 Franklin St., Oakland, Calif.	200
San Francisco: Bethany Center Senior Housing, 580 Capp St., San Francisco, Calif.	134
Long Beach: New Hope Home, Inc., 921 East 10th St., Long Beach, Calif.	140
Oakland: Printing Specialties Union Retirement Center, Inc., 2267 Telegraph Ave., Oakland, Calif.	201
Pleasanton: Pleasanton Gardens, Inc., 363 Saint Mary St., Pleasanton, Calif.	40
Los Angeles: Progressive Home for the Elderly, Inc., 1470 West 50th St., Los Angeles, Calif.	141
Los Angeles: Wilnor Corp., 634 South Normandie, Los Angeles, Calif.	287
Oakland: Satellite Senior Homes, Inc., 1512 Franklin St., Oakland, Calif.	152



CALIFORNIA—Continued		
	Number of units	
Approved:		
Seaside: Seaside Civic League, Inc.	80	
San Luis Obispo: Judson Terrace Homes	107	
San Diego: Green Manor	151	
Los Angeles: E. Victor Villa	46	
Belmont: Belmont Retirement Residence	166	
Fresno: Twilight Haven	32	
COLORADO		
Completed:		
Arvada: Colorado Luthern Home, 8001 West 71st Ave., Arvada, Colo.	94	
Boulder: Golden West Manor, 1055 Adams Circle, Boulder, Colo.	115	
Canon City: Royal Gorge Manor, 1125 North 15th St., Canon City, Colo.	124	
Denver: Maltese Cross Manor, 1590 Yates St., Denver, Colo.	158	
Grand Junction: Monterey Park Apartments, 2120 North 10th St., Grand Junction, Colo.	54	
Pueblo: Park Central Apartments, 1605 Moore Ave., Pueblo, Colo.	48	
Colorado Springs: Pikes Peak Towers, 1912 East Lake Blvd., Colorado Springs, Colo.	145	
Loveland: Big Thompson Manor, Inc., 460 West 3d St., Loveland, Colo.	58	
Approved:		
Boulder: First Christian Manor, Inc.	140	
CONNECTICUT		
Completed:		
Hartford: Avery House, 705 New Britain Ave., Hartford, Conn.	54	
Stamford: United Church of Christ Residence, 25 Washington Ct., Stamford, Conn.	74	
Under construction:		
Bethel: Augustana Homes, Inc., 850 Norman St., Bridgeport, Conn.	100	
New Haven: New Haven Jewish Community Council Housing, 1050 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn.	217	
Hamden: Davenport Residence, Inc., 20 Drazen Dr., North Haven, Conn.	217	
Approved:		
Hartford: St. Christopher Apartments, Inc.	101	
DELAWARE		
Approved:		
Wilmington: Lutheran Senior Services, Inc.	204	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
Approved:		
Washington: Second New St. Paul Housing, Inc.	100	
Under construction:		
Washington: Episcopal Church Home, Friendship, Inc., 1515 32d St., NW., Washington, D.C.	200	
FLORIDA		
Completed:		
Lake Worth: Lake Worth Towers, 1500 Lucerne Ave., Lake Worth, Fla.	196	
Lehigh Acres: Golden Age Village, Post Office Box 615, Lehigh Acres, Fla.	48	
Lehigh Acres: Sunshine Villas, Post Office Box 356, Lehigh Acres, Fla.	168	
Miami Beach: Four Freedoms House of Miami Beach, 3801 Collins Ave., Miami Beach, Fla.	208	
Orlando: Magnolia Towers, 100 East Anderson St., Orlando, Fla.	155	
Daytona Beach: Louttit Manor, 229 South Ridgewood Ave., Daytona Beach, Fla.	177	
Jacksonville: Cathedral Towers, 601 North Newnan St., Jacksonville, Fla.	251	
Miami: CTA Towers, 1809 Brickell Ave., Miami, Fla.	272	
Orlando: Orlando Central Towers, 350 East Jackson St., Orlando, Fla.	198	
Sarasota: Jefferson Center, 930 N. Tamiami Trail, Sarasota, Fla.	211	
St. Petersburg: Presbyterian Towers, 23 3d Street, South, St. Petersburg, Fla.	210	
St. Petersburg: Lutheran Residences, 550 1st Ave. South, St. Petersburg, Fla.	225	
Miami: St. Elizabeths Gardens, 6301 Biscayne Blvd., Miami, Fla.	152	
Jacksonville: Edward Waters College Senior Citizens, 1864 Kings Rd., Jacksonville, Fla.	192	
Tampa: Florida Gulf Coast Apartments, Inc., Post Office Box 1313, Orlando, Fla.	150	
Fort Lauderdale: Gateway Terrace, Inc., 1943 Karen Dr., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	256	
Orlando: Kinneret, Inc., 515 South Delaney Ave., Orlando, Fla.	168	
Tampa: Tampa Presbyterian Community Inc., 4591 Shore Acres Blvd, NE., St. Petersburg, Fla.	210	
Melbourne: Trinity Towers, 550 Strawberry Ave., Melbourne, Fla.	156	
Under construction:		
West Palm Beach: St. Andrew's Residences of the Palm Beaches, Inc., 708 Harvey Bldg., West Palm Beach, Fla.	182	
Orlando: First Baptist Housing, Inc., Post Office Box 593, Orlando, Fla.	197	
Clearwater: Lutheran Residences, Inc., 3810 2d Ave., North, Clearwater, Fla.	180	
Jacksonville: Cathedral Manor, 333 East Ashley St., Jacksonville Fla.	207	
Jacksonville: Riverside Presbyterian Apartments, 849 Park St., Jacksonville, Fla.	205	
Fort Myers: Ft. Myers Presbyterian Community, Inc., 3800 50th Ave., South, St. Petersburg, Fla.	180	
Deland: Bert Fish Trustees, Inc., Whitehair Building, Deland, Fla.	198	
Tallahassee: Florida Sunshine Apartments, Inc., care of Office of Comptroller, State Capitol, Tallahassee, Fla.	150	
Approved:		
Sunny Isles: Sunny Isles Tower, Inc.	224	
Bradenton: DeSoto Towers, Inc.	204	
GEORGIA		
Completed:		
Americus: Magnolia Manor, Post Office Box 346, Americus, Ga.	177	
Atlanta: Campbell-Stone Apartments, 2911 Pharr Ct., South, NW., Atlanta, Ga.	198	
Atlanta: Wesley Woods Towers, 1825 Clifton Rd., NE., Atlanta, Ga.	202	
Waycross: Baptist Village, Post Office Box 1100, Waycross, Ga.	65	
Under construction:		
Atlanta: Atlanta Area Presbyterian Homes, Inc., 241 Ponce de Leon Ave., NE., Atlanta, Ga.	240	
Atlanta: Campbell-Stone Apartments, Inc., 2911 Pharr Ct. South, NW., Atlanta, Ga.	196	
Macon: Vine Ville Christian Towers, Post Office Box 248, Macon, Ga.	196	
Approved:		
Macon: St. Paul Apartments, Inc.	216	
Americus: South Georgia Methodist Home for Aging	50	
HAWAII		
Under construction:		
Kahului: Hale Mahaolu, care of Old Lihikai School, Kahului, Maui, Hawaii	111	
IDAHO		
Under construction:		
Nampa: Nampa Christian Housing, Inc., 619 12th Ave., South Nampa, Idaho	65	
ILLINOIS		
Completed:		
Chicago: Self-Help Center, 908 Argyle St., Chicago, Ill.	46	
Chicago: Drexel Square Apartments, 811 East Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill.	104	
Evergreen Park: Immanuel Residences for the Elderly, 6201 North Kirkwood Ave., Evergreen Park	24	
Oakbrook: Mayslake Village, 1801 West 35th St., Oakbrook, Ill.	175	
Peoria: Lutheran Home of Greater Peoria, 7019 North Galena Rd., Peoria, Ill.	50	
Under construction:		
Belvidere: Parkside Manor, 530 South State St., Belvidere, Ill.	100	
Approved:		
Peoria Heights: Galena Park Terrace	168	
Oak Brook: Franciscan Tertiary Province of the Sacred Heart, Inc.	147	
INDIANA		
Completed:		
Bremen: Bremen Manor, 515 Whitlock St., Bremen, Ind.	46	
Columbus: Town and Garden Apartments, 428 Pearl St., Columbus, Ind.	10	
Goshen: Greencroft Central Manor, 2000 South 15th St., Goshen, Ind.	86	
Evansville: Luther Village Foundation, 828 East Blackford Ave., Evansville, Ill.	148	
Approved:		
Terre Haute: Wabash Senior Citizens Housing, Inc.	25	
IOWA		
Completed:		
Denison: Eventide Lutheran Home for the Aged Professional Building, Denison, Iowa	51	
Eagle Grove: Rotary Ann Home, Box 85, Eagle Grove, Iowa	43	
Garner: Prairie View Home, R.R. No. 3, Garner, Iowa	76	
Rockwell City: Sunnyview, Rockwell City, Iowa	54	
Spencer: Sunset Retirement Home, 111 East 20th St., Spencer, Iowa	51	
Walnut: Peace Haven, Box C, Walnut, Iowa	85	
West Des Moines: Crestview Acres 916 Ashworth Rd., West Des Moines, Iowa	100	
Des Moines: Plymouth Place, 4111 Ingersoll Ave., Des Moines, Iowa	198	
Approved:		
Mason City: Good Shepherd Retirement Apartments, Inc.	93	
KANSAS		
Completed:		
Kansas City: Primrose Villa, 2804 Sewell Ave., Kansas City, Kans.	50	
Under construction:		
Topeka: First Christian Church Apartments, Inc., 1880 Gage Blvd., Topeka, Kans.	126	
Kansas City: Cross-Lines Retirement Center, Inc., 1428 South 32d St., Kansas City, Kans.	106	
KENTUCKY		
Completed:		
Covington: Panorama Apartments, 110 Brent Spence Square, Covington, Ky.	143	
LOUISIANA		
Completed:		
Shreveport: The Evangeline, 3875 Line Ave., Shreveport, La.	62	
Under construction:		
New Orleans: Monsignor Wynhoven Apartments, 1624 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.	201	
Approved:		
New Orleans: Christopher Homes, Inc.	154	
MAINE		
Completed:		
Bangor: Sunset Manor, 686 Broadway, Bangor, Maine	27	
Rockland: Methodist Conference Home, 39 Summer St., Rockland, Maine	48	
Approved:		
Madawaska: Elderly Home, Inc.	48	

MARYLAND			
Completed:		Owosso: Kiwanis Village of Owosso, Inc., City Club, Owosso, Mich.....	60
Baltimore: St. Mary's Roland View Towers, West, 3838 Roland Ave., Baltimore, Md.....	149	Troy: Bethany Villa Housing Association, 2601 John R., Troy, Mich.....	119
Baltimore: St. Mary's Roland View Towers, East, 3939 Roland Ave., Baltimore, Md.....	210	Saginaw: Saginaw Westchester Village, Inc., 2101 Gratiot Ave., Detroit, Mich.....	176
Silver Spring: Springvale Terrace, 8505 Springvale Rd., Silver Spring, Md.....	124	Saginaw: Essex Manor, Inc., 2101 Gratiot Ave., Detroit, Mich.....	96
Baltimore: Memorial Apartments, 301 McMechen St., Baltimore, Md.....	283	Flint: Flint Retirement Homes, Inc., 901 East 2d Ave., Flint, Mich.....	110
Havre de Grace: St. John's Towers, 505 Congress Ave., Havre de Grace, Md.....	68	Detroit: Cathedral Terrace, Inc., 2700 Penobscot Bldg., Detroit, Mich.....	238
Rockville: Bethany House, 199 Rollins Ave., Rockville, Md.....	274	Haslett: Capitol Grange Senior Citizens Housing Corp., 5878 Buena Parkway, Haslett, Mich.....	100
Sandy Spring: Friends House, 17401 Norwood Rd., Sandy Spring, Md.....	100	Approved:	
Baltimore: St. James Terrace Apartments, 809 North Arlington Ave., Baltimore, Md.....	151	Lansing: United Church Manors.....	100
Baltimore: Concord Apartments, 2500 West Belvedere Ave., Baltimore, Md.....	233	Detroit: St. Paul's Housing Corporation, Inc.....	141
Baltimore: The Westminster House, 542 North Charles St., Baltimore, Md.....	302	Flint: Flint Heights Senior Citizens Apartments.....	196
Approved:		Wyandotte: Cooperative Services, Inc.....	201
Takoma Park: Montgomery County Revenue Authority.....	187	Inkster: Chateau Cherry Hill, Inc.....	192
Silver Spring: United Church of Christ Home, Inc.....	31	Detroit: Martin Luther King Nonprofit Housing Corp.....	24
MASSACHUSETTS		Oak Park: Federation Apartments, Inc.....	169
Completed:		MINNESOTA	
Malden: Salem Towers, 280 Salem St., Malden, Mass.....	81	Completed:	
Quincy: Quincy Point Congregational Church Homes, 1000 Southern Artery, Quincy, Mass.....	216	Austin: Lutheran Retirement Home, 400 15th Ave. SW., Austin, Minn.....	56
Melrose: Congregational Retirement Home, 200 West Foster St., Melrose, Mass.....	109	Duluth:	
Worcester: Colony Retirement Homes, 485 Grove St., Worcester, Mass.....	61	"S" Elect Homes, 801 East 2d St., Duluth, Minn.....	66
Haverhill: Bethany House, 100 Water St., Haverhill, Mass.....	150	St. Ann's Home, 330 East 3d St., Duluth, Minn.....	200
Under construction:		Elk River: Riverview Apartments, 400 Evans Ave., Elk River, Minn.....	24
Peabody/Beverly (Danvers/Salem): North Side Housing Corp., 1 Joy St., Boston, Mass.....	321	Glenwood: Glenwood Retirement Home, 719 Southeast 2d St., Glenwood, Minn.....	26
Fitchburg: First Parish Housing of Fitchburg, Inc., Post Office Box 503, Fitchburg, Mass.....	168	Litchfield: Gloria Dei Manor, 218 North Holcombe St., Litchfield, Minn.....	38
Springfield: Springfield Hobby Club Housing, Inc., 128 Derryfield Ave., Springfield, Mass.....	167	Montevideo: Brookside Manor, 804 Benson Rd., Montevideo, Minn.....	80
Quincy: Quincy Point Congregational Church Homes, 1000 Southern Artery, Quincy, Mass.....	218	St. Paul:	
Falmouth: Cape Cod United Church Homes, Inc., care of Craigville Inn, Craigville, Mass.....	85	Wilder Residence Apartments, 508 Humboldt, St. Paul, Minn.....	82
Approved:		Redeemers Arms, 313 North Dale St., St. Paul, Minn.....	160
Boston: Jewish Community Housing for the Elderly.....	247	Central Towers, 20 East Exchange St., St. Paul, Minn.....	283
MICHIGAN		St. Peter: Estate Apartments, 511 South 5th St., St. Peter, Minn.....	20
Completed:		Marshall: Lyon County Retirement Home, 200 South 4th St., Marshall, Minn.....	53
Ann Arbor: Lurie Terrace, 600 West Huron St., Ann Arbor, Mich.....	142	Thief River Falls: Valley Christian Home Society, Box 525, Thief River Falls, Minn.....	67
Charlotte: Kiwanishome, 430 South Cochran Ave., Post Office Box 22, Charlotte, Mich.....	51	Proctor: Hillside Gardens, 419 7th St., Proctor, Minn.....	45
Detroit: Rochford Terrace, 3387 Lawton St., Detroit, Mich.....	26	Under construction:	
Rochdale Court, 1588 East Lafayette, Detroit, Mich.....	70	Litchfield: Augustana Lutheran Homes, Inc., 218 North Holcombe Ave., Litchfield, Minn.....	47
Four Freedoms House of Detroit, 1600 Antietam St., Detroit, Mich.....	320	Minneapolis: Ebenezer Towers, 2545 Portland Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.....	200
Wyandotte: Wyandotte Apartments, 2455 Biddle, Wyandotte, Mich.....	161	MISSISSIPPI	
Midland: Cleveland Manor, 2200 Cleveland St., Midland, Mich.....	105	Completed:	
Under construction:		Tupelo: Traceway Manor, 2530 West Main St., Tupelo, Miss.....	101
Muskegon: Muskegon Retirement Apartments, Inc., 1201 Jefferson St., Muskegon, Mich.....	192	MISSOURI	
Detroit: Independence Hall, Inc., 17376 Wyoming Ave., Detroit, Mich.....	216	Completed:	
Clawson: New Life, Inc., P.O. Box 315, Clawson, Mich.....	266	Kansas City: Paraclete Manor, 4725 Prospect Ave., Kansas City, Mo.....	121
		Concordia: Lutheran Good Shepherd Home, Concordia, Mo.....	58
		St. Louis: Council House, 300 South Grand Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.....	301
		University City: The Delcrest, 8350 Delcrest, University City, Mo.....	144
		Kansas City: John Calvin Manor, Inc., 7859 Holmes, Kansas City, Mo.....	100
		Under construction:	
		St. Louis:	
		Council House Redevelopment Corp., 300 South Grand Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.....	303
		Little Sisters of the Poor, North Side, 3225 North Florissant Ave., St. Louis, Mo.....	161
		MONTANA	
		Completed:	
		Glendive: Grandview Apartments, P.O. Box 1388, Glendive, Mont.....	45
		Plentywood: Montana, Pioneer Manors, 120 East 2d Ave. North, Plentywood, Mont.....	31
		Great Falls:	
		Eagles Manor, 12 4th Street, South, Great Falls, Mont.....	141
		Scorptimist Village, Inc., 2200 Alder Dr., Great Falls, Mont.....	60
		Helena: Penkay Eagles Manor, Inc., 1616 Euclid Ave., Helena, Mont.....	88
		Billings: Lutheran Retirement Home, 3940 Rimrock Rd., Billings, Mont.....	119
		NEBRASKA	
		Completed:	
		Lincoln: Lincoln Manor, 2626 North 49th St., Lincoln, Nebr.....	56
		Under construction:	
		North Platte: North Platte Odd Fellows Housing Corp., Route 4, North Platte, Nebr.....	120
		NEW JERSEY	
		Completed:	
		Atlantic City: Elliott House, 1200 North Indiana Ave., Atlantic City, N.J.....	104
		Clifton: Daughters of Miriam Association, 127 Hazel Street, Clifton, N.J.....	120
		Atlantic City: Best-of-Life-Park, 129 S. Virginia Ave., Atlantic City, N.J.....	208
		Trenton: Trent Center Apartments, 511-527 Greenwood Ave., Trenton, N.J.....	229
		Newark: Wesley Towers, 444 Mount Prospect Ave., Newark, N.J.....	299
		Paterson: Governor Paterson Towers, 225 20th Ave., Paterson, N.J.....	158
		East Orange: Senior Citizens Housing Association of East Orange, % City Hall, East Orange, N.J.....	127
		Under construction:	
		Jersey City: Grand View Terrace, 23 E. Essex Ave., Orange, N.J.....	300
		Keyport: Bethany Manor, Inc., 2000 Florence Ave., Hazlet, N.J.....	233
		Approved:	
		Camden: Beth-El Community Apartments.....	201
		Wildwood: Lions Center.....	112
		Paterson: The Riese Corp.....	159
		NEW MEXICO	
		Completed:	
		Roswell: Sunny Acres Senior Center, 1414 South Union, Roswell, N. Mex.....	96
		Deming: Kingdom of the Sun Retirement Center, 8th and Buckeye, Deming, N. Mex.....	57
		Approved:	
		Albuquerque: Community Association for Senior Housing, Inc.....	121
		NEW YORK	
		Completed:	
		Far Rockaway: Seagirt Village, 19-25 Seagrit Blvd., Far Rockaway, N.Y.....	257
		New York: Moris Park Apartments, 17 East 124 St., New York, N.Y.....	97
		Hempstead: General Douglas McArthur Senior Village, 26 Clinton St., Hempstead, N.Y.....	143
		New York: David Podell House, 181 Henry St., New York, N.Y.....	50
		Far Rockaway: Israel Senior Citizens Housing Corp., 19th and Seagrit Blvd., Far Rockaway, N.Y.....	256
		Approved:	
		Syracuse: Bldg. Service Employees Senior Citizens Center.....	145
		Penn Yan: St. Marks Terrace, Inc.....	110



NORTH CAROLINA		PENNSYLVANIA		Nashville: Greenhills Apartments, 2209 Abbott Martin Rd., Nashville, Tenn. 136	
Under Construction:		Completed:		Nashville: Trevecca Towers, 60 Lester Ave., Nashville, Tenn. 207	
Ashville: Vanderbilt Apartments, Post Office Box 7607, Asheville, N.C. 158		Philadelphia: Guld House, 711 Spring Garden St., Philadelphia, Pa. 91		Under Construction:	
NORTH DAKOTA		Philadelphia: Casa Enrico Fermi, Inc., 1300 Lombard St., Philadelphia, Pa. 288		Chattanooga: Jaycee Future, Inc., 9th and Terrace Sts., Chattanooga, Tenn. 204	
Completed:		Pittsburgh: Auba Senior Citizens Apartments, 2700 Centre Ave., Pitts- burgh, Pa. 59		TEXAS	
Beach: Golden Valley Manor, Beach, N. Dak. 54		Pittsburgh: Riverview Apartments, 234 McKee Pl., Pittsburgh, Pa. 108		Completed:	
Fargo: Bethany Towers, 1333 3d Ave. South, Fargo, N. Dak. 55		Harrisburg: Presbyterian Apartments, 322 North 2d St., Harrisburg, Pa. 165		Dallas: Blanton Gardens, 4829 West Lawther Dr., Dallas, Tex. 105	
Garrison: McLean Manor, Garrison, N. Dak. 49		Philadelphia: Four Freedoms House of Philadelphia, 6101 North Morris St., Philadelphia, Pa. 282		Denton: Fairhaven, 2400 Bell Ave., Denton, Tex. 48	
OHIO		Philadelphia: Phillip Murray House, 4 North 11th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 308		San Angelo: Rio Concho Manor, 401 Rio Concho Dr., San Angelo, Tex. 153	
Completed:		Philadelphia: Stephen Smith Towers, 1030 Belmont Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 140		San Antonio: Granada Hotel, 311 South St. Mary's St., San Antonio, Tex. 250	
Cleveland Heights: Council Gardens, 2501 Taylor Rd., Cleveland Heights, Ohio 92		Allentown: Episcopal House, 524 Wal- nut St. Allentown, Pa. 210		Dallas: Forest Dale, 6139 Monticello, Dallas, Tex. 207	
Dayton: The Lakewoods, 980 Wilming- ton Ave., Dayton, Ohio 265		Philadelphia: Brith Sholom Founda- tion, 3939 Conshohocken Ave., Phila- delphia, Pa. 312		Dallas: Pythian Manor, 2714 Forest Ave., Dallas, Tex. 76	
Dayton: Golden Village, 500 Scranton St., Dayton, Ohio 41		Munhall: Parkview Towers Apart- ments, 100-113 Caroline St., Mun- hall, Pa. 113		UTAH	
Lakewood: The Westerly, 14300 Detroit Ave., Lakewood, Ohio 160		Norristown: Jefferson Apartments, 1514 West Marshall St., Norristown, Pa. 164		Completed:	
Parma Heights: The Educator, 9275 North Church Dr., Parma Heights, Ohio 130		Philadelphia: Sidney Hillman Apart- ments for the Elderly, 215 South Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 278		Salt Lake City: Wasatch Manor, 525 South 2d, East, Salt Lake City, Utah 198	
Perrysburg: Elm House, 230 Elm St., Perrysburg, Ohio 31		Philadelphia: Ascension Manor, 911 North Franklin St., Philadelphia, Pa. 141		Ogden: Fellowship Manor, 2334 Monroe Blvd., Ogden, Utah 136	
Mayfield Heights: Villa Serena, 6800 Mayfield Rd., Mayfield Heights, Ohio 242		Philadelphia: Mt. Olivet Village Corp., Inc., 42d and Wallace Sts., Philadel- phia, Pa. 218		VIRGINIA	
Mayfield Heights: Schnurmann House, SOM Center Rd., Mayfield Heights, Ohio 198		Approved:		Reston: Fellowship Square Founda- tion 140	
Wooster: College Hills Retirement Vil- lage, Post Office Box 762, Wooster, Ohio 150		New Castle: Lawrence County Bldg. Trades 127		Roanoke: Shenandoah Homes, Inc. 151	
Montpelier: Glenview, R.D. No. 3, Montpelier, Ohio 30		Philadelphia: Unico Village, Inc. 221		WASHINGTON	
Cuyahoga Falls: Cathedral Apart- ments, Inc., 2700 State Rd., Cuya- hoga Falls, Ohio 202		Allentown: Phoebe Apartments, Inc. 131		Completed:	
Toledo: The Westmoor, 1001 North Byrne Rd., Toledo, Ohio 168		Philadelphia: Fraternal Order of Po- lice Senior Citizens Apartments. 106		Seattle: Hilltop House, 1005 Terrace St., Seattle, Wash. 144	
Youngstown: Eldercrest Apartments, 8 Ridgeview Lane, Youngstown, Ohio 147		PUERTO RICO		Seattle: Four Freedoms House of Seat- tle, 747 North 135th St., Seattle, Wash. 309	
Under Construction:		Completed:		Seattle: Theodora Home, 6559 35th St. NE., Seattle, Wash. 115	
Cleveland: Federation Towers, Inc., Suite 411, Manger Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio 278		Nuevo: LaCiudad Del Retiro, Nuevo. Rio Piedras: Altagarten Las Teresas, Rio Piedras, P.R. 91		Vancouver: Smith Towers, 515 Wash- ington St., Vancouver, Wash. 170	
Cincinnati: Cincinnati Business and Professional Women's Retirement Housing, Inc., 704 Race St., Cincin- nati, Ohio 136		Under construction:		Warm Beach: Warm Beach Manor, Rt. 1, Box 120, Warm Beach, Wash. 40	
Lakewood: Lakewood Senior Citizens, Inc., 14300 Detroit Ave., Lakewood, Ohio 160		San Juan: Residencias Los Jardines, care of Banco de San Juan, Ponce de Leon Avenue, Stop 17, Santurce P.R. 82		Walla Walla: Mike Foye Home, 408 West Poplar St., Walla Walla, Wash. 28	
Sandusky: Sandusky Bay Kiwanis Seinor Citizens, Post Office Box 618, Sandusky, Ohio 153		Ponce: Clinica Dr Pila, 1205 Ponce de Leon Avenue, Santurce, P.R. 96		Yakima: Yakima First Baptist Homes, 515 East Yakima Ave., Yakima, Wash. 153	
Dayton: Dayton-Miami Valley, 2307 Embury Park Rd., Dayton, Ohio 159		RHODE ISLAND		Under construction:	
Cleveland: Villa St. Rose, Inc., 10900 Lake Ave., Cleveland, Ohio 202		Under construction:		Tacoma: Harborview Properties, Inc., 23600 Marine View Dr., Zenith, Wash. 198	
East Cleveland: Teamsters Housing, Inc., 2070 East 22d, Cleveland, Ohio 231		East Providence: Trustees of Metho- dist Health and Welfare Services, Inc., 67 Howland Ave., East Provi- dence, R.I. 117		Wenatchee: Wenatchee Immanuel Baptist Homes, Inc., 512 Terminal St., Wenatchee, Wash. 80	
Approved:		SOUTH CAROLINA		WEST VIRGINIA	
Mayfield Heights: Luther House 119		Under construction:		Charleston: Brooks Manor, 23 Brooks St., Charleston, W. Va. 60	
OKLAHOMA		Charleston: Episcopal Diocesan Hous- ing, Inc. 480 East Bay St., Charles- ton, S.C. 204		Under Construction:	
Completed:		SOUTH DAKOTA		Morgantown: Friendship Homes, Inc., Post Office Box 75, Morgantown, W. Va. 62	
Cordell: Cordell Christian Home, Post Office Box 249, Cordell, Okla. 50		Alcester: Morningside Manor Alcester, S.D. 52		WISCONSIN	
Muskogee: Kate Frank Manor, South 33d St., Muskogee, Okla. 96		Mitchell: Wesley Acres, 1115 West Ha- vens Ave., Mitchell, S.D. 45		Completed:	
Oklahoma City: Superbia Senior Citi- zens Village, 9720 Stacy St., Okla- homa City, Okla. 215		Spearfish: Pioneer Memorial Manor, 930 10th Street, Spearfish, S.D. 23		Milwaukee: Cambridge Apartments, 1831 North Cambridge Ave., Milwau- kee, Wis. 104	
Tulsa: Terrace View Apartments, 1729 South Denver, Tulsa, Okla. 41		Mitchell: Wesley Acres, Inc., 1115 West Havens Ave., Mitchell, S.D. 38		Wisconsin Dells: Dells Housing, Inc., 225 Washington Ave., Wisconsin Dells, Wis. 41	
OREGON		TENNESSEE		WYOMING	
Completed:		Completed:		Completed:	
Corvallis: Samaritan Village, 285 N. 35th St., Corvallis, Oreg. 84		Johnson City: Appalachian Christian Village, 2012 Sherwood Dr., Johnson City, Tenn. 72		Cody: Mountainview Manor, 1339 Sun- set Blvd., Cody, Wyo. 47	
Portland: Westmoreland's Manor, 6404 SE. 23d Ave., Portland, Oreg. 301				Powell: Rocky Mountain Manor, 140 North Cheyenne, Powell, Wyo. 78	
Eugene: Ya-Po-Ah Terrace, 135 East 6th St., Eugene, Oreg. 225				Thermopolis: Canyon Village Senior Citizens Housing, Thermopolis, Wyo. 50	
				Casper: Skyline Towers, Inc., 300 East Railroad Ave., Casper, Wyo. 101	
				Approved:	
				Golden Manor, Inc. 26	

**PROPOSED COAL MINE SAFETY REGULATIONS TO BE OPEN TO PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on June 29, 1970, I urged the Secretary of the Interior to permit all interested members of the public to comment on proposed amendments to the Department's regulations under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the Department of the Interior has agreed by letter of July 21, 1970, to permit all interested members of the public to comment on proposed amendments to public comment.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary and a letter to me from the Acting Secretary, informing me of this decision, be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 29, 1970.

The Honorable WALTER J. HICKEL,  
Secretary of the Interior,  
Interior Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Friday, June 19, 1970, the staff of the Senate Labor Subcommittee was invited by your Department to observe a series of meetings, which began on June 22, 1970, between representatives of the Department of the Interior, the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, the National Independent Coal Operators Association and the United Mine Workers of America. The expressed purpose of these meetings was to consider proposed amendments to regulations issued under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

The present regulations were issued on March 28, 1970, to become effective on March 30, 1970. The short notice and lack of opportunity to comment on the March 28 publication contributed material to the administrative problems and confusion in the mine fields, which have developed in the first phase of the administration of the Act.

Although my representative has reported that these meetings are serving a constructive purpose, it is clear they would have been of considerably greater value had they been held six weeks to three months prior to the publication of the March 28 regulations.

It is also clear, however, that several critical deficiencies attach to the meetings. They have been held with no prior public announcement. No record has been made, and participation has been limited. In other words, the statutory safeguards, assuring that all interested parties will be heard, are not being observed.

In view of the growing discontent of the Nation's coal miners and the growing loss of confidence in the enforcement of the health and safety law, this is a most unfortunate procedure. Because of the adverse criticism and unnecessary problems caused by the failure to allow comment on the March 28 publication of the regulations, to bar comment again would create further doubt as to Interior's ability to administer this Act competently and effectively.

I believe that it is vital, in these tumultuous times in the coal fields, for you to take appropriate steps to assure that the statutory safeguards are applied to these meetings concerning issues of life and death to the Nation's miners, including the broadening of opportunities for interested parties to comment.

Sincerely,

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1970.

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This will respond to your letter of June 29, in which you express views regarding our coal mine regulations filed on March 28, 1970, and regarding the meetings we held starting June 22, 1970.

Please understand that we are of the opinion that our issuance of regulations under the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act does not require hearings or requests for comments, except when the Secretary proposes regulations which exceed the requirements of the Act and therefore did not require hearings or comments.

The recent meetings, which began on June 22, were not meant to be hearings. Rather, they were a practical effort to get information which would serve as a basis for our developing more effective regulations which would improve coal mine health and safety.

You will be pleased to know that we now are in the process of republishing a revised set of regulations. They will replace the present ones. Although in our opinion not required, we intend to invite written comments on the rewritten regulations. We believe that such a procedure will enhance understanding, will generate usable suggestions which we can incorporate in the rewritten regulations, and thus will promote the maximum coal mine health and safety results.

We will keep you informed of our progress on these replacement regulations.

Sincerely yours,

FRED J. RUSSELL,  
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

**THE WALL OF SILENCE**

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the wall of silence erected by the North Vietnamese between the 1400 American prisoners of war and their families here still remains.

The North Vietnamese violation of the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention continues, even though that government is a signatory.

But, as Alexander Pope wrote:

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast."

We shall not give up hope that our efforts to persuade the North Vietnamese to obey the convention will in the end prevail.

**DRAFT CALLS RETURN TO PRE-VIET SIZE**

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I note that the Secretary of Defense yesterday announced that our draft calls for the rest of 1970 will average below 10,000 a month, which will be a return to the level that existed before the escalation in the Vietnam war.

Specifically, this is the lowest monthly draft call since March 1965 when the call was for 7,900.

I should also like to point out that in October 1967, 49,200 of our young men were drafted to serve in our Armed Forces. A goodly percentage of these, perhaps as many as three-quarters of them, were sent to Vietnam; and, on the basis of estimated casualty rates, we would have to assume that approximately 1,000 of these may have lost their lives.

The President of the United States ran for that office in 1968 with the promise to wind down the war.

He is doing it. This is an example of what he has accomplished.

I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Washington Post this morning on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1970]

**DRAFT CALLS RETURN TO PRE-VIET SIZE**

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said yesterday that draft calls for the rest of 1970 will average below 10,000 a month, a return to pre-Vietnam levels.

"In the remaining months of this year," Laird said, in a speech for about 550 students working as summer interns with the government, "I anticipate that draft calls will average below 10,000 per month."

In the past, he has predicted that total draft calls this year will fall between 150,000 and 170,000 young men, compared with the 290,000 drafted in 1969.

Aides said Laird still sticks to that forecast. Through August, draft calls this year have totaled 124,500.

**COMMUNICATION FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

**TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS**

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**REPORT OF A COMMITTEE**

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 14619. An act for the relief of S. Sgt. Lawrence F. Payne, U.S. Army (retired) (Rept. No. 91-1035).

**BILLS INTRODUCED**

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

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 4118. A bill to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 4119. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of World War I veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 4120. A bill to protect the public health and welfare by providing for the inspection



of imported dairy products and by requiring that such products comply with certain minimum standards for quality and wholesomeness; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 4121. A bill for the relief of Baptist College at Charleston, Charleston, S.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous consent.

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

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 4122. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Demitrios Apostolakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. HANSEN):

S. 4123. A bill to designate the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir and the Blue Mesa Reservoir as the Edwin C. Johnson Dam and Reservoir and the Eugene D. Millikin Reservoir, respectively; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

#### S. 4119—INTRODUCTION OF THE "WORLD WAR I PENSION ACT OF 1970"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce today a bill to provide World War I veterans and their widows with badly needed and long overdue pension increases. As each succeeding Congress convenes and adjourns the need for this legislation grows ever more necessary.

The tendency to forget things of the past should not be allowed to cause want and deprivation to those who are heroes now as well as when they fought in the trenches of France. We must do for them at least what we are doing for the present day GI.

Mr. President, each year our World War I veterans are growing older, and their ranks and those of their widows are growing thinner. A man who was only 18 when the war ended will be 70 this year. Those who were 28 will be 80. For them there was no GI bill of rights as there was for the World War II and Korean veterans. They are truly the forgotten heroes. Today there are approximately 1,500,000 World War I veterans. Widows number approximately 1,350,000. Their ranks thin at the rate of over 600 per day. The costs of this bill would be minimal. Yet the economic benefits to those receiving the pensions would provide these forgotten Americans with peace of mind and dignity in their last years. Also, we should not forget the benefit to the economy by the substantial increase in purchasing power represented by this bill. The time is long overdue to grant these veterans and widows the recognition and benefits that are theirs in all fairness.

These men are still living among us. Many of them are in need of the kind of benefits this bill would give, if only to put them on some plane of equality with those who have in more recent times marched to preserve this country and all it stands for.

Mr. President, the bill sets a requirement of 90 days of service or more during World War I for eligibility, or shorter service if it culminated in discharge or release for service-connected disability. A World War I veteran would receive \$100 per month if unmarried and with less than \$2,400 annual income; or if married and with less than \$3,600 income. If the veteran is helpless or blind, or requires the regular aid or attendance of another person an additional sum of not less than \$70 per month would be given.

There is also provision for widows of World War I veterans at the rate of \$75 per month. But to qualify the widow must have married the veteran before December 14, 1944, or have been married for at least 5 years before his death or be the mother of a child born to them.

This bill represents no bonanza for anyone. The income test sees to that. It provides income for those who really need it. It provides dignity for those barely subsisting on personal or governmental handouts. It will help raise from abject poverty many who are now in their final years. Let us now act to make those last few years—years of security and dignity.

Mr. President, the time is long overdue to provide these veterans and their wives or widows what they have a right to expect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4119) to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of World War I veterans and their widows, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### S. 4120—INTRODUCTION OF THE "FOREIGN DAIRY QUALITY ACT OF 1970"

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, for appropriate reference, establishing stricter regulations to prevent unsanitary or badly contaminated foreign dairy products from coming onto the American market.

Food and Drug Administration figures show nearly a 10-percent annual rejection rate for the small portion of dairy imports now inspected.

Our customs officials often check less than 10 percent of incoming shipments of foreign dairy products. Yet, they find contamination of unsafe additives in about one dairy import in every 10 offered to the American market.

American dairy farmers and processors have been for too long on the short end of a double standard because of the strict sanitary standards they must meet.

Farmers and businessmen must invest thousands of dollars for special equipment and buildings to meet local, State, and Federal health regulations.

But we have no assurance that foreign dairy farms and plants whose products are marketed in the United States will be operated under comparable sanitary requirement.

Imposing this financial burden on American dairymen without similar requirements on producers of foreign products which compete directly with U.S. commodities is unfair and discriminatory.

This legislation will require foreign dairy farms and processing plants producing dairy commodities for U.S. consumption to meet sanitary standards set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The quality controls established by this bill would insure that the health of the citizens of the United States is not jeopardized by substandard conditions in other countries.

The U.S. Government maintains a stringent quality control program for all American dairy operations produced for export under U.S.-supported export programs.

In effect we are protecting the health of citizens in foreign countries receiving our products through the food for peace programs and various AID projects, but are failing to apply the same safeguards to dairy imports from many of those same countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be provided at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 4120) to protect the public health and welfare by providing for the inspection of imported dairy products and by requiring that such products comply with certain minimum standards for quality and wholesomeness, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 4120

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Dairy Quality Act of 1970".*

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other business unit.

(3) The terms "dairy products" and "milk products" mean those food products derived from milk, including milk such as butter; cheese (whether natural or processed); dry, evaporated, stabilized, condensed or otherwise processed milk, cream, whey and buttermilk; edible casein; frozen desserts; and any other food product which is prepared in whole or in part from any of the aforesaid products as the Secretary may hereafter designate.

(4) The term "wholesome" means sound, healthful, clean, and otherwise fit for human food.

(5) The term "labeling" means labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter on or attached to the container of any dairy product.

(6) The term "purity" means free from poisonous or deleterious substances which may render the product injurious to health.

(7) The term "quality" means the minimum quality standards defined by the Secretary in accordance with this Act.

(8) The term "administration and super-

vision" means the administrative review of foreign country laws, regulations, and enforcement procedures offered as being comparable to United States laws, regulations, and enforcement procedures, under the provisions of this Act, and the supervision of inspection personnel both here and abroad.

(9) The term "inspection" means the official service rendered by the Department of Agriculture, under the administration and supervision of the Secretary, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) No dairy product shall be imported into the United States unless it has been inspected and found to be wholesome and unless the foreign farms and plants in which such products were produced, manufactured or processed comply with all the inspection, grading, and other standards prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(b) The standards established by the Secretary for any imported dairy product and for the establishments in which such imported dairy product is produced, manufactured or processed shall be comparable to those standards prescribed by the Secretary for the same kind of dairy product produced, manufactured or processed in the United States and for establishments in the United States in which the same kind of product is produced, manufactured or processed whenever the Secretary, in connection with any dairy product program carried out by the Department of Agriculture has established standards for such product and for the establishments in which such product is produced, manufactured or processed. The Secretary shall establish standards with respect to those kinds of imported dairy products (and the establishments in which they are produced, manufactured or processed) for which no Federal standards have been established, and such standards shall be equivalent to those standards heretofore established for other kinds of dairy products and the establishments in which such other kinds of dairy products are produced, manufactured or processed.

(c) The labeling of imported dairy products shall comply with the requirements of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act and shall be otherwise marked as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of establishing comparable inspection requirements and preventing the importation of dairy products produced, manufactured, or processed in foreign dairy farms or plants not approved for inspection by the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary shall, where and to the extent necessary, require such products to be accompanied by a certificate of compliance issued by the exporting country in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary establishing minimum standards as to the quality of the milk, farms, and plant facilities, equipment, and procedures used in the production, manufacture, and processing of such products.

(b) The Secretary shall cause to be inspected, in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, all dairy products imported into the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) All imported dairy products shall, after entry into the United States, be subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and other Acts providing for the inspection, testing, or grading of dairy products to insure their purity and to insure that they are wholesome in the same manner and to the same extent as if such products were produced in the United States.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act, and such rules and regulations shall provide for the destruction of dairy products offered for entry and refused admission into the United States, unless such dairy products are reexported or brought into compliance within the time fixed therefor in such rules and regulations.

(c) All charges for storage, cartage, and labor with respect to any article which is imported contrary to this Act shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against such article and any other article thereafter imported under this Act by or for such owner or consignee.

SEC. 6. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary may cooperate with foreign governments, other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and with appropriate State agencies, and may conduct such examinations, investigations, and inspections as he determines necessary or appropriate through any officer or employee of the United States, of any State, or of any foreign government, who is licensed by the Secretary for such purpose.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary may prescribe such assessments and collect such fees as he determines necessary to cover the cost of the inspection services rendered under the provisions of this Act.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the cost of administering and supervising the provisions of this Act shall be borne by the United States.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the administration and supervision of the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 9. Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 and imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 10. If any provisions of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This Act shall take effect 180 days after enactment.

#### S. 4121—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF THE BAPTIST COLLEGE AT CHARLESTON, CHARLESTON, S.C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for the relief of the Baptist College at Charleston, Charleston, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PACKWOOD). The bill will be received and referred, without objection, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 4121) for the relief of Baptist College at Charleston, Charleston, S.C., introduced by Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous consent.

#### S. 4123—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL IN HONOR OF EUGENE D. MILLIKIN AND EDWIN C. JOHNSON, FORMER U.S. SENATORS FROM COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on May 30, Colorado's former Senator, Edwin C. Johnson, died.

The Denver Post recognized this recent loss in a lead editorial on June 1. In its recitation of his many accomplishments, the following is stated:

In the U.S. Senate—with his equally brilliant Colorado colleague—U.S. Senator Eugene D. Millikin—Colorado had a one-two

punch that was remarkable. Millikin was Republican but they saw eye to eye on the issues of paramount relevance to the state and nation.

Gene Millikin died July 26, 1958. There is no doubt of the highly distinguished contributions and service of both Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin and, as the Denver Post editorial points out, though Democrat and Republican, partisan interests were laid aside when it came to the vital questions affecting Colorado and our Nation.

Senator Johnson and Millikin served their State and Nation with great distinction, and it was my honor to have known them both.

Thus, Mr. President, I am introducing today, with Senators DOMINICK and HANSEN a bill to establish monuments to their preeminent dedication and illustrious public service.

The bill we are introducing will change the name of the Blue Mesa Reservoir in Colorado to the Eugene D. Millikin Reservoir, and the name of the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir in Colorado to the Edwin C. Johnson Dam and Reservoir.

Both of these men loved the high Colorado Mountains which overlook the cold clear waters of these reservoirs. Each was committed to, and outstanding in, his work to meet the great challenges of the West including those presented by nature. Each was brilliant in his accomplishments on behalf of proper water conservation and control measures and I deem it highly fitting and proper to name these water conservation features in their remembrance.

It is especially decorous to make this tribute and memorial in a single measure in view of their many united endeavors and common interests.

It should also be noted that each completed his elective public service career at the same time. Ed Johnson retired from the Senate in 1954 after 18 years and then served as Colorado's Governor through 1956. And, in the fall of 1956, Gene Millikin, after 15 years in the Senate, determined not to seek reelection due to his ill health.

Thus it was that the State of Colorado, which had reaped many benefits from the service of these statesmen, suffered a dual loss; it is all the more proper to make this dual memorial.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference to accomplish this purpose on behalf of myself and my colleague, Mr. DOMINICK, and ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement, immediately following my remarks, of my colleague, Mr. DOMINICK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD together with the statement of Mr. DOMINICK.

The bill (S. 4123) to designate the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir and the Blue Mesa Reservoir as the Edwin C. Johnson Dam and Reservoir and the Eugene D. Millikin Reservoir, respectively, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, and Mr. DOMINICK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular



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

S. 4123

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the dam and reservoir known as the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir, located on the South Platte River in Colorado, is hereby designated as the Edwin C. Johnson Dam and Reservoir.

Sec. 2. The reservoir known as the Blue Mesa Reservoir, located on the Gunnison River in Colorado, is hereby designated as the Eugene D. Millikin Reservoir.

Sec. 3. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States designating or referring to the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir or the Blue Mesa Reservoir shall be held to be a designation of or reference to the Edwin C. Johnson Dam and Reservoir or the Eugene D. Millikin Reservoir, respectively.

The statement of Mr. DOMINICK is as follows:

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to join my distinguished senior colleague in sponsoring this bill to commemorate two great Coloradans and Americans. Without question, the service rendered to the people of Colorado by these two men was outstanding in the history of our state and in the country as a whole.

Eugene Millikin served in the United States Senate from 1941 until physical disabilities forced him to retire in 1957. For two years he served as Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and expended exhaustive efforts to rewrite and codify the tax code. He was also a prominent member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as well as Chairman of the Republican Conference. Renowned for his wit and debating skill in general, Gene was beloved by his fellow members and by the people of Colorado.

Gene Millikin's senior colleague in the Senate for 14 years was Ed Johnson. Although Gene was a Republican and Ed a Democrat, the two Senators' respect for each other and mutual dedication to the people of their State often caused them to join forces in an unusually effective partnership to further the interests of Colorado.

For a continuous period of 35 years, Ed Johnson represented the people of Colorado as Governor, member of the Colorado House of Representatives, Lt. Governor, and for 18 years, a member of the United States Senate. While a member of this body, he was a conscientious and tireless member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, Finance, Manufacturing, Interstate Commerce, and Indian Affairs. The esteem in which he was held by the people of Colorado is perhaps best evidenced by the fact that he was undefeated in eleven straight elections. His following was not restricted to the citizens of Colorado alone. On the contrary, his understanding of the problems of water distinguished him in the eyes of citizens of most Western states.

As a man, "Big Ed," as he was affectionately called by all who knew him, was one of the warmest and most sincere human beings it has ever been my pleasure to know. It was indeed a privilege to have known him on a personal basis for some twenty years.

Mr. President, it is only fitting that these two men be honored in the manner this bill proposes. In addition to working extensively and successfully for the Upper Colorado Storage Project, the Purgatory River Dam, and numerous other measures to help solve the water problems of the West in general and Colorado in particular, Gene Millikin and Ed Johnson also accomplished much of the groundwork for the Fryngpan-Arkansas Project which was enacted in 1962 when I was a member of the House and my distin-

guished senior colleague a member of this body. That is why, Mr. President, I co-sponsor and urge favorable action on this legislation to honor and commemorate these two distinguished former members of this body and honored Coloradans.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado, I should like very much to be included as a cosponsor of his bill.

It was my distinct privilege to know both these very fine Senators. I too, held them in high regard, as has just been attested to by the Senator from Colorado; therefore, if it is not inappropriate, I should like to be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I know that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming as a former Governor of Wyoming worked with both Senators Millikin and Johnson, and not only in a political sense.

My colleague, Mr. DOMINICK, and I are most happy and believe it would be most appropriate to have his cosponsorship of the bill and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his support.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 75—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 2601

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. TYDINGS) submitted an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make corrections in the enrollment of S. 2601, which was considered and agreed to.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia when he submitted the concurrent resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 3844

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) be added as cosponsors of S. 3844, the Franchise Full Disclosure Act of 1970.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4039

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names

of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senators from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) and (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be added as cosponsors of S. 4039, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business.

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

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 24, 1970, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3279) to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada, and for other purposes.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

##### ADDITIONAL DEATHS OF ALABAMIANS IN VIETNAM

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I have previously placed in the RECORD the names of 997 Alabama servicemen who were listed as casualties of the Vietnam war through March 31, 1970. In the period of April 1 through June 30, 1970, the Department of Defense has notified 45 more Alabama families of the death of loved ones in the conflict in Vietnam, bringing the total number of casualties to 1,042.

I wish to place the names of these heroic Alabamians in the permanent archives of the Nation, paying tribute to them, on behalf of the people of Alabama, for their heroism and patriotism. May the time not be distant when there will be no occasion for more of these tragic lists.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names and next of kin of these 45 Alabamians.

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

#### LIST OF CASUALTIES INCURRED BY U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL FROM THE STATE OF ALABAMA IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONFLICT IN VIETNAM, APRIL 1, 1970, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1970

##### ARMY

Capt. Willie J. Ridgeway, husband of Mrs. Ingeborg M. Ridgeway, 705 Raines Drive, Mobile, 36609.

Pfc. John L. Smith, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Smith, Route #1, Box 120, Millbrook, 36054.

Sgt. James F. Lee, husband of Mrs. Mattie A. Lee, Route 1, Box 120, Gallion, 37742.

Pfc. Richard L. Higginbotham, son of Mr. and Mrs. Billy L. Higginbotham, 516 Cedar Hill Drive, Scottsboro, 35768.

Pfc. Leroy Nelson, son of Mrs. Eula M. Nelson, Route 4, Box 770, Theodore, 36582.

Spc. 4 Edward E. Howard, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Howard, Route #2, Box 42, Tuskegee, 36083.

Capt. Howard R. Andrews, Jr., son of Mr.

and Mrs. Howard R. Andrews, Sr. 3124 Acklen Drive, S.W., Huntsville, 35805.

Maj. George E. Powell, husband of Mrs. Joy M. Powell, 224-B Ruemalson, Mobile, 36608.

Sp. 4 Richard A. Moiren, son of Mr. and Mrs. Freddie F. Moiren, Route 4, Box 503, Mobile, 36609.

Pfc. Albert C. Powell, son of Mr. Albert C. Powell, 5142 Avenue "C", Fairfield, 35064.

Maj. James A. Russ, husband of Mrs. Mattie L. Russ, P.O. Box 143, Daphne, 36526.

S. Sgt. Joseph T. Roberson, husband of Mrs. Gloria J. Roberson, 601 North Maine Street, Enterprise, 36330.

Sgt. Larry N. Jones, son of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil T. Jones, Sr., Route 1, Box 316, Oakman, 35579.

Sp. 4 Willie Austin, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Willie Austin, Sr., P. O. Box 161, Mount Vernon, 36560.

Pfc. Paul D. Brannon, son of Mr. and Mrs. Daniel T. Brannon, Route 1, Newville, 36353.

Sp. 4 Ramon L. Grayson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Nelson Grayson, Route #1, Box 11, Dixon Mill, 36736.

WO1 Lawrence J. Herman, III, son of LTC and Mrs. Lawrence J. Herman, Jr., 103 Wesley Drive, Ozark, 36360.

S. Sgt. James Bush, husband of Mrs. Edna M. Bush, Route #2, Box 211, Mumford, 36268.

Pvt. Jimmy L. Thompson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Major Thompson, Route #2, Box 338-A, Florence, 35630.

Second Lt. Morgan W. Weed, husband of Mrs. Carolle E. Weed, 1807 Woodmont Drive, S.E., Decatur, 35601.

Sgt. John L. Hendon, husband of Mrs. Sharon A. Hendon, Box 424, Carbon Hill, 35549.

WO1 Donald R. White, son of Mr. and Mrs. Florin W. White, 31 Tein Manor, Northport, 35746.

Sp. 4 Edward E. Nisewonger, son of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Nisewonger, Jr., P.O. Box 268, Flomaton, 36441.

WO1 Raymond H. Krug, Jr., husband of Mrs. Clara A. Krug, P.O. Box 221, New Brockton, 36351.

Pfc. Jessie F. Sanders, son of Mrs. Ruby I. Sanders, Hollytree, 35751.

Sp. 4 Frank D. Salter, son of Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Salter, Route 2, Box 333A, Evergreen, 36401.

Capt. Eddie J. Molino, husband of Mrs. Nancy R. Molino, 416 Bryant Street, Brundidge, 36010.

S. Sgt. Cecil C. Shofield, son of Mr. and Mrs. Clary C. Schofield, 1610 Wood Avenue, Florala, 36442.

1st Lt. Claude H. Cargile, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Cargile, 1200 Wakefield Drive, Tuscaloosa, 35401.

1st Lt. Larry F. Mattingly, husband of Mrs. Chikako W. Mattingly, 1 Hall Drive, Ozark, 36360.

Sp. 4 Dannie L. Hawkins, son of Mr. and Mrs. Claude C. Hawkins, Route 1, Hanceville, 35077.

Pfc. Ananias Bentford, son of Mr. and Mrs. Eddie D. Stanley, Route 1, Box 63-B, Leighton, 35646.

Pfc. Rodney R. Sanders, son of Mr. and Mrs. Sannie F. Sanders, Route 3, Box 417, Phenix City, 36867.

Sgt. Jerry R. Johnson, son of Mr. Elvis L. Johnson, 331 S. Smith Street, Florence, 35630.

Sgt. Roderick K. Tolbert, son of Mrs. Jessie B. Tolbert, 5308 Avenue "H," Fairfield, 35064.

Sp. 4 Howard L. Williamson, son of Mrs. Cornelle Williamson, P.O. Box 212, Ridge Drive, Opelika, 36801.

First Lt. Grady E. McBride, III, husband of Mrs. Judy G. McBride, 705 Lay Street, Gadsden, 35903.

Pfc. Johnny M. Watson, son of Mrs. Zale H. Watson, 323 Smith Street, Mobile, 36607.

Sp. 5 Jimmie L. Chamblee, son of Mr. and Mrs. James I. Chamblee, Route No. 1, Box No. 297, Centre, 35960.

Pfc. John H. McClendon, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. John N. McClendon, Sr., Route No. 1, Box No. 333, Fyffe, 35971.

Sp. 4 Jerry D. Carver, son of Mr. and Mrs. Vivin T. Carver, 1602 16th Avenue, East, Tuscaloosa, 35401.

Sp. 4 Clint J. Sims, son of Mr. and Mrs. Brice C. Sims, Jr., 1849 49th Street, Central Park, Birmingham, 35208.

Pfc. Harold Carstarphen, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Carstarphen, Sr., 824 Avenue "C," Gadsden, 35901.

#### MARINE CORPS

L. Cpl. Frank M. Kitchens, Jr., husband of Mrs. Marcella L. Kitchens, 1604 Cherry Avenue, Birmingham, 35214.

Pfc. Adam Jackson, son of Mrs. Virgestine Jackson, 3456 30th Way North, Birmingham, 35207.

#### AIR FORCE

Capt. Travis H. Scott, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Travis H. Scott, Sr., 3505 Pelzer Avenue, Montgomery, 36109.

### FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA LAUNCH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this morning the Future Farmers of America officially launched their new build our America community program. I have reviewed the informational literature on this new program and I am very much impressed with the quality and imagination of the material.

I am encouraged and pleased by the commitment of this organization of young people to a most worthwhile and challenging effort—that of strengthening and improving our rural communities.

This new program will do a great deal to encourage and assist tomorrow's leaders in becoming more active and more effective in the development of their local communities.

This is a most timely effort. The Nation as a whole is becoming increasingly aware of the need to improve the economic, social, and cultural conditions of our rural communities. We must improve the quality and quantity of opportunities in our smaller communities so that fewer persons will be forced to migrate to the overcrowded and overburdened metropolitan centers.

The Federal Government can and must provide a range of aids and incentives for rural development but, in the final analysis, much of the initiative must come from the local communities themselves. They must identify their problems and define their future goals for improvement. Our young people will necessarily constitute a major source of this initiative. This program now getting underway will help to substantially increase the number of interested and trained local community leaders.

This program is also timely because it affords young people the opportunity to get involved in community affairs, and to make a genuine contribution of their own. Today's youth are distinguished by their eagerness to participate in solving this Nation's problems and the strengthening of that which is best in our country. This program will provide an excellent avenue for greater youth participation.

Mr. President, this program was developed in cooperation with the Farmers

Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, I want to salute and commend not only the leaders and advisers of the Future Farmers of America but also the Farmers Home Administration for its important and critical role in putting this program together.

### RANDOLPH VOTES TO STRENGTHEN LAW ENFORCEMENT TO CURB CRIME IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I voted in support of the District of Columbia crime bill.

It provides a total and complete overhaul of the hopelessly inadequate court system in the Nation's Capital and will provide better means for more effective law enforcement. I commend the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYBINGS) for his well-reasoned leadership in this constructive effort.

The court reorganization provisions are critical to effectuate permanent reduction in the criminal case backlog in the Capital. The bill's codification of portions of criminal law in this city is the first in half a century. The expansion of the public defender service and the bail agency will result in mechanisms to provide adequate representation and supervision of criminal defendants. The second offense minimum mandatory sentencing and wiretap provisions make applicable to local crimes in the District of Columbia penalties and procedures instituted by Congress in previous crime legislation.

Two provisions of the bill have developed into considerable controversy; namely, pretrial detention and no-knock warrants. One of these is a closely safeguarded form of pretrial detention for dangerous criminal defendants, coupled with court reorganization to promote speedy trials and increased bail supervision by an expanded bail agency. It should be emphasized that recent studies have demonstrated that crime committed by persons on court-ordered release is of large enough proportions to be considered of major consequence to law enforcement. The National Bureau of Standards report indicated that 25 percent of persons charged with dangerous crimes and 17 percent of those charged with violent crimes can be expected to be rearrested for further crime while on pretrial release.

The measure conforms the District of Columbia law on search and arrest with Supreme Court decisions which permit a police officer to dispense with the standard notice of his identity and purpose when he serves a search or arrest warrant. Nothing in the conference bill, passed 332 to 64 in the House of Representatives and concurred in 54 to 33 by the Senate, enlarges the authority of officers to search without a warrant. It codifies the Supreme Court decisions which specify that a police officer may enter premises without knocking, when an announcement of his presence and purpose would endanger his life or result in destruction of the evidence for which the court has authorized him to search.

Additionally, the bill increased the number of local trial judges, provides a



modern juvenile code, and provides the temporary assignment of Federal district judges to the local trial bench.

The need for action and the time for action is now. We must curb the increasing crime rate. This measure will provide the comprehensive approach necessary to resolve this crisis.

#### INCREASE IN TEXTILE IMPORTS AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, two recent articles in the *Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle*, should be of interest to Members of Congress regarding the legislation in the House on textile import quotas.

First, the *Chronicle* of July 14 contains an article entitled "Textile Imports Balloon." The article indicates that cotton, wool, and synthetic fiber textile imports totaled 355 million square yards in May, up 3 percent from April, and 12 percent above the same period last year.

The *Chronicle* of July 13 contains another article, entitled "Negro Employment Jump Noted in Textile Industry." This news story showed that Negro employment in the textile industry increased 21 percent to a level of 14.3 percent of the entire industry during the first half of 1970.

Mr. President, both articles are important. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

#### NEGRO EMPLOYMENT JUMP NOTED IN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON.—Negro employment in the textile industry increased by 21 per cent to a level of 14.3 per cent of the entire textile work force during the first half of 1970, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute reported Sunday.

The institute, using Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, said this non-white textile employment compares with an average of 10.1 per cent of non-white employment in the nation's entire manufacturing industry.

This improvement in Negro employment in textile manufacturing occurred at a time that the textile employment level was declining, the institute said. The institute also pointed out that the non-white employment percentage for all manufacturing remained unchanged during the past six months.

Negro textile employment in certain counties of North Carolina and South Carolina has reached levels above 40 per cent, the institute said.

#### TEXTILE IMPORTS BALLOON

WASHINGTON.—Cotton, wool and synthetic fiber textile imports totaled 355 million square yards in May, up 3 per cent from April and 12 per cent higher than May a year ago.

For the January-May period, textile imports totaled 1.7 billion square yards, up 19 per cent from the first five months of 1969.

The value of textile imports in the first five months of this year was \$710 million while textile exports totaled \$286 million.

Imports from Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Korea accounted for 56 per cent of the trade in the January-May period, up 11 per cent from the same months of 1969.

Cotton imports totaled 142 million square yards, 17 per cent above April but 5 per cent less than May, 1969.

Synthetic fiber imports totaled 201 million square yards, down 4 per cent from

April's record but 34 per cent above May, 1969.

Wool imports totaled 13 million square yards, down 7 per cent from April and 27 per cent below May, 1969.

#### IN PRAISE OF MORMON PIONEERS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at mid-day exactly 123 years ago today, Brigham Young and his company of rugged pioneers had at least reached their journey's end. In the "Promised Land" of Salt Lake Valley they sensed that they had found their sanctuary. On this day, atop a high plateau overlooking the valley, President Young lay in one of the caravan's 73 prairie schooners, his body weak with mountain fever. The great Mormon leader was raised gently from his bed to view the towering snow-dusted mountains guarding the peaceful plain below and the brilliant blue waters of the lake. Looking out from the plateau, he exclaimed: "This is the place."

The 102 days exodus West was over, leaving far behind the assassins whose bullets had downed their beloved prophet, Joseph Smith, leaving behind those who sought to persecute them for their religious beliefs. The seemingly endless vistas, the constant danger of attack, the scarcity of food and water, the narrow passes, the mountains to climb, the rivers to ford, the bogs to pull through, the timber wolves, the rattlesnakes, the tired, aching muscles, the sickness, the death—all these hardships had led finally to that glorious day.

Hardly resting from the epic march the Mormon pioneers set out with characteristic determination upon a new mission: the establishment of a distinctive community based on the Bible and the teachings of Joseph Smith. Having for the time being outdistanced their human persecutors, these dauntless men and women now pitted themselves against the challenge of a sparse environment. A flinty soil—and several bent plows—led them to build small dams on streams in order to store and divert a flow of precious water onto the parched earth. With tenacity and trial-and-error ingenuity, the Mormon pioneers became the founders of modern irrigation in America.

Their resourcefulness in bringing water to the desert is representative of their success in other areas. While continuing to resist persecution throughout most of the latter half of the 19th century, the Mormons undertook one of the most remarkable colonizing efforts in the history of our country. They assimilated into their intermountain community thousands of European converts, making them immediately welcome and content in their new homeland. They seeded the entire mountain west with towns and cities, and were the first to settle in my own State of Idaho, founding Fort Lemhi in 1855. Five years later they established the first permanent town in Idaho—and the first school—at Franklin, named for a noted Mormon pioneer, Franklin D. Richards.

Nor have the spiritual ancestors of the Mormon pioneers settled for lesser achievements. The faith and vitality of Mormonism of the 19th century still

characterizes the church in 1970. Over 4,000 young LDS members give a year or more to the work of spreading the teaching of their church throughout the United States and overseas, where they have proved outstanding citizen-ambassadors for our country as well as for their church. Partially as a result of this missionary work, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latterday Saints now has more than 2.8 million members, an increase of 74 percent during the 1960's. The Mormons continue to offer a model of church service: they are quick to help those members suffering from illness or want, and the excellence of their programs for young people is well known.

The quality of the LDS commitment to education is equally outstanding; the most Mormon State in the Nation, Utah, is also the most extensively educated. Brigham Young University, the keystone of the church's own higher educational system, has grown to more than 25,000 students and, nestled in the tree-shaded foothills of Provo, it is surely one of the most beautiful universities in the world. In my State at Rexburg, Idaho, the LDS Church can take pride in Ricks College, which now enrolls over 4,500 students on an expanding campus where 16 new school buildings have been erected since 1962. The Mormons have also constructed 69 other new schools during the 1960's located chiefly in South America and the South Pacific. The church publishes a magazine in 17 languages and lesson manuals in 21 languages.

The achievements of Mormons in public life are considerable. One has been a presidential candidate, others have played important roles in Congress, and held such prominent executive positions in Government as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Treasurer of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Commissioner of Education, and Secretary of the Interior, serving under both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

In other human endeavors, Mormons have always been at the forefront, whether the contest be for Miss America or for a boxing championship. Just recently a young athlete at Brigham Young University shattered the world record in the men's 440-yard hurdles race. And, in the world of music, who has not been deeply moved by the Mormon Tabernacle Choir?

The accomplishments of the early Mormon pioneers and their modern counterparts have been extraordinary; they have set a high mark in Christian living. Certainly in the period of divisiveness that presently troubles our land, their strong sense of community is exemplary. I am very proud to join with the people of my State and with those of our sister State to the south, Utah, in paying tribute to the Mormons on this anniversary of the arrival of their forebearers in the Great Salt Lake Valley.

#### DRAFT U.S. SEABEDS TREATY DISCUSSIONS SHOULD BEGIN

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in recent years we have seen growing international interest in the resources of the seabeds, particularly as technology has

developed to make seabed resources economically extractable at ever greater depths. Oil, gas, helium, nitrogen, carbon dioxide, water, geothermal energy, sulfur, saline minerals, and manganese nodules on and under the seabeds are among the resources of interest to the United States and other countries.

Facing the United States and other countries as we turn toward use of resources of the seabed and subsoil are many complex problems. Scientific, technical, military, legal, and political issues are raised by our prospective use of the seabeds and incursion into territory to which no nation has a traditional claim of sovereignty or sovereign rights.

The Stratton Commission stated the problem, quoting President Johnson:

Under no circumstances must we ever allow the prospect of rich harvest and mineral wealth to create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep seas and the ocean bottoms are, and remain, the legacy of all human beings.

In addition, the Stratton Commission cited other objectives that any international framework for minerals exploration and extraction must have:

It must encourage scientific and technological efforts and the other major capital investments needed for such exploration and exploitation by making it possible to conduct these activities in an orderly and economic manner.

It must give the United States and all other nations a fair chance to engage in minerals exploration and exploitation.

It must minimize the creation of vested interests that will inhibit changes in the framework deemed desirable in the light of unfolding experience with actual exploration and exploitation.

It must seek to avoid and not to provoke international conflict.

While President Johnson's statement and the Stratton Commission's report set forth objectives clearly, the Johnson administration and the Nixon administration did not have a clear statement of policy regarding the ocean seabeds. Indeed, this was the subject of much discussion, and a special study on U.S. suboceanic lands policy was conducted by the Commerce Committee last fall, of which I had the privilege to be chairman. Other committees were also interested. The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), of the Foreign Relations Committee, had introduced Senate Resolution 33, and spoke eloquently on the need for clear U.S. policy regarding the seabeds. The Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) is chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Outer Continental Shelf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and has also conducted extensive hearings late last year and into this spring. Until May 23 this year, the U.S. Government had no position on the seabeds; it was busy formulating one.

On May 23 the President announced a bold, thoughtful and controversial U.S. oceans policy. He proposed that:

All nations adopt as soon as possible a treaty under which they would renounce all national claims over the natural resources of the seabed beyond the point where the

high seas reach a depth of 200 meters (218.8 yards) and would agree to regard these resources as the common heritage of mankind. He proposed establishing an international regime for exploitation of seabed resources beyond the 200 meter limit, providing for the collection of mineral revenues for international community purposes. The treaty he proposed would establish general rules to prevent unreasonable interference with other uses of the oceans, to protect the ocean from pollution, to assure the integrity of the investment necessary for such exploitation, and to provide for peaceful and compulsory settlement of disputes.

Importantly, the President proposed that the treaty provide that coastal nations act as trustees for the international community in an international zone extending from the 200 meter limit to the edge of their continental margin. He also proposed that international machinery to authorize and regulate exploration and use of seabeds resources beyond the continental margins be included in the treaty.

At the same time, the President announced an effort to obtain a new law of the sea treaty, establishing a 12-mile limit for territorial seas and providing for free transit through international straits.

Mr. President, anyone knows that when he holds to the middle of the road he is bound to get hit from both directions. The President's proposal is no exception. Some in the United States have accused the President of renouncing portions of its sovereign territory. And at the recent Pacem in Maribus conference in Malta, representatives from less industrialized countries accused the President of another colonialistic grab.

Those of us who had a chance to study the President's proposal saw many ideas and problems couched in the general language. The President promised that specific proposals would be introduced at the next meeting of the U.N. Seabeds Committee to carry out the objectives of his proposal. We have all waited those specifics, and recently many here on the Hill received copies of a draft of the proposed treaty, which finally puts specific proposals on paper.

I welcome seeing the draft treaty, because now the process can begin in earnest and we can talk specifics. No more do we need vague statements and broad outlines; the draft provides specific approaches to grapple with. But I stress that this is the beginning of a process that is like the legislative process with which we are more familiar. A draft treaty, like a newly introduced bill, is not a final commitment or enactment of law. When proposed and introduced, it begins a process of discussion and negotiation that may or may not result in a treaty.

The exploration and extraction of mineral resources of the seabeds is a complex subject. Any treaty on the subject will necessarily be complex also. A great deal of consultation with Members of Congress and our staffs, with environmental, scientific, industrial, international, and other interests will be necessary before any treaty results.

Mr. President, it is important that these talks begin soon and that the

United States be the leader in initiating specific discussions. For this reason I am supporting the President's proposal to introduce the proposed draft seabeds treaty at the August 3 convening of the U.N. Seabeds Committee in Geneva.

I give this support in full knowledge of the controversy that has arisen around the draft treaty. But I emphasize that it is important to begin and important to understand that the present draft is not necessarily the final version that may result. Complex international discussions must begin, and the U.N. Seabeds Committee, in which the United States has a strong voice, is the obvious and proper place for the talks to begin, for the committee represents a broad segment of international interests.

I have had an opportunity to review the draft treaty and there are several reasons why I have concluded that it is in the national interest to begin the international discussions of it now. First, it represents U.S. leadership in an important area in days of waning influence. Second, the draft treaty seeks to rectify an imbalance in the law of the sea that generally works to the detriment of less industrialized countries and countries with no coastlines. It is fair, and in its fairness it protects vital U.S. interests.

It protects national security interests, particularly by proposing an international agreement that would control the excessive creeping jurisdictional claims by certain nations. It protects legitimate interests of U.S. petroleum companies. I was informed that top representatives of U.S. oil interests were consulted as the draft went through various revisions. In fact, counsel for our Subcommittee on Oceanography was present at a meeting at which one of the foremost representatives of oil interests stated unequivocally that oil companies could "live with the President's policy." Representatives of hard mineral companies have also been consulted during the drafting process, and I understand that their interests have been considered and taken into account in the draft treaty. Living resource interests, and scientific interests have also participated and made substantial contributions to the draft. All of these are protected I am convinced.

The proposed treaty has several features that are important and that I want to point out:

It would not turn control over to the United Nations. Coastal states would act as trustees of an international area and would exercise a control and bear responsibilities that are based on a realistic balance between powerful and less powerful nations. The United States would have an effective voice in the international machinery that would be established.

It would provide a mechanism for firm control of exploration and exploitation of minerals such as oil so as not to pollute the ocean environment.

It would provide a mechanism for speedy settlement of international disputes.

It would provide for free and open scientific research, continuing this important freedom of the sea.



It would clearly define the limits of the Continental Shelf and the rights of coastal nations in the area beyond the Continental Shelf over the continental margin.

Despite the fact that the proposed draft treaty is long, complex, and imperfect, it is a good, thoughtful start toward full consideration of the specific issues relating to seabed resources. At some point the Senate may be called upon to give its advice and consent on a seabeds treaty. We would have to know whether the international community would support the President's proposal, to decide whether it is in the best interests of the United States. The time to begin and to find out is now, while the leadership is ours. We should support the President's leadership in this proposal and begin.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I urge that the U.S. representatives to the U.N. Seabeds Committee introduce the proposed treaty at the Geneva meeting in August. And in recognition of the controversy and legitimate concerns many people have about the draft, I also urge that the State Department, the Defense and Interior Departments, and all other affected interests continue full discussions with the Commerce, Foreign Relations, and Interior Committees of the Senate, and with the appropriate committees in the House of Representatives. Together I hope we shall arrive at a sound seabeds treaty.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), chairman of the Committee on Commerce, is necessarily absent today. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I very much appreciate and support the statement just made by Senator Hollings, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography. The points that he makes that we must begin international discussions of a seabeds treaty and must continue full discussions between the affected interests and the appropriate Congressional committees are important.

The uncertainties in the law of the sea regarding seabed resources in the area beyond the 200 meter limit of the continental shelf have been compounded since the Continental Shelf Convention came into force. Now, when technology has advanced to permit mineral exploitation in depths greater than 200 meters, there is an unacceptable uncertainty in the law of the sea that would threaten the security of any economic investment made to extract mineral resources from the continental slope or over the continental margin. We could let the law of the sea develop by custom and by letting nations go out and assert claims the way certain Latin American countries have regarding fishing. Or we could sit down with the many different countries and interests and try to negotiate a rational treaty. Exploitation of seabed resources is too complex and important a subject to let the law of the sea develop haphazardly.

The uncertainty in the law of the sea regarding seabed resources has existed for at least ten years. The pace of individual claims for these resources is accelerating. After long deliberation the President has announced a United States seabeds proposal for introduc-

tion at the U.N. Seabeds Committee meeting in August. Rather than risk eroding the leadership the President has exercised, I support the effort to have the President's proposal introduced at the Committee meeting.

I also want it clearly understood that the Committee on Commerce, as well as the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has considerable interest in this matter and expects to be kept fully informed of the discussions and negotiations on the seabed treaty while they progress. In addition, our Committee expects to continue discussions with all of the affected interests, private and public, as an attempt is made to arrive at a sound seabeds treaty.

#### SENATOR MILLER ON "CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, recently the CBS radio program "Capitol Cloakroom" featured the senior Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER). Facing questions from three correspondents, our distinguished colleague, a member of the Committees on Finance and on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Joint Economic Committee, provided an incisive analysis of current national issues. The questions focused on an area of the Senator's special knowledge and expertise, the economy, and those who may have missed the broadcast should find Senator Miller's comments interesting and worthwhile.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the July 15 broadcast of "Capitol Cloakroom" be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### CBS CAPITOL CLOAKROOM

Produced by Ellen Wadley.

Guest: U.S. Senator Jack Miller (R-Iowa).

Panel: Bruce Morton, Anchorman; Daniel Schorr; Stephen Rowan.

BRUCE MORTON. Senator Miller, will the economy get better by election time?

DANIEL SCHORR. Senator, will the family assistance plan come out of Congress this year?

STEPHEN ROWAN. Senator Miller, what will the continuing war in Indochina do to the Republicans' hopes of gaining control of Congress this year?

ANNOUNCER. Capitol Cloakroom. From the nation's capital, CBS Radio brings you the 1,123rd presentation of Capitol Cloakroom, a spontaneous and unrehearsed interview with an outstanding public figure. This week's guest is Senator Jack Miller, Republican of Iowa. He meets with CBS news correspondents Bruce Morton, Daniel Schorr, and Stephen Rowan. First we hear from Bruce Morton.

Q—Senator Miller, welcome to Capitol Cloakroom. Our guest is Iowa Republican Jack Miller, first elected to the Senate in 1960, reelected six years later; a member of the Finance and Joint Economic Committees and the Agriculture Committee. Senator, those first two qualify you, I suppose, as much of an expert as anybody else is these days on the economy. Administration spokesmen keep telling us that things are going to get better. Do you think they'll get better by election time, or do you see the economy as a major issue in this fall's campaigning?

—Senator MILLER. I think the economy will be an issue in this fall's campaign. I'm naturally hopeful that it will get a little better but I'm not optimistic about it because I do think that when we're moving from a wartime to a peacetime economy, you're bound

to have a period of readjustment. There are fewer people working in defense industries now than there were a year ago, and there will be fewer working in the months ahead. There will be fewer people in the armed forces because they're dropping out the numbers in the armed services. And, when you take those factors into account, it looks to me as though we can expect to have an unemployment rate around five percent, perhaps even up to five and a half. And I said myself, a year ago, that after the inflationary binge we'd been on for several years in this country, my knowledge of economics told me that we must expect a period of hurt. Secretary Kennedy stated a year ago that we were paying for our past sins. Now, hopefully, a recession that we would have (and I believe in calling it a "recession") would be a mild one, which might mean five percent unemployed and, hopefully, it would be a short-lived one, which would mean eight or ten months.

I don't see that that eight or ten months' period, if it is a short-lived recession, will be over before the fall elections. And I personally think we'll be doing very well, taking into account the inflationary binge, taking into account the movement from the wartime to a peacetime economy . . .

Q— . . . inflationary binge, Senator Miller?

Senator MILLER. Well, I have to look at who was in control of the Congress. I'm not talking about who was the President because, after all, what the President has to say is just paper and just words. It's the Congress, those in control of the Congress, that implement economic policy, and I must tell you, as you well know, that the Democrats were fully in command of the Congress during those years.

Q—It's almost bound to translate though. It may be that the Democrats were to blame, but people tend to vote on today's bad news. Isn't that going to hurt the Republicans in the fall?

Senator MILLER. Well, I think it's a two-edged sword. I think it depends upon how well-informed the public is. I think it depends upon how well the candidates point up where the responsibility lies. I have always done so in my state; I see no reason why candidates in other states can't do the same thing.

Q—Aren't the Democrats simply going to say, "Well, President Nixon has refused to put into effect any of the proposed controls that we've given him"?

Senator MILLER. Well, of course they will say that but, when you get down to bedrock, the most important thing in this inflation-high interest problem is whether we come out with a reasonably balanced budget. Now, when you have those in control of the Congress exceeding, as of this date, the budget requests of President Nixon by \$4 billion, when you had those in control of the Congress run this federal government of ours \$25 billion deeper in debt two years ago, I must say that that's where inflation starts. And we've had recent testimony by I. W. Abel, the President of the United Steel Workers, pointing out that wage increases did not really get moving until you had a cost of living increase. And the cost of living increase, or inflation, started right here on Capitol Hill with the inflationary binge, the multi-billion dollar deficit spending binge, by those in control of the Congress. And I think it's high time that the American people understand that the President can make speeches and he can write out anti-inflationary programs on paper, but they're not worth any more than that paper unless the Congress, those in control of the Congress, implement them. Now, let me give you an example of what I'm talking about. Three months ago I was out in Los Angeles on a forum, and James Tobin, a Democrat and former member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Kennedy, praised—

publicly praised—the Nixon Administration's anti-inflationary program. So, it's a good program, I think, but I must repeat it's no better than the piece of the paper that it's written on unless those in control of the Congress, and I'm of course talking about the Democrats who control the Congress, carry it out. And the most important aspect of carrying that out is to match outgo with income of the federal government.

Q—Well, as Mr. Morton said, the voters are going to look at today's bad news and today's bad news, as you've admitted, in November is likely to be more inflation and a deeper and deeper recession.

Senator MILLER. Oh, wait just a minute. I didn't admit that there's going to be more inflation. Please don't quote me on that. I suggest that we can have an unemployment rate of five percent in November, yes, but I do think that inflation, if anything, will tone down. But I'm not expecting it to tone down very much.

Q—Well, now, you've been blaming the Congress. Mike Mansfield has been saying all year that the Congress cut the President's budget by something like \$7 billion last year. Is that wrong?

Senator MILLER. Well, of course that's wrong. This was fully aired out on the floor of the Senate. In fact, it all started back at the time of the HEW appropriations bill, and some of the Democrats were pounding their chests and pointing out that they had cut the Nixon budget—I think it was \$5 billion—and they were referring to \$135 billion in the budget. They were a little embarrassed when I said, well, after all, the spending budget is up around \$200 billion—why are you only talking about the \$135? And then it was brought out that on the extra amount over and above \$135, they had actually increased the Nixon budget. But as far as cutting the Nixon budget was concerned, that was actually done by the Administration. I'll grant you that, when the original budget came over a year ago, that it was up around \$135 billion, but in subsequent weeks, before the Administration came before the appropriations committees, they, of their own volition, cut the budget about \$5 billion. So when they came before the appropriations committees, all they were asking was that the appropriations committees ratify the cuts the Nixon Administration had already put into effect. So, I think it ill behooves them to try to tease the public by saying "we" cut the Nixon budget. All they did was to ratify what the administration had already done. But I think it's important to note that in this fiscal year, as of today, those in control of the Congress have exceeded the Nixon budget by \$4 billion, and we have several appropriations bills yet to pass.

Q—Getting off appropriations bills, Senator, to what may be future appropriations if the program ever comes about. I guess, for listeners, I'll have to fill in a bit of background before I even ask you the question.

The House, by a large vote, passed the family assistance plan that the Nixon Administration had submitted, intended to overhaul the welfare system by providing a minimum income system accompanied by incentives to work. It came up before the Senate Finance Committee for hearings. The Committee sent it back to the Administration to get some bugs out of it about inequities and lack of smooth incentives. The program has now been sent back. The Senate Finance Committee is going to schedule hearings on it, next week, I believe, but there's a great deal of talk of lack of enthusiasm in the Senate Finance Committee. Conservatives don't like it very much, and the liberals don't like it for other reasons. Daniel Patrick Moynihan says if your Committee will bring it out, he's sure the Senate will pass it. If you don't bring it out, if it isn't passed, it may be the last chance in a

generation to overhaul welfare. So, with that brief introduction, what's going to happen?

Senator MILLER. Well, with all deference to Dan Moynihan, I do think that he has, perhaps, exaggerated the matter a little bit. Just because the Congress might not pass something this year doesn't mean they won't pass something next year. And to suggest that we won't do something about a long outmoded welfare system within the next decade because we haven't acted this year, I think is carrying it a little far. But there's no question but what after the hearings, the original hearings before the Finance Committee, and after particularly the excellent staff work that was done in locating the bugs in the bill, that there was some disaffection on the part of even the proponents. I myself, endorsed the idea, the concept, that President Nixon advanced because I think we've been going in the wrong direction on welfare for thirty-five or forty years, and for once we had a President of the United States who came over and suggested a new philosophy, a new approach, which would be designed to get people to want to move out of this welfare cycle that family after family has found itself in. Now, when the bugs showed up, it was found that, although the theory behind this legislation was generally enthusiastically received by both Democrats and Republicans on the Committee—it was found that the bill didn't implement that philosophy because we found cases in which there would be a disincentive to work, where you would find somebody who was earning some money who would receive less overall, counting his earnings and counting other welfare-type programs—food stamps, medical assistance, public housing and so on—he would have received less than if he just sat home and did nothing.

Q—For a certain number.

Senator MILLER. That's what we call disincentive. And so we told the Administration to take this bill back and do a job of correlating all of the various types of welfare-type programs—not only the family assistance program itself but food stamps, public housing assistance, medicare, medicaid—and put them all together and revise this . . .

Q—You don't mean medicare?

Senator MILLER. Medicaid. And put them all together so that they would be able to show us that they had debugged the disincentives from the program. Well, they've done that, I think, although the staff is still going through it to see whether or not they have actually done a complete and thorough job on it. But where I am hung up a little on this is that I look at a schedule, for example, covering Phoenix, Arizona, and I note that they have laid out what would happen as between somebody who earned nothing and somebody who earned \$720, and a thousand, and two thousand, and three thousand; and the total take, you might say, that they have with their earnings, with the family assistance plan benefit, with a state supplemental benefit, food stamps, the medical insurance bonus which they're proposing, and the housing bonus under public assistance housing or rent supplements, and so on. And I find that, while there is no disincentive, that the incentive is very low, very slight. For example, somebody who earned a \$1,000 out in Phoenix under this overall program might be encouraged to earn two thousand, but if he earned two thousand he would end up with only about \$90 net benefit as against just earning a thousand. Now, my question is whether or not that extra \$90 is enough of an incentive for a person to take the time and the trouble to earn \$2,000 instead of only \$1,000. And you'll find a similar closeness between the various stages of earned income—two to three, three to four, four to five—which bothers me. And I don't know whether that's enough of an incentive as between these various income brackets to get the job done that we want to get done. So give them credit for

debugging it and taking out the disincentives, but you have to have enough incentive for people to really want to go out and work longer and work harder.

Q—Senator, without going into a great deal of detail on what will be coming up at your hearings, if Republicans like you are still not convinced and the Democrats on the Committee don't seem to be very helpful, do you think that bill is going to come out?

Senator MILLER. Well, no, I don't, but I would hasten to suggest that I do think there are some Democrats on the Committee who are quite open-minded about this and who do definitely want to try to support something that is going to change the philosophy that we've been operating under for a long time. Republicans like me still want to be shown, but I emphasize that I have endorsed the idea from the very beginning and, if it entails some further work to try to provide a greater incentive, or if I can be persuaded that the differences in these income areas are sufficient incentives, then I will support it and I hope my colleagues on the Republican side will do likewise.

Q—But you're saying you don't think it's going to come out this year?

Senator MILLER. No, I haven't said that, and it's possible that it will, but I think it—I've been on the Finance Committee long enough to tell you that you never quite know what the Finance Committee is going to do. I think most of us in there are asking questions and we're not asking questions for the purpose of destroying. We're asking questions for the purpose of trying to be constructive because we do like the philosophy. I don't know of any member of the Senate Finance Committee who hasn't bought the philosophy. The important thing is whether or not the bill squares with the philosophy sufficient so you'll have a majority vote in the Committee.

Q—We were talking earlier of the effect of recession on Republican chances in the November election. The Administration has made it clear that this bill is the centerpiece of President Nixon's domestic program. This would be the one new innovative thing that he had hoped to do before the election. Is the election any factor in your thinking on this?

Senator MILLER. I don't think so because this bill would not be implemented anyhow until next year, so it would have no impact on the . . .

Q—You could talk about it being passed. They made a great deal of talk about the House passing it.

Senator MILLER. You can talk about it being passed, but until actually you have the mechanism in effect I don't think you're going to have much voter effect.

Q—Senator, if my recollection is correct, there are twelve Republican seats and about twenty-three Democratic seats up in the Senate this year. You've got to gain seven to win control of the Senate. Are you going to be able to do it?

Senator MILLER. Well, I have said that I think that if I were inclined to make a wager I would wager that there would be a net gain of Republican seats, but I don't think I would wager that there's going to be a net gain of seven. In other words, I don't think I'd put a lot of money on that. I'm quite confident that there will be a net gain, however. But, as to whether or not you're going to have a net gain of two, four, six, seven, or eight, you're getting into areas where, because of the speed and the intensity of communications today and the developments that take place rapidly around the world and in this country, you can have changes almost overnight right up to election day.

Q—As long as you're betting, which states would you bet are the safest and which perhaps the weakest for the Republicans this year?

Senator MILLER. Well, I don't like to pinpoint, but I do think that there's a very



strong probability that we'll end up with a Republican Senator, another Republican Senator, from Florida, for example, and from Texas. There are other states where you could flip a coin and the outcome could be determined again by developments that take place right up to election day. Wyoming can be a very—can be a toss up.

Q—Senator, let me broaden Dan's original question about Florida a little bit. What kind of Republicans do you see winning this year? Is there a conservative trend? I mean, do you see Charlie Goodell-style Republicans or conservatives or what sort of new Senator? Senator Miller—Looking at the stable of Senate candidates that we have seeking those twelve Democratic seats that you're talking about, I think you'll find that most of them are what you would call moderate to conservative types. None of them arch-conservatives. They'd be moderate to conservative. For example, George Bush in Texas. For anybody to suggest that George Bush is a rock-ribbed conservative just hasn't followed his record down here. On the other hand, he certainly is no flaming liberal. He's a moderate to conservative type, and I think that you'll find that that's the general pattern of our stable of candidates in the election coming up.

Q—If the Senate goes more conservative and if particularly the Republican side of the Senate goes more conservative, do you foresee a challenge to Senator Scott next year?

Senator MILLER. Well, of course, that's always a possibility. One just doesn't know. We're fairly evenly divided in the Senate on conservative, liberal, moderate. If you analyze the voting records of the Republicans in the Senate, I think you'll find they're rather split up three ways: what you would call liberals, what you would call conservatives, and what you'd call moderates.

Q—How would you rate Hugh Scott's leadership? Have you been comfortable with him as leader?

Senator MILLER. Well, I have been comfortable with him. I think he has a horribly difficult problem. You know Senator Dirksen was having a horrible problem before he passed away. There was talk around the Senate that Everett had lost control of things. Well, I don't know that Everett had lost control of things, but we had had some new members come in and they were just not about to take the advice and counsel of their leader. And Hugh Scott simply fell heir to that situation. And you put yourself in the shoes of a leader and he's got three groups of Senators and they're equally divided—a group of liberals, a group of conservatives, and a group of moderates—and you've got yourself one horrible leadership problem.

Q—Not to even mention the problem of working with the White House.

Senator MILLER. Well, I think that from all I understand that Hugh Scott has worked pretty well with the White House.

Q—Even though they occasionally pull the rug from under him?

Senator MILLER. Pardon me?

Q—Even though they occasionally pull the rug from under him?

Senator MILLER. Well, I wouldn't say that they pull the rug out from under the Republican leader any more, if as much, than Lyndon Johnson pulled the rug from under Mike Mansfield.

Q—Did the incursion into Cambodia pull the rug from under some of the Republican candidates this fall, do you think?

Senator MILLER. If it has, I haven't heard about it.

Q—Do you think that there are going to be those who will be seriously affected by that move?

Senator MILLER. I don't think that Cambodia will be an issue in the fall campaign. I think it's a dead duck.

Q—You don't think all this talk of peace candidates, citizens groups, and all that kind

of thing is going to have much effect on the fall voting patterns, then?

Senator MILLER. I would doubt it. I can see where it might in certain specific areas such as happened out there, for example, in Jeff Cohelan's district in Oakland, California, but I think you will find it's rather limited. I'd be inclined to guess that it would have more effect on Democratic primaries around the country than anywhere else.

Q—Senator, I'm sorry to interrupt but our time is up. Thank you very much for being our guest on Capitol Cloakroom.

#### SENATOR SYMINGTON'S POSITIVE RESPONSE TO THE NEEDS OF RURAL AMERICA

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the plight of Rural Americans in the last quarter century has become increasingly serious. Increased production as well as improved farming methods have multiplied the problems of agricultural workers. Migration to the cities in greater and greater numbers has been the inevitable result. This addition of significant numbers of people to our already overcrowded urban centers has forced us to consider ways and means of developing the resources of rural areas.

Recently, my distinguished senior colleague from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) delivered a thoughtful address on the subject at the dedication of Missouri Rural Electric Cooperatives Headquarters in Jefferson City, Mo.

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

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

#### RURAL AMERICANS IN URBAN AMERICA—THE CHALLENGE

(By Senator STUART SYMINGTON, July 8, 1970)

In recent years I believe it fair to say that most of the nation's attention has been fixed on the plight of our decaying cities and our urban poor. At the same time it would appear just as important, if not more so, that we find solutions to the problems of rural America and its citizens—particularly the poor, the aged, and the unemployed.

Today less than 30 percent of the nation's population is rural; but 46 percent of the people with poverty-level incomes in this country live in rural areas; and 60 percent of America's substandard housing is located in rural regions. Millions of rural Americans are undernourished and ill-clothed. Over 35,000 rural communities are without water systems and 45,000 need sanitary disposal systems.

For too many of our rural citizens the good life is but a dream of an earlier America which counted 19 out of every 20 citizens among its rural population. Today that number has dwindled to 6.

Now what are the basic reasons for rural deprivation?

For the past 300 years, agriculture has been the anchor of rural America. In the last quarter century, however, we have experienced an agricultural revolution. Research, improved fertilizers, increased mechanization, and vast irrigation programs have transformed America's countryside.

Since the end of the Second World War crop production per acre and livestock production per breeding unit have increased almost 100 percent. In 1945, we produced 2.6 billion bushels of corn. In 1969, by contrast, we produced 4.6 billion bushels on one-third fewer acres. In 1945, the average milk yield

per cow was 5000 pounds a year. Today it is 9200 pounds.

In the last 15 years productivity has increased by more than 6.6 percent per year—more than twice as fast as productivity in the economy as a whole.

This is a great testimonial to the resourcefulness and ingenuity of the American farmer. As a result, today he is one of our very best foreign exchange earners.

But as agriculture has become more and more mechanized, and as farm yields have multiplied, fewer and fewer people have been employed in agricultural work.

As agricultural employment shrinks, in their search for opportunity rural Americans in ever-increasing numbers have been forced to migrate to our already overgrown cities. Many small communities and crossroads villages which over the years have been sustained by the farmer are dying; and their populations too are streaming into our cities.

In recent years this flow has developed into a flood. Except for developments that create major improvements, such as the Table Rock Dam, most of our counties in the past two decades have been losing population. During this same twenty year period, however, the population of the United States as a whole rose by some 33 percent.

Unfortunately, this migration has only intensified the already serious problems facing our cities. Thousands of rural people arrive in those cities with high expectations; but they lack the skills and education necessary to find adequate employment. Thus, all too many become names on the metropolitan welfare rolls.

If we do not act now, I believe that within thirty years many hundreds more of our small towns will become ghost-towns; and rural America could become a vast empty land, inhabited by a relative handful of agricultural technicians cultivating gigantic tracts with computers and drone tractors.

At the same time, most of our population would thus be further concentrated in huge urban agglomerations, compounding the problems of congestion, pollution and crime.

If we are to prevent this from occurring, there must be genuine recognition of the fact that rural America's problems are urban America's problems; and unless we begin, now, to solve the problems of the countryside, there can be no real long-term hope for our cities.

It would now appear essential to restore an urban-rural balance in America; and this would call for some redistribution of our population across the map of the United States.

Let us begin, therefore, a real and practical effort to revitalize our small towns in effort to accelerate rural development efforts.

I would now present seven possible key elements in a total town and country development program.

First, we should do our best to try to eliminate more of the opportunity gap that exists between urban and rural America. Today a lack of jobs often prevents many individuals who would like to do so from living and working outside the city. But in order to draw new industry to our rural areas, and thereby create new jobs, we will need to have a trained and educated labor force.

Unfortunately, in the past vocational training programs in rural areas have either been too oriented towards agricultural efforts alone or designed with an emphasis on home-economics skills. There is now an urgent need for greatly expanded vocational training programs which will emphasize non-farm job skills, and thereby prepare rural youth for today's highly technical world.

Secondly, we should strive to make our small communities and rural areas more attractive and appealing places in which to live. In this regard, I believe we should consider developing a national "Rural Renewal" program—one similar to our urban renewal

efforts. This would mean loans and grants available for modernizing and refurbishing the fading main streets of small town America; and would also mean sorely needed planning and technical assistance would be available to small towns.

Thirdly, the quality of life in rural areas must also be improved.

Over the years perhaps no other activity has more enhanced rural life than rural electrification. Although electricity was slow in coming to many farms and small towns in the early part of this century, since the Rural Electrification Administration was established in 1935, remarkable advances have been made. In 1935, for example, less than 11 percent of America's farms possessed electricity. Today 99 percent of the nation's three million farms are electrified.

Telephone service has also increased rapidly. As late as 1950, only 38 percent of our farms had telephones; but today over 80 percent of our farm people have this convenience; as do virtually all small town residents.

Missouri has the third largest number in the nation of consumers who benefit directly from the REA program. Of this we should be very proud.

The Rural Electrification program has been the one great incentive for bringing new jobs and new opportunity to America's heartland. Since 1961, it is estimated that over 300,000 new jobs have been created as a result of this superb REA program; and as a result, the standard of living among rural people has increased in recent years.

Much remains to be done, however. Rural America continues to lag behind our cities in terms of modern roads, water and sewer systems, schools, hospitals, and other public facilities.

In the years ahead, therefore, we should make a concerted effort to improve these services and facilities, and thereby lessen the disparity that continues to exist between rural and urban modes of life.

Fourth, I believe that experience demonstrates the construction of Federal reservoir projects can be of inestimable benefit in promoting economic development in rural areas. Not only do reservoirs bring needed flood control, water supply, hydro-electric power, and recreation to rural America, but they bring enormous social benefits as well.

Again I mention Table Rock Reservoir in southwest Missouri as an excellent example of the progress which accompanies reservoir development.

In the short period of 11 years, from 1958 when Table Rock was completed, to 1969, the combined assessed valuation of the seven county Table Rock area climbed from \$87 million to \$140 million; and as a result of the new investments generated by the reservoir, on June 1, 1966, Taney County was removed from the list of the 50 most depressed counties in the United States.

Surely we will all agree that our expansion of water resource development programs would be a most important step in the promotion of rural development, all across the nation.

Fifth, the possible construction of "New Towns" as is necessary in the case of Pattonsburg offers great latitude for dealing with some of the problems of rural America. This approach could in some cases provide an alternative to the present policy of relatively haphazard national growth. It could also help locate those tens of millions of new Americans who are expected in the coming decades. It could aid cities from many of their worsening problems; and at the same time, act as regional growth centers to stimulate rural development. It is with this thought in mind that I recently called for consideration of constructing some 300 new towns of 300,000 people each by the end of the century.

Sixth, in order to give proper recognition to the problems of rural America, we should consider expanding the Office of Small Town

Services in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to sub-cabinet status.

Seventh, for too long we have maintained a policy of two Americas in meeting the complex challenges facing us here at home—one set of programs to deal with urban America, and another to deal with rural America. Today, I believe it fair to say that there is an increasing recognition of the fact that the problems of urban and rural America are so interrelated we must take steps to develop a common national policy for both.

In the United States today, our human resources constitute the foundation of our basic strength. With that premise I know we will all agree that the unfulfilled hopes and untapped resources of rural America present us with a great challenge and a great opportunity. To fulfill that opportunity will take imagination, hard work, and money. Nevertheless the reward we can rightly expect from that vision and effort would be a major contribution on our part to the future security and prosperity of America.

#### DEATH OF JAMES G. LUCAS, SCRIPPS-HOWARD WAR CORRESPONDENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the untimely death of Scripps-Howard Correspondent James G. Lucas is a loss to the citizenry of our Nation.

Jim distinguished himself by accurate and informative coverage of military life during World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. He was the Ernie Pyle of the last two decades.

Mr. President, I feel a personal loss in his passing. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jim G. Lucas," published in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, July 21, 1970.

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

#### JIM G. LUCAS

One of many amazing things about Scripps-Howard War Correspondent Jim G. Lucas was that a lifetime of witnessing and writing about the tragedy of wars left him without a trace of inner hardness or cynicism.

He was, until the end, what one speaker said of him years ago in bestowing upon him some particular medal: "A truly modest man—an old Marine with a soft heart."

And he could, and did, write with the best of the journalists of any era.

He undoubtedly saw more combat than any newspaperman in U.S. history. He seemed to be always at the front—until age and a long, losing bout with cancer caused him to return from Vietnam three years ago for the last time. When, for example, Gen. Omar Bradley at a Washington banquet in 1953 awarded Jim with glowing terms the VFW's Gold Medal for conveying the feel of the battlefield in his stories, Jim was on the frontlines in Korea. When he was awarded the 1954 Pulitzer Prize for his human interest stories from Korea, he already was in Hanoi covering still another war. (He was in Hanoi when Ho Chi Minh's troops took over North Vietnam.)

Still, 25 years of frontline reporting in three major wars never shook his belief in the worth of the individual, the value of life, or the love of country.

He never married. He loved young people and there are countless stories of his help to the young, particularly young newspapermen on their first assignment to a war zone. He could, and did, oratorically wave his country's flag at the slightest provocation.

Jim Lucas was a great reporter with a rare gift for chronicling the miseries and

joys, heroism and humdrum of the life of the American soldier on the frontlines in three wars.

Thousands upon thousands of ex-GIs will long remember him from the clips of his stories they have pasted in their scrapbooks.

Scores of young newspapermen in the future, we are sure, will be studying his work and seeking to emulate it—just as has been true in the case of Jim's predecessor, Ernie Pyle.

For those of us in Scripps-Howard, it has been an exceptionally rare privilege to have worked with Jim Lucas.

#### IMPORTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION TO KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the importance of transportation to the State of Kansas cannot be overemphasized. Lying in the strategic center of the United States, our landlocked State would be isolated and forgotten but for the highway, rail, and air transportation available to us.

Regrettably, rail transportation in Kansas is rapidly deteriorating and disappearing. Perhaps in a few years the great iron horse that opened our region of the country to westward expansion will serve us no more. Accordingly, the importance of air transportation becomes each day more vital for the growth and potential of our State.

As one who has been keenly interested in aviation for over 20 years, I am particularly pleased by the progress which one air carrier, Air Midwest—a third level commuter carrier—has achieved in increasing and improving air service to Kansas. It has moved aggressively into the air passage market partially abandoned by Frontier Airlines as well as expanding new markets in our region. I have met with the men who are the officers at Air Midwest and I have been encouraged by their imagination and determination to provide adequate and efficient service to my State. I salute them and wish them well.

Indicative of their increasing success, an article published in a recent edition of an aviation magazine, *Airline Management and Marketing*, highlights the efforts of these men to get this new airline off the ground—both literally and financially.

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

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

#### AIR MIDWEST: "FLAG AIRLINE OF KANSAS"

In this election year, a lot of politicians would do well to study the "grass roots" support being built up by Air Midwest in Kansas.

Faced with minimum service by some airlines and a pullout by another due to the uneconomic nature of the short-haul routes, Kansans—particularly western Kansans—are doing all they can to keep themselves in the transportation mainstream. That's where Air Midwest comes in.

The company, based in Wichita, started life in 1965 as Aviation Services Inc., a one-plane, one-employee air mortuary/charter operation. The employee (and founder) was Gary Adamson, now president of Air Midwest, which flies one Beech 99 and three Sessna 402s on its scheduled flights, has two 402s for backup and three Cessna 206s for charters.

Although Air Midwest is classed as a



"commuter air carrier," the 70-employee organization, serving 14 cities in four states, is providing "local service" with small aircraft and 133 weekly flights.

"Most of our customers need hub airport connections rather than commuter service," Adamson told AMM/AA. Dubbed "the official flagship airline of Kansas" last year, Air Midwest is providing the only scheduled air transportation from some points, the only frequently scheduled service from others, and the only nonstop service at still others.

Dodge City, a 45-min. nonstop from Wichita, is an example. An agriculture-oriented town of 15,000 with a thriving cattle-sale/meat-packing center, Dodge is now served on a scheduled basis only by Air Midwest, following a Frontier Airlines suspension in 1968. The city also has two trains daily and some bus service.

According to an editorial in the *Dodge City Daily Globe*, the community should support and cultivate the commuters: "Reliance on a major carrier, either to return or remain, is pure folly."

To show its appreciation for the third-level service, Dodge floated a bond issue to extend the airport runway, is building a new ticket counter from funds provided by local businessmen, and kicked in \$12,500 as one portion of a five-city, \$100,000 loan to Air Midwest for expansion and operating capital.

David B. Ross, executive director of the town's Chamber of Commerce, said: "They're really part of the family in Dodge City. We're aware of their problems and background, and work with them closely because of the mutual advantages."

Dodge isn't alone in that thinking. According to Albert L. Kamas, a Wichita lawyer and member of the state's Economic Development Commission: "We're trying to keep our children in Kansas, but we need something for them to do. So we have to get industry in and industry wants transportation, so we follow 'these kids' (median management age is 30) around." KEDC can't give Air Midwest actual funding, "but it can do almost everything else," Kamas said.

One instance where there was some resistance, but where Air Midwest came out on top, was at Great Bend, an oil products center with 20,000 population and no rail service. Frontier still serves the community with three flights daily, while Air Midwest provides 11. The airport, a former military base has three 8,000-ft. runways and growing business jet traffic.

When Air Midwest first started Beech 99 operations in Great Bend last year, "we actually had people come to the airport to see if the plane would be there when we said it would," said James Pickett, vp-marketing/corporate planning. As of last month, Frontier had applied to suspend service at Great Bend, and Air Midwest told CAB it would fill the breach. Although there was some minority dissent, the city council okayed the move.

If approved, Air Midwest will not only increase the passenger service there, but plans to provide all-cargo service, a big potential money-maker in that area of the state, and to add Air Express.

Air Midwest has "done everything it said it would," Gene Cole, manager of Great Bend's Industrial Development Inc. project, said. "We went through Continental's growing pains, then Central's. All of them outgrew Great Bend."

It might seem a paradox that, in a state boasting "the air capital of the world" (Wichita), selling air transportation would be a problem. But, Pickett said, "our people aren't commuters like they are in the East. Most people would rather jump in their cars and drive three hours to Wichita from western Kansas."

One good method of making sure people become air-transportation-minded is Air

Midwest's recent intrastate stock offering. The way the carrier figures it, spreading the ownership is going to gain a lot of additional salesmen. With 360,000 shares going public at \$1.25 a share, the stock will be "so widely held we'll gain all that many more people interested in making it go."

The support is by no means limited to Dodge and Great Bend. Other towns in the state, such as Colby and Hays, are building new counters, terminal facilities and navigation aids.

What, in turn, is Air Midwest doing for Kansas? "Our purpose is to serve our customers," said Pickett, "and everything is aimed at that goal." What this translates into is that when Air Midwest has connecting passengers coming in, it waits. The scissoring of flights that takes place at Great Bend every afternoon to make connections to Kansas City or Wichita is a sample. Some customers have to change planes from a 402 to a 99 or vice versa, but "no one complains."

Late last year, when losses started to mount higher than anticipated, the airline initiated a cost-cutting campaign. No part of that, however, affected the primary goal of serving the passenger. By spring, management was pretty well satisfied that the loose ends had been pulled together.

"Every position requires people who can solve problems," Pickett said. "We must have creativity without spending dollars for it." For example, all of Air Midwest's signs at Wichita Municipal, including the one at the carrier's attractive ticket counter, were done by airline employees.

Walter Troyer, Air Midwest's 23-year-old chief pilot and holder of an ATR, was re-writing the crew training manual when he visited Wichita. Troyer said he spends a lot of his time with FAA "trying to work things out. They're just as new in this business as we are. Cooperation with the local FAA man has helped in circumventing some of the problems."

Air Midwest has 20 pilots. Qualifications include a 1,500-hr. total with 200-300 hr. multi-engine time. Age must be between 20 and 25. Every crew member starts as a copilot and upgrading comes in 6-12 months. Although pay is low, turnover rate is also low. What pilots may not get in salary they make up for in company stock and being in on the development of a young company.

Maintenance work is performed in a facility at Wichita Municipal purchased from Bevan Radio in 1969. Air Midwest has eight maintenance personnel, a complete engine shop and a 402 spares shop, and is one of the few commuters approved for progressive maintenance on the 99.

A sophisticated marketing approach is not something characteristic of third-levels. But Air Midwest is one carrier that is making a good try.

The airline hired an agency, Crow Advertising, after it changed its name last year. A new image was the goal. The company set aside \$30,000 for the campaign for the first year, and arranged for some \$24,000 in media tradeouts, but went over that figure. "Everything cost more than we figured," Pickett said. However, the one-time development costs included in the image change are completed.

How does a commuter sell its services? Going on two-day "sales blitzes," which means pounding on doors of business people in one community.

Giving free airplane rides and refreshments when a new plane is delivered, or a new route started.

Aids to travel agents, such as the new combined gate pass/travel itinerary in Air Midwest colors.

A no-charge, long-distance reservations phone number for people throughout the system when the local reservations office is closed.

A mini-stewardess aboard 99 flights to help passengers with gate connections and information and to serve as a public relations rep.

Air Midwest also takes pride in its growing sophistication in providing customers with wide accessibility to reservations data. An electronic switching system was installed during the winter. An Arinc system is set up at the ticket counter that allows a check of the passenger list before takeoff. Air Midwest is now listed on Braniff's reservations computer, and is planning to work out a similar agreement with Continental.

And, no less than its big brothers who are moving into areas such as hotels and ground transportation to facilitate the passenger's travel, Air Midwest is looking into establishment of airport bus service and involvement in hotel/convention development.

Like most commuters, Air Midwest lost money last year on revenues of \$470,000, although it did show a profit in 1968. The loss, according to Adamson, was attributable to the route expansion last year (the carrier added Denver, Omaha, Hutchinson and Colby), building its new image and offering "super-excellent" service. With the passenger increase starting up again in March and the cost-cutting measures, Adamson hopes the company will show a profit in 1970 with the additional revenue gained from taking over as sole carrier into Great Bend and Hutchinson.

After the stock offering, which will be used to acquire a second 99, retire the \$100,000 loan and as a buffer for operating capital, shares owned by a group of 15 inside investors will be escrowed until the company is able to pay a 6% dividend.

#### LEADERSHIP OF SENATOR MCGOVERN ON HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION INVESTIGATION

Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. President, the Senate over the years has had many examples of fine leadership on important national issues. No example has been more outstanding, however, than that provided in the past year and a half by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) on the issue of hunger and malnutrition which affects millions of our less privileged citizens.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, Senator McGOVERN has conducted a searching investigation of hunger throughout the country. This investigation has imprinted the reality of this problem on our national consciousness and has resulted in major food stamp and school lunch legislation being passed on by the Congress.

The distinguishing characteristic of the Senator's leadership has been his determination to stick with this problem until it is actually resolved, regardless of its current popularity with the press. I was particularly pleased to see this quality of leadership recognized in a recent TRB column in the *New Republic* magazine.

I recommend highly the reading of this column and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRB FROM WASHINGTON

NO BITE

It's a big room paneled in pine with cork floors and hardly anybody in it. The TV

camera lights are on but the crew is reading newspapers. The witness is Dr. Arnold Schaefer, head of the government's National Nutrition Survey that Congress ordered two and a half years ago. A couple of experts sit beside him, one of them seemingly intent on keeping him from saying anything dramatic about hunger. Last year Dr. Schaefer spoke his mind and probably cost the government several million dollars in extra food grants. He is short, sober, middle-aged, prosaic and obviously watching his step. This year he sticks to graphs, tables and a dull text.

Normally a dozen senators sit behind that semicircular dais up front that looks down on the witness, but this time there is just one man there, George McGovern of South Dakota. He is all alone.

All the drama has gone out of it. The country was shocked and incredulous when McGovern and others went out a couple of years ago and showed there is hunger, malnutrition and even starvation in affluent America. But a lot of other excitements have come up since then. Congress ordered a national nutrition survey and this is part of it; today we will hear about two of the 10 states surveyed, Louisiana and Texas. But, it's like counting the ballots where the election is already conceded—old stuff. Yes, there's a direct correlation between poverty and malnutrition; who doubted it? Yes, in counties where the survey has been weighted toward low income groups there is almost complete lack of dental care. (It is interesting, though, to think of an area where 18 percent of all subjects over 10 "found it difficult to bite or chew." Curious, eh?) Then there is that bit about infants and lactating mothers; they are always the ones who show up with iron deficiency anemia, vitamin deficiency and what not. And of course, Negroes and Spanish Americans.

Out of 26 counties surveyed in Texas, 19 have food distribution programs, but only 10 percent of the households in the 19 counties participated. "That's odd; why is it?" asks McGovern as though he didn't know. Well, says Dr. Schaefer almost morosely, suppose a family has income of only \$100 a month—then it's eligible for food stamps. But the head of the family must come into town and put down \$40 cash to get his \$21 food bonus. It's hard for a near-destitute family to raise \$40 cash. It's not easy to get the right papers or to get transportation, or to know when and where. Only 10 percent participate.

Dr. Schaefer says that 40 percent of the children studied in the hungry areas were smaller than a comparable group of kids in Iowa. McGovern tries to put life into it. How about mental retardation? (Scientists know that underfed baby mice are mentally retarded; they think humans are too, and that it's irreversible, they can never catch up.) Dr. Schaefer says that mental tests weren't included. He looks at his colleague as though tempted by an indiscretion. He mutters that so far as he is concerned he thinks undernourished children will score lower; be "harder to teach."

Sitting up there alone McGovern keeps asking questions. He never quits. He lacks the drama of McCarthy; the glamor of Kennedy. He's got no style or wealth. Somewhere out in the Adriatic one time he crash-landed a collapsed B-24 and got a Distinguished Service Cross. But his clothes aren't Fifth Avenue. He's got a slight Midwest nasal accent and kind manner. He doesn't look like a hero. He went to Dakota Wesleyan, and got into politics as a history teacher. He looks like a YMCA secretary.

It is awfully hard to stop men like McGovern. They have iron in them. When they think about hungry children it bothers them. When they go out and find the facts and come back with them then, by golly, before the Senate knows what it's doing it appro-

propriates money—as much as \$200 million of it, because McGovern and others won't let up. Will he get his bill through Congress? I don't know. Mr. Nixon had his celebrated "White House Conference on Hunger" which rode off in all directions as expected, and that was that. Now the President has more sensational things to spend money on, like Cambodia. But McGovern is still there. "For a quarter of a century," he says in his mild voice, "America has been caring for the rest of the world. The time has come for America to care for its own."

Don't underestimate him.

#### SLOW APPROACH TO PASSAGE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun of July 14 contains an editorial which expresses a view I have long held.

It concerns Congress' increasingly slow and cumbersome approach to passing appropriations bills.

So that all Senators may read the Sun's stern words, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### MONEY GAP

One of the most irritating faults of Congress is its perennial failure to pass appropriations bills on time. The government runs on a fiscal year that begins July 1. More often than not, most agencies start the new year without knowing what they will be allowed to spend that year, because Congress hasn't acted on the 14 major appropriations bills. Makeshift arrangements have to be made. Last year Congress set a record, we believe, by not passing a single appropriations bill until after the new fiscal year started. In fact, it was three months into the year before the first one was finally passed. Seven of the 14 weren't passed until December, or about half way through the year.

The House, which originates appropriation bills, was to blame last year. It only finished up with two bills before the end of the year. This year, everybody agreed last year, was going to be better. For the House, it has been. All but two appropriations bills were sent to the Senate by June 24, a week before year's end. But the Senate has completed action on only four. House-Senate conferences to smooth out differences have been completed on only one. That, by the way, is the one for the District of Columbia, \$636 million, or about one-half of one percent of the total to be appropriated.

#### SENATOR JAVITS ARGUES FOR GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the highlights of the recent hearings on the Genocide convention by a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee was the cogent and well-reasoned rebuttal to the major arguments against Senate ratification by the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). His rebuttal is particularly important today since it comes to grips with the major legal and moral issues of the convention at a time when Senate action on the issue is drawing near.

It has been argued, for example, that the Convention on Genocide would commit the United States to an international treaty—if ratified—at a time when a substantial portion of the American peo-

ple wish to contract rather than expand their international obligations.

Senator JAVITS' rebuttal was this:

One must distinguish between different kinds of international obligations. It is true that many people have argued that the American military commitments should be contracted. This view, however, does not entail the further argument that the development of international law should be halted. Treaties of a great variety of kinds not involving military commitments have been negotiated and have provided for more ordered relations among nations. It is hard to imagine that one would argue against the Genocide Convention on the grounds that it expands American international obligations.

In a further statement, Senator JAVITS answers the question of whether individuals as well as public officials would be subject to trial and punishment for offenses which have always been regarded as matters falling within the domestic jurisdiction of the various nations. In his answer, Senator JAVITS states that the protection of human rights has always been an international concern. The United States has shown that it agrees with this view by ratifying the World War II peace treaties, the United Nations Charter, the Slavery Convention of 1926, and more recently the Supplementary Convention on Slavery, 1967, and the Supplementary on Refugees, 1968.

The Senate must answer a call of conscience in this session. The arguments have been made time and time again for the urgent need to ratify the United Nations Convention on Genocide. The time has long passed us by on this issue. We must act as a responsible deliberative body before it is too late.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.



Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending order of business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending order of business is the authorization of appropriations for military procurement, H.R. 17123.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the Senate now begins the consideration of the annual military authorization bill for fiscal year 1971. I propose today to give an outline of the high points of the bill; the committee's action thereon; and, briefly, some of the major reasons for the items in the bill and the action of the committee.

I expect and I hope that we have a healthy debate on the bill. I do not believe there is reason for unusually prolonged debate. I shall point out the hearings we have had, the availability of the testimony in printed form, and the availability of the report in the course of my remarks. But I do hope that Monday next we can move immediately into consideration of the bill and then on to votes as soon as possible.

This legislation provides the authorization, first, for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and certain other weapons; second, for research, development, test, and evaluation for all of the Armed Forces; third, for the fiscal year 1971 personnel strength of the Selected Reserves; and fourth, for the use of defense appropriations for the free world forces in Southeast Asia under certain stated conditions.

This year, Mr. President, as for fiscal year 1970, the bill contains the fiscal year 1971 military construction authority for the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. That is an item that is ordinarily in the other bill. It was brought over for reasons that I shall give later. I shall discuss now the remaining provisions during the course of my remarks.

Heretofore, for the information of the Senate, I have given brief speeches on the floor. One concerns the commitments that we have around the world with reference to mutual security defense compacts.

I also made another speech on the dollar value of our military program today as compared with fiscal 1964. I have also referred to a special subject matter that we dealt with more at length this year. That concerns the item ordinarily called research and development.

That comes under the subcommittee chaired by the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE). He will speak on that subject, I hope, today and many times later.

I also had a preliminary speech concerning the surveillance that the Senate Armed Services Committee has been giving during the course of the last 6 months

over certain major Department of Defense contracts for weapons.

I refer to those now for the information of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that I may later have printed in the RECORD at this point, the places in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where those speeches can be found.

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

#### NATURE OF STATEMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I emphasize that this general statement on the entire bill must necessarily be in the nature of a summary. The various items in the bill will, of course, be treated in much greater depth as we proceed to debate the separate elements of the bill.

I would also point out that there is before each Senator a copy of the committee report totaling some 121 printed pages along with five volumes of hearings including a separate volume on the CVAN-70 and the appendix.

Mr. President, those printed hearings are not all on the Senator's desks. There are five volumes. One volume is on the desk and the other four volumes are on the racks underneath the desks.

I do not have the total number of pages before me. However, there are more than 2,500 pages of those hearings. I think they are the most comprehensive and completely detailed hearings that we have had in modern times, at least, on this military program. It is all indexed. This is a very valuable aid to anyone who wants to find a particular item.

In addition, there is this 122-page printed committee report which also includes a vast number of tabulations for comparison purposes. I think that any Senator who wishes to do so will find this report a very valuable aid, as will the press.

Every weapons system is identified in these hearings and in the report with something about the nature of it, something about its cost and its relative position in the whole list of weapons.

This report has been filed for some time, and printed copies of the RECORD have been available.

I believe, Mr. President, that every Senator, having this substantive information before him, will be enabled to make a judgment upon every matter of substance. We cannot have it available ad infinitum, of course. But I think Senators are entitled to the substance of the facts, pros and cons. That is what we have tried to do in this report.

We will be glad to furnish any other information that we might have to any Senator. We also have a very competent staff. The staff knows these hearings from beginning to end. They know these weapons.

The staff will be available for any Senator, regardless of that Senator's position on any particular item. The staff will be available to give any Senator a briefing on the facts and such information as we have available. That is part of the process, and it is part of our committee's position.

I want to emphasize that I want everyone to be free to use that source. Of course, other sources are open and avail-

able to Senators in such ways as they might wish.

#### GENERAL SUMMARY IN DOLLAR RESULTS

Mr. President, in terms of procurement and research and development, the bill now before the Senate is 6.6 percent below the amount recommended by the House and 6.7 percent below the Department of Defense request. The House version was reduced by \$1.329 billion. The committee is recommending a total of \$18.9 billion for procurement and research and development as compared to \$20.237 billion recommended by the House and \$20.271 billion requested by the Department of Defense. To this amount the committee has added \$334 million for Safeguard military construction authorization.

That item was taken from another bill so that both of these items would be in the same bill and in the same debate. This makes the total amount of the bill now before the Senate \$19,242,889,000.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first I warmly congratulate the Senator upon the exposition he has given of the hearings and of the voluminous report which is available.

There is only one question that I want to ask. I note that there is one Senator, a member of the committee, who filed individual views relative to the C-5A program. Does that indicate that he was the only Senator who had minority views with reference to the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. He was the only one who submitted minority views for the report. There were others who voted against that item. The best I can recall now, the amendment lost by a vote of 12 to 6.

There was only one Senator who filed minority views.

Mr. HOLLAND. There was some disagreement in the committee relative to the C-5A program?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was there disagreement on the report other than that just mentioned within the committee?

Mr. STENNIS. The general answer to that question is "No." There was a split vote from time to time on various items. We really put this bill together item by item. Each major item was passed on.

I remember that we had a good debate about the amount of funds that would be necessary for research on the B-1, the new bomber. It was a very small amount. We were in disagreement on it. Some favored \$50 million. Some favored \$100 million. Those who favored the \$50 million were in the majority. So that is the amount that is in the bill.

Generally speaking, I think after a division was had, the ABM excepted, it was the intention of the Senators to go ahead and support the items.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the report speaks for an undivided committee in general, and the only Senator filing individual views, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEKER), is not taking issue with the committee in general on the whole report, but only with reference to the C-5A.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; that is correct. I emphasize that there were divided votes on some items, but many of them were just a question of where did the majority lie, and the others would go along with it. ABM was an exception; there was a division on that, as we had last year, although the Senator from Nevada decided, in view of the fact we had already started it, this was the second section and he would support it as he announced later.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, this is a very prestigious committee and it is a committee composed of a group of very fine Senators. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the members of the committee be printed in the RECORD. It is my understanding there are 18 members of the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

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

#### ARMED SERVICES

John Stennis, of Mississippi, *Chairman*.  
 Richard B. Russell, of Georgia.  
 Stuart Symington, of Missouri.  
 Henry M. Jackson, of Washington.  
 Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina.  
 Howard W. Cannon, of Nevada.  
 Stephen M. Young, of Ohio.  
 Daniel K. Inouye, of Hawaii.  
 Thomas J. McIntyre, of New Hampshire.  
 Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia.  
 Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine.  
 Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina.  
 John G. Tower, of Texas.  
 Peter H. Dominick, of Colorado.  
 George Murphy, of California.  
 Edward W. Brooke, of Massachusetts.  
 Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.  
 Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. I simply wanted to bring out the matter as to whether there was serious division on the report in general, and I think the Senator has covered that in his answers. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I want to be certain now. Another split vote has occurred to me. The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) proposed certain matters about the MIRV, for instance, and he reserved his rights to present something on the floor of the Senate. He may have some amendments along that line, but I do not know.

Those things are conclusive proof that this matter was really put together by the committee and weighed on the evidence and actual votes taken—not as to everything, not as to all items, but any item that was questioned. I think that most of these major items were explained more than once as we went along, and we had a very thorough discussion.

I thank the Senator.

#### PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Mr. President, prior to discussing the bill in detail, I would like to make several preliminary observations, some of which have already been covered.

#### EXTENSIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Mr. President, the committee began hearings on this bill February 20 and continued on a systematic basis until

June 11, 1970, resulting in printed testimony of 2,715 pages. In addition, there were lengthy hearings and printed testimony on the part of the special Joint Subcommittee to study the CVAN-70 with a special report already published on this matter. I recite the foregoing in order to show the intensive examination extended to this bill this year.

I would also emphasize that the committee was unanimous in its final vote on reporting the bill. I would not imply, however, that all of the committee recommendations were unanimous since many of these decisions were vigorously debated with naturally differing views on some issues on the part of the committee membership.

I wish to acknowledge the cooperation of the entire committee membership. I especially want to thank our ranking Republican member, Senator SMITH of Maine, who will be back with us in a short while. She has been a source of great strength to me in her service and support on this bill as a whole.

I also want to mention the outstanding work of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) who was chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Tactical Air Power and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) who was chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Research and Development. The work of both of these subcommittees, which will be fully discussed later, was crucial to the outcome of this legislation. They also made quite a contribution last year.

#### BASIC CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED

Mr. President, the basic task the committee must perform in this legislation is twofold: first, to decide what major military hardware will be needed by the Armed Forces in the period of from 1 to 7 years ahead; and, second, to project the research and development needs for the period of from 1 to 10 years ahead.

In trying to make a sound judgment, the committee was faced with a number of conflicting considerations. We were acutely aware of the severe financial condition of the Federal Government and the need of recommending the lowest possible authorization consistent with our national security requirements.

At the same time, we are confronted with the grim fact of rapidly increasing Russian strategic forces which could place this country in jeopardy in the years ahead. We all know of the increase in the SS-9's and other types of missiles, their growing naval power, both strategic and conventional, as well as the growing momentum of the entire Russian military research and development program. We are also aware that this country has some sort of mutual defense arrangements with approximately 44 foreign countries. Let me say that I personally favor a thorough review of our commitments, but until these obligations are revised, we must continue to provide the means of honoring them.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a speech I made on July 16, 1970, entitled, "Defense Budget and Worldwide Military Commitments."

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

#### DEFENSE BUDGET AND WORLDWIDE MILITARY COMMITMENTS

The basic point that I am making today is that, as long as we have these heavy worldwide commitments, we are obligated to provide the resources to meet them. If we are not willing to do this, then we should take prompt action to divest ourselves of at least some of the obligations which we have assumed. The matter of the approval of our treaty obligations was within the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not the Committee on Armed Services. Similarly, any change or reduction in our treaty obligations would be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not the Committee on Armed Services. However, as long as these treaty obligations remain in existence, it is the obligation of the Committee on Armed Services, and the Senate as a whole, to recommend the weapons and other resources which are essential to meeting them.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee, therefore, has the duty of recognizing not only the needs for protecting this country but also the needs arising from our foreign obligations. Underlying all of the issues and problems in this bill, Mr. President, is the overwhelming priority of providing for our national survival. I always want to make that clear. I refer to commitments we have and our obligations to them. Whether I stated it every time or not, the overwhelming priority of providing for the matters in this bill is for our own national survival to be properly protected.

Mr. President, the committee has produced a bill which, in its judgment, adequately meets our defense requirements and the need for austerity.

#### REDUCED BUYING POWER OF DEFENSE DOLLAR

In emphasizing the austerity of this bill, I would like to make a significant historical comparison. I call this especially to the attention of Senators. In terms of buying power, the procurement and research development recommendation of \$18.9 billion before the Senate is 20 percent less than the equivalent authorization bill for fiscal year 1964, the last prewar year. Let me explain. The procurement and R. & D. funding enacted for fiscal year 1964 was actually \$14.4 billion. If we add to this figure the additional items which presently require authorization, the fiscal year 1964 figure would have been \$18.9 billion which is identical to the figure in the present bill. That is quite a coincidence but that is the way it came out. The factors of inflation and price increases have reduced the buying power of the bill before us by about 20 percent as compared to fiscal year 1964. To put the matter another way, if the factors of inflation and price increases since 1964 were eliminated from the fiscal year 1971 authorization, the present bill would not be \$18.9 billion but only \$15.1 billion. In reality, therefore, the bill before us represents a 20 percent lower bill in terms of buying power as compared to the 1964 level.

That 1964 level, as Senators know, represented the last fiscal year before the special buildup in Vietnam. That special



illustration there will hold up, and it shows that when an allowance is made for those increases based upon outside factors like inflation and price increases, this bill is comparable to the one in 1964, and in buying power is 20 percent lower.

#### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Mr. President, I shall discuss several items of special interest in the bill.

#### REDUCTION OF \$334.8 MILLION IN RECOGNITION OF UNUSED PRIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, the Committee reduced the new obligational authority in this bill by the amount of \$334.8 million in recognition of certain prior-year unused appropriations which the Department of Defense anticipates will not be obligated during fiscal year 1971. In the opinion of the committee these funds should be used if needed in lieu of adding new obligational authority in that amount to the legislation. The committee report itemizes, beginning on page 13, the various categories affected by this decision and discusses the matter in detail.

That \$334.8 million, by the way, is almost identically offset by the amount we took out of the military construction bill on the ABM construction program and put over into this bill, solely for the reason that we wanted to get all of that ABM money in the same bill, thus avoiding a duplication of its consideration.

#### SAFEGUARD ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. President, the Safeguard system with the subject of many days of debate last year in the Senate, and an equally intensive discussion will undoubtedly occur in this connection with the pending authorization. At this juncture, I would make the following points with respect to the matter.

First. The committee effected a fundamental policy change in limiting the role of the ABM system to the protection of our land-based strategic deterrent. It was the view of the committee that the present circumstances do not justify the so-called thin defense against a potential Chinese threat. And I would emphasize, Mr. President, that this limitation as set forth is a matter of law since the bill precludes funding at any sites other than the four covering our Minuteman forces.

Funds were approved for four sites: Grand Forks and Malmstrom, both of which have been previously funded; Whiteman Air Force Base; and advance preparation funds only for Warren Air Force Base. The total request for the Safeguard program approved by the committee is \$1,349,400,000. This sum includes \$334 million for military construction mentioned a few minutes ago. No other funds will be needed for fiscal 1971.

Second. The basic issue posed was whether we need an ABM system at all and, if so, at what time. It was the conclusion of the committee this year, as last year, that this Nation must have an ABM system. We all know from the recent announcement of new evidence of additional SS-9's that the Russian threat is growing ever more serious. The present number of these intercontinental missiles, each of which can carry a 25-megaton warhead, and either under construction or operational, exceeds consid-

erably the number which last year at this time was in evidence of being either operational or under construction.

The next issue is whether there is an alternative ABM system which would be as effective as Safeguard would be available in the same time period, and at roughly no greater cost. The evidence fails to show any such alternative system which would meet our needs. I emphasize that, Mr. President.

As I understand the testimony now, with the exception of two or three, or perhaps a few more—it makes no difference where they testified or when—all the scientists and all the witnesses agree that if the SS-9's are going to continue to increase in number, we must have, if at all possible, an ABM system.

There is no dissent on that basic principle, or perhaps only a very slight one.

That brings us into the question, then, what about this system? There are those who say it is inadequate, and likewise, or unlikely, at least, there are those who say it is well on its way to being a successful anti-ballistic-missile system.

Allowing for the differences there, a great majority agree that so far this is the best we have, and there is a great abundance of special, respectable authority that this system, being ahead of the others, can be perfected to the point where it will serve the purpose.

Let me point out that, as a general proposition—and I am no authority in this field, but I have been on the committee as long as we have had these major missiles, and each year I have learned about the progress, the setbacks, and the final successes that they have all had—this is not something as to which one can just go to 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, blow a whistle, and get somebody who can make these missiles and make them work. That was not the way Thomas A. Edison perfected the incandescent lamp. He labored and labored and labored and made many mistakes, but in the end he came forward in an almost miraculous way, and all these years, although there have been some improvements, most of his basic ideas are found therein, as I understand.

So we come down to the proposition of knowing there is an increase in the SS-9's and the almost unanimous feeling that, if that is going on, we almost have to have some kind of system to protect our aggressive weapons. According to what I think is the better estimate, it is the best start we have made, and since I think all agree that time is getting short, it is almost basic that we move on.

Third. The other aspect concerns the relationship of the Safeguard system to the SALT talks. The first question is whether the 1971 increment for Safeguard will jeopardize the SALT talks—I mean our side of the situation in those talks. The committee does not believe this to be the case. On the contrary, a decision not to proceed with a reasonable Safeguard program would seriously weaken the negotiating position of the United States. We would have a situation where Congress would deny to our President the very item—the major item, I believe—of the bargaining arrangement. On the other hand, Mr. Presi-

dent, if the SALT talks should result in a mutual limitation on ABM systems, President Nixon would make the necessary adjustments to our program. Of course, I should add, Mr. President, that by limiting its role to the protection of our strategic deterrent, the anticipated total acquisition cost of the Safeguard program would be reduced from \$10.7 to \$6.5 billion based on 1970 dollars.

Now, of course, that is an estimate, but relatively speaking, we have enough information to hit somewhere near home base with reference to that estimate; and, basing it on 1970 dollars, which will not allow for inflation, increases in salaries, and so forth, I believe this is a fairly reasonable anticipation of what those costs will be.

These foregoing considerations leave us no realistic alternative but to proceed with the Safeguard program.

Mr. President, the debate on this issue has already started. It starts today, at least. We shall have this subject under discussion perhaps more than any other during our consideration of this bill. But to my mind, it starts again with the idea of cutting the rug out from under the Chief Executive of this Nation at the SALT talks. We all know this is a major issue at that negotiating table. I am not expecting a whole lot to come out of it all of a sudden, or within a few months, or maybe within the next year. I do believe there is a chance that something good will come out of it.

But if we stop now, in midstream, it is just sending a clear call, a clarion message to those on the other side that "Well, after all, the Government of the United States does not know what it wants to do. It is divided and the Executive head of the Government, after going into this matter, has had a setback, now, with reference to the ABM, so he does not speak for the Nation."

That is the first point they would make. The next would be that "No one else speaks for the Nation in matters like this," and the next would be that "We do not have to concede anything, because they have already taken away from him the major matter in which we are primarily interested."

So I invite the earnest consideration by every Member of this body of that major point.

#### C-5A PROGRAM

The C-5A, Mr. President, which is the largest aircraft ever built, was conceived in the early 1960's for the primary purpose of carrying the outsized equipment—the tanks, large guns, and other items—of our combat divisions. The original program contemplated a total of 120 of these aircraft. This program was reduced, however, because of cost and other factors. In November 1969 the Secretary of Defense announced that the program would be held to 81 aircraft. I approve of that decision and that conclusion. I think it is enough. That will be enough under all the circumstances; and, in fact, I think it is a very satisfactory cutoff point on this particular aircraft.

The fiscal year 1971 budget request totals \$622.2 million for the C-5A aircraft including \$344.4 million for unfunded prior-year production commitments;

\$200 million in contingency funds which is an amount in excess of the contract ceiling as interpreted by the Air Force; \$66.2 million for initial spares; and \$11.6 million for research and development.

The committee is recommending the approval of these funds subject to two very important statutory conditions I shall shortly discuss.

Mr. President, we had just as well get these figures into our minds. This \$66.2 million for initial spares, I think, is a matter of course; we will not have to bother with that any more.

The \$11.6 million for research and development is well understood; these planes have to continue to have a certain amount of spending in the fields we designate as research and development.

The \$344.4 million I have referred to is for unfunded prior year production commitments. There is no dispute about that amount.

The \$200 million in contingency funds, which is an amount in excess of the contract ceiling, as interpreted by the Air Force—that is the item here in contest, one might say. That is the item which will be the major part of the debate on this issue.

This was an unusual contract. I do not defend it, and never have, and I hope we never have another one like it. But we cannot just wish it away; we have this one, and we have to deal with it.

I do not know what will finally be determined by the contractor and the Air Force, or the Department of Defense, as the level of the obligation of the Federal Government. But this \$200 million is above what the Air Force says the contractor is due under the contract. They just bring it right out in the open and stand on that, and that is the way I have put it here today. The Air Force could be proved wrong in negotiations or in the courts, but for the time being—and this is an unfinished contract—the Air Force claims the Government is not obligated beyond this \$344 million for the 81 planes.

Mr. President, we all are familiar with the controversy surrounding this aircraft and its contractual arrangement. I certainly do not stand on the Senate floor and attempt to defend the so-called total package procurement contract of the C-5A and all the various issues and problems that have arisen during the history of this total package contract.

The issue for the Senate on this matter is how this body should deal with the C-5 program under the present circumstances and at this point in time. The committee has recommended that we go forward with the C-5A program for one basic reason—the need for this aircraft for our national defense.

What alternatives does the Congress have at this time with respect to the program? Let me say first, Mr. President, that the total amount which has been appropriated for the C-5A program—that is, for fiscal year 1970 and prior years—is approximately \$3.4 billion. If the Congress should decide that there should be no further program at all—that is, no funds appropriated for fiscal year 1971 for the C-5A—the Air Force would receive about 17 completed air-

craft for \$3.4 billion, which would be a unit cost of about \$200 million each. There are, of course, in the production pipeline literally millions of parts of every description, as well as a number of partially assembled planes. With no further funding, substantially everything that is in the present production pipeline, costing millions, therefore would be wasted.

Mr. President, as another alternative, if only the \$344 million is approved, the Government would receive about 30 5-C aircraft for the total program. This sum would finance the program through about December 31, 1970, but no further. Under this alternative, \$3.75 billion would have been spent for a unit cost of about \$125 million per aircraft.

If the entire \$544.4 million is authorized, which of course includes the \$200 million in contingency funds to which I have referred, the Government would receive about 42 aircraft, with a cost of about \$94 million each. The question of funding beyond the 42 aircraft is not before the Senate at this time since further funding is not being requested. If the program is completed, however, for the total of 81 aircraft, the average unit cost for the entire program will be about \$56 million each.

Under that, we would have 81 aircraft costing \$56 million each, in round figures. That would include all the cost of research and development for the whole program. So I emphasize, Mr. President, that the cost of the additional aircraft after the \$344 million has been authorized will be about \$16 million each.

I emphasize that again. The cost of the additional aircraft after this \$344 million has been authorized—that is the first item in the bill that I mentioned—then would be approximately \$16 million additional for each. We put very effective restrictive language in this bill as a part of this \$200 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want to ask the Senator a question about the C-5A. When he said that the cost of additional aircraft after a certain point would be \$16 million each, I did not get the precise reference. I wanted to get it correctly.

Mr. STENNIS. I was referring to this money after the \$344 million. That would be the \$200 million extra we have talked about for this year, and then the sums for next year which are estimated now. It means that the additional cost—all of that added together and figuring in the number of extra planes we are going to get—would be approximately \$16 million. But I did not mean to say that the planes would cost only \$16 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The overall cost, I understood the Senator to say, if we completed the program, would be \$56 million for each plane. But the additional cost, if instead of stopping the program without appropriating the \$200 million that is asked and all additional sums asked in connection with that—the difference if Congress goes astray would be, as I understand it, \$16 million on the

planes that could be built, the additional authorizations. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the way it works.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not want to leave any inference—and I am glad the Senator brought that point up—that it would cost only \$16 million apiece. And I do not want to leave any inference here when I say that the matter of additional money is not before us now. If this is approved and we go on with the program, it will be before us next year for additional money.

#### RESTRICTIVE COMMITTEE LANGUAGE

Mr. President, the issue in controversy on the C-5A is the \$200 million in so-called contingency funds, which is an amount in excess of the contract ceiling as interpreted by the Air Force. I would note at this point that the contractor does not agree with the Air Force position. Moreover, the committee takes no position on the merits of the contractual disagreement. We are not trying to say which one is right—the contractor or the Air Force. We are not saying it now. Of course, it shall be the duty of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force to represent the Federal Government with vigilance in settling with the contractor as to the contractor's obligation and the Air Force's obligation under the original contract. No one has waived anything. The Federal Government is not waiving anything. The committee does not want to inferentially waive anything. But the committee says that it is the duty of the Department of Defense and the Air Force to represent the Federal Government with vigilance in settling with the contractor as to his obligation and what is the obligation of the Air Force.

The C-5A matter received the most intensive consideration by the committee. In fact, four different hearings were held. Mr. Packard, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, appeared before the committee on three separate occasions in connection with the C-5A. In addition, the Secretary of the Air Force and other military officials testified separately on the matter. The fact is that unless additional funding is authorized, the contractor will be without the financial resources to proceed with the C-5A program after about December 31 of this year. The committee therefore decided, for the reasons I have outlined, to recommend that the program proceed under certain restrictive conditions.

Mr. President, the committee was of the firm view that this \$200 million in contingency funds should not be used until there is a complete understanding as to how the \$200 million will be utilized. The committee, as a part of the bill itself, is recommending statutory language providing that none of the \$200 million will be obligated until the Secretary of Defense has submitted a plan for the use of the \$200 million and this plan has been approved by both the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services. In effect, Mr. President, there will be submitted to the two committees for approval not only a plan for the use of the \$200 million, but also an overall proposal



as to how the remaining portion of the 81-plane program will be completed. This plan must necessarily set forth what will be the proposed final arrangement between the Government and the contractor with regard to the completion of this program.

That is a matter that the committee, naturally, would not seek and would not like to get into. But this is a situation in which the Government should have this plan. It must utilize the moneys already spent. Someone has to share part of that responsibility, and we decided that we had the history and the staff and the means of getting at this matter, and we, therefore, decided that the committee should assume this responsibility.

The second provision insures that the \$200 million in contingency funds will be used only for the C-5A program insofar as the contractor is concerned. I can accurately state that this provision is the tightest statutory language ever drawn from a defense contract with respect to precluding any possible intermingling or diversion of these funds to other programs of the contractor. The Defense Department has indicated that it is in agreement with this restrictive language. That restrictive language will require that, as a part of the plan that Mr. Packard brings back to the committee, it will have to include compliance with this language, so that it is airtight, that this money is going to be used in the channels here that will produce these planes for us.

#### SOUNDNESS OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, with respect to the soundness of the C-5A, a rather complete report by a special group has been submitted to the Department of Defense indicating certain problems with regard to the aircraft. The Armed Services Committee has been assured by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Packard, that he is of the firm opinion that the technical problems which have arisen in connection with the plane can be resolved.

With the exception of those categories in that report, everything else about the plane is favorable. It is being flown now extensively and is in the process of evaluation and testing. I think it has been flown by a member of our committee and perhaps by another Member of the Senate, and those things will come out in the debate. We followed up on this special group, submitting a report; and Mr. Packard, with his open frankness about matters and with his experience, said that that problem can be resolved. Anyway, it is his responsibility, with the special attention we are requiring to this contract from here on out, to cover not only that point but also to have a plan that covers the other and protects the Government in every way.

In summary, Mr. President, in the interest of wise management and the need for this specialized aircraft for our national defense, the committee thinks that the Senate should proceed to approve the entire funds requested for the C-5A program.

#### PROCUREMENT ARMY AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, the committee recommends a total of \$292.1 million for the

procurement of 814 Army aircraft. I should note that all of these are helicopters, and 600 are of one type—the OH-58 observation helicopter. About 65 percent of this number will be to replace losses, and about 35 percent will represent a modernization program by replacing the older and less efficient types.

#### NAVY AND MARINE CORPS AIRCRAFT

The committee recommends a total of \$2,337.7 million for the procurement of 259 aircraft. This number, Mr. President, represents the smallest number of aircraft procured by the Navy since 1946. By any standard, Mr. President, this is a most austere program, and even with this buy, the average age of aircraft in the Navy inventory will increase rather than hold its own.

I would like to mention several separate items. The Navy aircraft request contains funds of \$658 million in the procurement amount for 26 F-14A's. I would observe that this is the new air superiority fighter for the Navy and, as the Senate may recall, is the follow-on for the TFX which was cancelled as a Navy program. That cancellation, by the Navy, and the start of a new plane, was a congressional act.

This aircraft, which is a long-deferred modernization item, will enter the fleet in the 1973-1975 time period and will replace the F-4 which dates to 1955 in terms of technology. The Navy must have a modern fighter capable of air superiority against any potential enemy.

I would also mention that the bill as passed by the House contained \$79 million for two of the S-3A antisubmarine warfare carrier-based aircraft. This is a new program, Mr. President, and the committee recommends that this sum be deleted from the procurement account and transferred to the research and development account since these are, in effect, test aircraft and should be more properly in the research and development program.

#### AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT

The committee recommends an authorization of \$3,225.5 million involving the procurement of 375 aircraft. This request represents a reduction of \$89.4 million under the House and \$148.8 million less than the amount recommended by Defense.

Mr. President, I would emphasize that the 375 aircraft are the smallest number that have been procured by the Air Force since 1935, and I should add also that over half of this 375—that is, the smaller aircraft—are earmarked not for our Air Force, but for the free world forces. Those are small planes and helicopters.

Several items deserve special mention. First, the request of \$30 million in procurement funds for the so-called International Freedom Fighter was denied by the committee on the premise that \$28 million was authorized in fiscal year 1970 which has not yet been expended. Moreover, in view of the need for austerity for the entire Defense program, this item is not of the highest priority.

Mr. President, the F-111F aircraft also deserves special mention. The bill contains \$563.3 million for this item, of which \$283 million is for new aircraft procurement and the remainder for prior

over target costs and other items, all of which are set forth on page 27 of the committee report. I would emphasize that this is the only all-weather, deep interdiction tactical aircraft that will be in the Air Force inventory.

The Senate generally is familiar with the long history of structural problems on this fighter. Because of the need for this aircraft, however, the committee is recommending approval, but only on two conditions. First, it is on the understanding that the funds in this year's bill will represent the final procurement of this aircraft, and the committee has received a formal statement from the Air Force to this effect. Second, the committee has recommended statutory language which will preclude the obligation of any of the \$283 million for new aircraft until certain certifications are made by the Secretary of Defense to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services insuring that the structural problems of this aircraft have been successfully resolved. In other words, this aircraft must be completely airworthy in every sense of the word before this new money can be obligated. That item has been one of some controversy in the past. It is the last active buy of the old TFX. It is the last one that the committee will approve and the last time the Air Force will request it. One of the big points is that this is the only all-weather, deep interdiction tactical aircraft that will be in the Air Force inventory. There are some there like this, but this will fill out the last part.

#### MISSILES

##### ARMY MISSILES

Mr. President, the committee is recommending authorization of \$1,031.6 million for the procurement of Army missiles. The largest element in the Army missile procurement account is \$650.4 million for Safeguard, which I have previously discussed. Of the remaining items, the largest is \$106.3 million for the TOW missile, the Army antitank missile, which is the wire-guided missile that will be used by Army combat troops against enemy tanks.

I would observe, Mr. President, that the committee deleted a \$37 million request for the procurement of the Hawk antiaircraft missile in view of the unused prior-year appropriations already available for this item and the only partially successful testing program for this item.

##### NAVY MISSILES

The committee is recommending approval of \$932.4 million for Navy missiles for fiscal year 1971, covering 12 different items.

Mr. President, I would observe that of the total, \$559 million constitutes funding for the ballistic missile program—\$540.5 million for Poseidon, and \$18.5 million for Polaris.

##### MARINE CORPS MISSILES

Mr. President, the committee is recommending \$12.8 million for the Marine Corps missile program. This is a reduction of \$14.8 million which represents the deletion of the funds for the procurement of the improved Hawk for the reasons I have already cited in connection with the Army Hawk program. The ground support equipment for this item was not deleted, however.

## AIR FORCE MISSILES

Mr. President, the committee recommends a total of \$1,479.4 million for the Air Force missile request. The largest single item is \$475.7 million for the Minuteman II and III programs.

## NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

The committee recommends an authorization of \$2,276.9 million for the Navy shipbuilding and conversion program for fiscal year 1971. This represents \$452 million less than the \$2,728.9 million recommended by the Department of Defense and is \$737 million below the amount recommended by the House, which was \$3,013.9 million. In support of the general fiscal year 1971 shipbuilding and conversion program, Mr. President, the amounts recommended, in the opinion of the committee, are the bare minimum which are essential for modernizing the over-aging fleet of United States Navy. Let me emphasize, "modernizing the over-aging fleet."

At the present time, the Navy has about 750 ships in the active fleet and approximately 47 percent of these are over 20 years of age. This country has reached the point where adequate modernization can no longer be delayed if we are to have an effective modern naval force. The entire shipbuilding and conversion program, together with the committee's action on each item, is set forth in the committee report on pages 55 through 60.

In line with the need for austerity the committee did make certain deletions.

The committee deleted an addition of \$435 million by the House for five additional naval vessels of various types. These items were not in the President's budget request although the Secretary of Defense did indicate that if the ships were authorized and appropriated for, the funds would be obligated. The Senate committee felt, however, that in view of the necessity for austerity, these ships should not be funded this year.

## DISAPPROVAL OF FUNDS FOR NUCLEAR ATTACK CARRIER

The committee has recommended the deletion of funds for the procurement of the lead items in the amount of \$152 million for the third *Nimitz* class carrier known as the CVAN-70.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that the committee did not reject the concept of an additional carrier. That was expressly understood by each member of the committee. The committee's action was based on the fact that the executive branch of the Government has not made a firm, unconditional budget request for this item. The request for \$152 million was contained in the President's budget. However, the budget message stated that the funds, even if approved, would not be obligated until studies on the need for the carrier had been completed by the National Security Council. The committee, just prior to markup of the bill, requested the Secretary of Defense to provide a final position of the executive branch on the CVAN-70, and we were advised that the position had not been changed. Under the circumstances, the committee did not feel justified in recommending the \$152 million in lead funds.

I should also note, Mr. President, that as a result of a provision in last year's authorization bill directing a joint study by the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services on the need for the CVAN-70, a joint subcommittee of the two committees was appointed. Extensive testimony was taken; a subcommittee report has been issued; and the hearings totaling 768 pages have been published.

I would make two observations, Mr. President: First, a majority of the subcommittee recommended the additional carrier, principally on the basis of need for modernity and second, the joint subcommittee made every effort to obtain and seek out all witnesses who might want to testify against the concept of the carrier—and I might add there was some difficulty in this regard.

We did have certain outside witnesses who gave different points of view. Some of those who were thought to be in opposition, however, did not appear. I would observe that we also had testimony from the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) on this matter.

Mr. President, I personally made quite an effort to get some outstanding witnesses to appear in opposition to the concept of a carrier.

I remember over the telephone one very outstanding man, who asked to be excused, saying that all he could contribute would be about the same as any other witness. He could give the pros and the cons. And there were some well understood pros on the matter and oft-repeated cons.

That is about the way that any kind of a hearing or investigation of this matter would turn out. Personally, I believe that the greatest single deterrent force we have day after day around the world is the proper presence of these carriers at key points in key areas of the world. They have a tremendous potential. They can be seen by any seaman or by people on the shorelines and have been for years, time after time. That is not to say that we threaten anyone or that we have a reputation of being a Nation that threatens other nations. But I think the psychology of this great power, its availability and movability, is a tremendous factor in maintaining the balance of power in the world in which we are now living.

## DELEGATION OF HOUSE LANGUAGE PROBLEMS

Mr. President, on page 56 of the committee report the committee indicated its reasons for deleting three statutory provisions contained in the House bill relating to the shipbuilding and conversion program. These concern, first, the requirement that \$600 million of the shipbuilding request be spent only in naval shipyards; second, that no fiscal year 1971 shipbuilding funds be obligated until a recommendation has been received from the National Security Council on the CVAN-70; and, third, the provision requiring that the contract for the DD-963 destroyer program provide for the construction in at least two shipyards.

As I say, these matters are covered in full on page 56 of the report. It was de-

ecided after consideration and discussion not to include those. They will be in conference and will have such consideration as the conferees see fit to give to any of them.

The matter concerning the amount of money that would be spent only in naval shipyards, as I recall, is actually usually settled in conference, where it can be done in rather excellent fashion.

## TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES

Mr. President, for the Army the committee is recommending \$182.2 million for fiscal year 1971 for tracked combat vehicles. This amount can be compared to \$206.2 million in the House bill and \$207.2 million in the budget request.

For the Marine Corps and the Navy, the committee recommends the amount of \$47.4 million as compared to \$48.4 million which is the sum of both the House version and the budget request. This account covers the procurement of tanks, personnel carriers, and other tracked vehicles, all of which are set forth by line item in the committee report.

Mr. President, this category covers the entire Army tank program and I shall devote some brief remarks to the requested programs.

The Army request contains funds for three different tanks. The first is the M60A1 which is the basic standard tank, or what I refer to as the workhorse. The committee is recommending \$56.7 million for this item which will permit the procurement of 300 of these tanks.

The next tank is known as the M60A1E2. This is the tank started in 1965 which represented an attempt to adapt the Shillelagh missile to the old model tank, M60A1. Funds have been provided in prior years, but the technical problems have never been resolved. Under the circumstances, the committee has deleted the \$12.1 million for further work on this tank. These funds would have continued the effort of resolving the technical problems involved in the marriage of the Shillelagh to the M60A1. The committee was of the opinion that this program was at the point where no further investment should be made and all energies should be concentrated on projecting the M60A1 and on refining and accelerating the development of the MBT-70, the main battle tank. That is the one in the process of researching.

I am able to report to the Senate that all of the investment will not be lost since a substantial number of the chassis for the so-called M60A1E2 tank can be used for the standard M60A1 tank to be produced. The M60A1 program was reduced from \$67.6 million to \$56.7 million because of the application of savings resulting from the cancellation of the M60A1E2 program.

The last tank item concerns the MBT-70, known as the main battle tank. Mr. President, the bill contains a total request of \$77 million for this item—\$36 million for research and development plus \$41 million for advanced production engineering. This tank, which is still in the development stage, has undergone considerable change as compared to fiscal year 1970. It will be produced independently of Germany and will be on a much



more austere basis as a result of the program reviews which have been undertaken by Mr. Packard, the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, we must have a new tank for the 1975-80 time frame, and the MBT-70 in its revised program offers the only hope of attaining this goal. The committee, therefore, strongly urges the approval of this request for \$77 million.

I would like to say a special word on that. Along with other Senators, I made a special effort to get information and try to find out what the trouble was. I think that we got to the bottom of this matter.

We brought one witness back from the Armed Forces in the field, near the Czechoslovakian border. He is an outstanding Army colonel. I had seen him in action as head of the training units over there. He is unusually well qualified from the standpoint of being a field soldier and a fighting colonel to testify on this matter. I especially refer any Senator interested in the matter to his testimony. He was quite convincing in covering this matter.

Mr. President, I shall supply the page number and the volume where his testimony is to be found. The hearings on page 1444 contain the testimony of Col. Paul Baltas on this matter.

#### OTHER WEAPONS

Mr. President, as a result of an amendment last year to the military procurement bill, there is now a new category which requires an authorization prior to appropriation known as other weapons. In fact, this category covers weapons which serve individuals and crews and for the most part consists of machine-guns and rifles. The total request for the Army account for fiscal year 1971 for this category being recommended by the committee is \$67.2 million, and for the Navy and Marine Corps, \$4.4 million. The only adjustment made by the committee was a slight reduction of \$1 million representing a recognition of prior funding already available for this purpose. I would note as a matter of interest that this Army request includes \$27.1 million for the procurement of 253,738 M-16 rifles. The committee has eliminated restrictive language added by the House concerning manufacture of the M-16 rifle with fiscal year 1971 funding.

#### REQUIREMENT FOR AUTHORIZATION OF TORPEDOES BEGINNING FISCAL YEAR 1972

Mr. President, as a result of the development problems that have arisen in connection with the Mark-48 torpedo, the committee has recommended language in the bill requiring that beginning in fiscal year 1972 the procurement of naval torpedoes will be authorized prior to an appropriation, in the same manner as for other weapons now contained in the bill.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, I now turn to the research and development portion of this bill. I have already made a separate speech on this feature of this legislation. The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) will also treat research and development funding requests in great depth. I hope he has some remarks to make on it today. My remarks at this

point, therefore, will be limited to the highlights of the committee's research and development actions.

Mr. President, the committee is recommending a total of \$7.016 billion for research and development for the Department of Defense representing a reduction of \$385 million below the Department of Defense request and \$249.1 million below the House bill. In reality the Senate committee is reducing the research and development programs by a total of \$464.1 million or 6.3 percent below the request. There was a transfer of \$79 million for two S-3A aircraft from the Navy procurement budget to the research and development account which has reduced the dollar reduction to \$385.1 million.

#### TWO SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, I would emphasize to the Senate that out of this \$7 billion being reduced only about \$400 million goes to basic research. More than \$3.7 billion, or over half the entire Research and Development budget, is spent for engineering and operational development programs which involve the actual fabrication of completed weapons systems used for the test program.

Another large segment of the program, about \$1.2 billion, pays for the management and maintenance of the Department of Defense test and research and development organization. There are included the salaries of 88,000 civilian personnel—scientists, engineers, and technicians.

That is one of the most extensive and most important aspects of this entire military program. I mention these aspects to indicate the vast magnitude of the Research and Development program.

#### SPECIAL ITEMS IN THE BILL

Mr. President, the committee report from page 70 through 100 discusses in detail the Research and Development funding requests. I shall mention only several highlights of the committee action.

First. The \$17.6 million requested for further development of the Cheyenne helicopter was deleted in view of the committee's approval of \$27.9 million for the AX for the Air Force program and \$17 million for the Army advanced helicopter technology program.

Second. The committee reduced by \$50 million—from \$100 to \$50 million—the request for development funds for the B-1 advanced bomber for the Air Force. The committee observes that \$65 million of funds approved last year remain unobligated.

Third. The committee denied the request for \$33.6 million for the subsonic cruise armed decoy because the Department of Defense has delayed the start of this program, and some \$8 million of fiscal year 1970 funds approved have not been used.

#### LANGUAGE PROVISIONS ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, there are several language provisions being recommended by the committee, none of which were contained in the House bill, which deserve special mention.

#### DEFENSE-RELATED REQUIREMENT

The committee has recommended in section 204 of the bill the reenactment of the restriction adopted on the Senate floor last year which prohibits the use of any research and development funds for research projects and studies unless they have a direct and apparent relationship to a specific military function.

This provision sponsored last year on the Senate floor by Senator MANSFIELD has proved to be a very effective and worthwhile control on the defense research and development program and the committee is recommending its reenactment for fiscal year 1971.

#### INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, the committee is recommending a new provision of law for the control of independent research and development within the Department of Defense. This provision now set forth as section 203 is the result of long and intensive hearings by Senator McINTYRE's subcommittee. This activity which has not been the subject of a budgetary control will be under a ceiling of \$625 million for fiscal year 1971 as well as under certain other controls set forth in the provision.

#### DOMESTIC APPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill, as a result of a recommendation by Senator BROOKE, contains a provision set forth in section 205 which will provide for the creation of interdepartmental machinery under which Defense research and development projects, where applicable, may be utilized for civilian domestic purposes. Certain permissive grant authority is also contained in this section.

#### CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE PROVISIONS

The remaining language change for research and development relates to certain provisos regarding chemical and biological warfare: First, reinstating last year's provision prohibiting procurement of delivery systems for lethal chemical and biological warfare agents; second, adoption of provision relating to safety procedures with respect to the disposal of lethal chemical and warfare agents; and, third, proviso directing a study on the ecological and physiological effects of the use of herbicides.

#### CONTINUED AUTHORITY FOR THE USE OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971 FOR FREE WORLD FORCES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. President, this bill continues for fiscal year 1971, with two modifications, the same authority that has been enacted for each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1966, authorizing the use of defense appropriations for the support of the Vietnamese and other free world forces as well as local forces in Laos and Thailand.

Let me first emphasize that this authority does not relate to the use of funds for U.S. forces. These funds relate only to what we call foreign military aid. It does, however, authorize the use of Defense funds for the support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam and, as amended by the committee, or certain limited operations in Cambodia and for local forces in Laos and Thailand. This support and related

costs is authorized on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine.

As a matter of historical interest, Mr. President, this provision was adopted for fiscal year 1966 in order to accomplish a merger of funding for the support of allied forces in a combat area with that of the U.S. forces engaged in the same area. This was the practice followed during the Korean war.

Ordinarily this is what we would call foreign military aid, but for the reason given here it has been handled since fiscal year 1966 in this bill. It really is not related to military procurement and authorization. I do not think that they both should be in the same bill, although our committee is not running from the handling of this matter, especially as long as the war is going on. Next year if they insist on putting them both in the same bill. I want our committee to insist on taking it out of the military procurement bill and putting it into a separate bill so that it will be brought here as a separate matter. It is confusing, in a way, in the debate, to have all these items concerning research programs, all the authorizations concerning tanks, airplanes, missiles and everything else, tied in with policy questions on how the war should be operated.

#### COMMITTEE LIMITATION OF \$2,500 MILLION

The bill as passed by the House contained no ceiling on the amount of funds that could be used for the support of free world forces under this authority. The committee has adopted a limitation of \$2.5 billion which could be used for this purpose from fiscal 1971 funds. This ceiling is identical to that adopted for 1970 funds.

#### CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY

Since fiscal 1966 a provision has authorized the use of defense funds for the support of the "Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam."

When this bill was before our committee the Cambodian sanctuary take-over was raging as a part of the battle in South Vietnam. The words "in Vietnam"—all this activity was limited to South Vietnam itself—have given rise to some doubt as to whether such funds are available for support of the free world forces outside of Vietnam in the so-called sanctuaries of Cambodia. In order to remove any doubt in this matter the committee deleted the words "in Vietnam" and substituted the words "in support of Vietnamese forces." The reason for this substitution is discussed in detail in the committee report on pages 105 to 107. Our reason was to make clear that this authority did extend to the support of free world forces in border sanctuaries and related operations in Cambodia in order to accomplish protective reaction strikes or to protect U.S. forces in Vietnam. The entire purpose, of course, of any operations in Cambodia would be to accelerate the Vietnamization program or protect the U.S. forces.

It still is a limitation of the use of these funds as far as this authorization goes to matters concerning the taking of sanctuaries and related activities and the protection of our own troops and the

carrying out of the Vietnamization program.

The word "Vietnamization" is a rather long word there, but it means that the use of this money must have to have some relationship to the President's program as carried out so far in a broad sense in the recent operation.

I would emphasize, as the report states, that there was no intent to permit the use of Defense appropriations under this authority to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the Cambodian Government.

I personally did not want us to undertake—not through this method here; I do not favor it under any circumstances that I know of here—to underwrite the sustaining of the Cambodian Government. We already have our hands full.

The committee's basic purpose was to allow a reasonable latitude for operations in these limited areas of Cambodia for the purposes I have already explained.

There was no other plan of operation before the committee. I want to make clear that, as far as I know and believe, the President of the United States has not made any promises to the Government of Cambodia. I do not want to leave any possible inference from what I have said on that score, and I say there was no other plan presented to the committee.

I have said many times that I thought if Asia was going to save itself, it was going to have to be done by the help of Asian nations, one to the other. If there is a good, clean, clear-cut plan for the use of mercenaries—and I do not think that is a bad term—I am not saying I would be opposed to that, but if it is tied in in any way with the underwriting or sustaining of any other government or any other country in Southeast Asia, I think that is beyond our call of duty and beyond the call of reason. As far as any clear-cut plan is concerned with respect to mercenary troops, if the President wants it and is going to be responsible for it, I would not rule that out at all, in my view, as a part of some additional legislative effort.

#### REQUIREMENT OF CONSENT FOR DEFENSE ARTICLES GIVEN TO THIRD PARTIES BY SOUTHEAST ASIAN COUNTRIES

The bill also contains a provision set forth in section 502(a)(2) which requires notification to and consent of the U.S. Government in the event Southeast Asian countries transfer U.S. defense articles received by them to third countries. This authority is similar to that already contained in existing law with regard to items now furnished under the military assistance program and the military sales program. This provision was adopted following a suggestion of Senator SYMINGTON.

#### AUTHORITY FOR THE SALE OF AIRCRAFT TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. President, the committee in section 501 of the bill has recommended a statutory provision which authorizes the transfer of aircraft and supporting equipment by this country to the State of Israel on the basis of sale, credit sale,

or guaranty. The committee adopted this provision on the premise that the special authority was justified in order to provide the State of Israel with a greater means for its own security.

#### PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE SELECTED RESERVES

Mr. President, existing law requires that the personnel strength of each of the selected reserve components be authorized on an annual basis.

For fiscal year 1971 the committee has recommended all of the strengths contained in the House bill and as recommended by the executive branch except for the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve. Except for the Coast Guard the total strengths being recommended for the Department of Defense components total 972,514, with each element as follows:

Army National Guard.....	400,000
Army Reserve.....	260,000
Naval Reserve.....	129,000
Marine Corps Reserve.....	47,715
Air National Guard.....	87,878
Air Force Reserve.....	47,921

For the Coast Guard Reserve the committee has recommended an average strength for fiscal year 1971 of 10,000. The budget submission recommended a zero strength for fiscal 1971 and the House version of the bill recommended a total strength of 16,590.

#### SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. President, the foregoing remarks summarized the various provisions of the pending legislation. It is an adequate bill and it is also an austere bill which represents the minimum in the judgment of the committee necessary to support the increment of hardware and research and development for fiscal 1971.

On that basis, I urge the Senate to give the bill its full support.

Let me say this, in addition. These are not casual things we have in the bill. They have been well considered by the committee membership, all of whom have had some experience in these matters and some of whom have had a great deal of experience. It was determined that, whatever our recommendations were going to be, they were going to be developed on facts and proof by responsible people, and that proof was to be developed by knowledgeable people and checked out, and contrary witnesses called where it was thought necessary. Some of the hearings were open. As many of them are open as we thought possible.

I again call special attention to the report and the testimony, all of which is as complete as could be made under the circumstances.

I repeat again, our staff is ready, and I know they are able, and I know they are willing, to go into any matter with reference to this entire important measure, that any Member of the Senate, off the committee or on the committee, might wish.

In that spirit and on those facts, we are honored to present the bill to be considered by the Senate.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. McINTYRE. For the purpose of



emphasis, would our chairman again state the request of the Department of Defense as initially coming to us as opposed to what we are recommending, so that the record will indicate clearly the amount of the reduction that our committee in this particular area is recommending?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to do that. There are two answers to that question, in this way: We took out of the military construction bill \$334 million, as the Senator knows, on the Safeguard. So I will give an answer leaving that change out and then give an answer including it.

The Department of Defense requested

for procurement, research, and development \$20.271 billion. We recommended for procurement, research, and development \$18.9 billion. The House has recommended \$20.237 billion for that purpose.

That leaves in the Senate bill for those items \$18.9 billion as against the Department of Defense request of \$20.271 billion.

However, when we add in the \$334 million to which I referred, which we took from another bill for the sake of uniformity in debate and presentation, our bill then contains \$19,242,889,000.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I thank the Senator. I also wish to commend our distinguished chairman for his fine explanatory remarks concerning this difficult bill, be-

cause this undoubtedly signals the debater that will occupy this distinguished body for let us hope not longer than the next 4 weeks.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator very much, and I thank him for what he did in making this bill possible and for taking part in the debate.

Mr. President, in connection with the Senator's question, I ask unanimous consent that page 8 of the report on this subject, which gives the statistics in reference to this matter, be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

SUMMARY BY MAJOR CATEGORY—ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND DEFENSE AGENCIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Procurement	Authorized 1970	Appropriated 1970	Prior year programs to be reauthor- ized (included in total re- quested 1971)	Total re- quested 1971	House		Senate Armed Services Committee	
					Change from request	Authorized	Change from House	Recommended amount
<b>Aircraft:</b>								
Army.....	570,400	554,400	(2,400)	296,900	-2,400	294,500	-2,400	292,100
Navy and Marine Corps.....	2,391,200	1,826,200	(35,500)	2,487,700	-35,500	2,452,200	-114,500	2,337,700
Air Force.....	3,965,700	3,730,800	(59,400)	3,374,300	-59,400	3,314,900	-89,400	3,225,500
Subtotal.....	6,927,300	6,111,400	(97,300)	6,158,900	-97,300	6,061,600	-206,300	5,855,300
<b>Missiles:</b>								
Army.....	880,460	831,900	(8,000)	1,094,600	-8,000	1,086,600	-55,000	1,031,600
Navy.....	851,300	818,800	(7,500)	983,000	-36,400	946,600	-14,200	932,400
Marine Corps.....	20,100	3,400		27,600		27,600	-14,800	12,800
Air Force.....	1,486,400	1,448,100	(14,000)	1,544,600	-39,300	1,505,300	-25,900	1,479,400
Subtotal.....	3,238,260	3,102,200	(29,500)	3,649,800	-83,700	3,566,100	-109,900	3,456,200
<b>Naval vessels: Navy</b>	2,983,200	2,490,300	(150,000)	2,728,900	+285,000	3,013,900	-737,000	2,276,900
<b>Tracked combat vehicles:</b>								
Army.....	228,000	201,100	(1,000)	207,200	-1,000	206,200	-24,000	182,200
Marine Corps.....	37,700	37,700		48,700		48,700	-1,300	47,400
Subtotal.....	265,700	238,800	(1,000)	255,900	-1,000	254,900	-25,300	229,600
<b>Other weapons:</b>								
Army.....			(1,000)	69,200	-1,000	68,200	-1,000	67,200
Navy.....				2,789		2,789		2,789
Marine Corps.....				4,400		4,400		4,400
Subtotal.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	(1,000)	76,389	-1,000	75,389	-1,000	74,389
<b>Total procurement</b>	13,414,460	11,942,700	(278,800)	12,869,889	+102,000	12,971,889	-1,079,500	11,892,389
<b>Research, development, test, and evaluation:</b>								
Army.....	1,646,055	1,596,820	(18,000)	1,735,900	-88,000	1,647,900	-38,700	1,609,200
Navy (including Marine Corps).....	1,968,235	2,186,400	(15,000)	2,212,300	-15,000	2,197,300	-3,000	2,194,300
Air Force.....	3,156,552	3,060,600	(18,000)	2,927,700	-18,000	2,909,700	-191,700	2,718,000
Defense agencies.....	450,200	450,000	(5,000)	475,700	-15,000	460,700	-15,700	445,000
Emergency fund.....	75,000	75,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Total, R.D.T. & E.....	7,296,042	7,368,820	(56,000)	7,401,600	-136,000	7,265,600	-249,100	7,016,500
<b>Total procurement and R.D.T. &amp; E.</b>	20,710,502	19,311,520	(334,800)	20,271,489	-34,000	20,237,489	-1,328,600	18,908,889
<b>Military construction, SAFEGUARD</b>	12,700	12,700		325,200		325,200		325,200
<b>Family housing, SAFEGUARD</b>				8,800		8,800		8,800
<b>Grand total</b>	20,723,202	19,324,220	(334,800)	20,605,489	-34,000	20,571,489	-1,328,600	19,242,889

<sup>1</sup> Authorization for other weapons not required prior to fiscal year 1971.

<sup>2</sup> Of this amount, \$350,000,000 to be derived by transfer from stock funds.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as soon as I finish yielding for questions, I shall be glad to yield the floor.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I, too, commend the Senator from Mississippi for his, as usual, extremely able explanation of a highly complicated bill.

I should like to ask the Senator about the C-5A once again, because I want to get clear in my mind what the issue is. I must say that the Senator and the report of the committee present a very powerful case for going ahead with authorization above the contract, and substantially above the contract.

As I understand it, the original contract called for something like \$3.7 billion for 120 planes. If we go ahead with the fourth alternative listed here on page

18, which is the full 81 planes, the cost will be \$800 million above that, as I understand it, so that the cost per plane would then be \$56 million, which compares with a much lower contract cost, of course, even if the highest figure in the contract were assumed—and the contract was one which had a low and a high estimate involved.

I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if either the committee or the Pentagon has given any consideration to securing another tenant, someone else to complete this operation. I ask that question in all seriousness, because this plant in Marietta, Ga., in which the plane is being built is owned 100 percent by the Federal Government, as the Senator knows; the equipment, much of the equipment is owned by the Govern-

ment; progress payments have been paid to the tune of 90 to 100 percent, including labor costs, and so forth, by the Federal Government.

One could make the case that the Lockheed Co. has not been competent. Certainly it has not been efficient. The costs have been very, very high, and I wonder what consideration has been given to trying to determine, whether some other concern could do this more efficiently, and complete the job more efficiently, especially in view of the fact that the latest report we have on the plane states that it is deficient in some respects, and has had a lot of trouble with its wings, that that may have to be restructured and reworked, and there has been some degradation in its cargo carrying capacity, and so forth.

What consideration has been given to getting another manufacturer?

Mr. STENNIS. Some consideration has been given to the Senator's question. As I recall, he and I talked a little about it one day unofficially, not in debate. Several Senators have discussed this matter with others who are informed in this field, but frankly, the committee relied largely upon Mr. Packard, the Assistant Secretary of Defense. He has given a lot of attention to this matter, as shown in the unclassified part of the record, and he advised against it.

One of the main points is that there is no dispute, it seems, about Lockheed having the skilled men and the know-how; and even though there is a fracture in the wing, which is not unusual, it is a going concern, I mean the wheels are turning and the know-how is there, and to undertake a change of management and a shifting of all this would be a monstrous undertaking. My commonsense makes me back off from it, just on the surface.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That may well be. My question was, however, that it seems to me, in view of the record of Lockheed on the C-5A, that this question ought to be explored. We ought to at least have from the Department of Defense some evidence that they have given the matter consideration to the extent of discussing it, say, with Boeing and some of the other outstanding aircraft manufacturers, to see if there is any possibility that they could step in.

If this were Lockheed's plant and equipment, and they were not receiving Government progress payments that would be one thing; but it is not. It is really a Government operation, with Lockheed management providing a product that is a failure.

Mr. STENNIS. It is a part of Lockheed's nationwide operations, as the Senator knows. It happens that this is an old Government plant, that is true. But this matter is, except for the repetitious making of additional planes, almost over now. The know-how has all gone into it, and the operation, except moneyness, has been rather successful.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Are we really assured? Does the Senator feel very confident that this additional \$800 million would be all that would be necessary to get us the 81 planes? Is that pretty definite and clear in the Senator's mind? Of course, he cannot make a guarantee.

Mr. STENNIS. No.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But I am saying, does he feel strongly that there will be no further overrun?

Mr. STENNIS. There is a sum to be added to the figure the Senator has mentioned. The Senator mentioned \$800 million?

Mr. PROXMIRE. \$800 million; yes.

Mr. STENNIS. \$800 million is the best estimate that we now have as to what will be required. As the Senator says, we cannot guarantee it, but we think that is in the neighborhood of being the correct amount. That is the amount we had to admit to ourselves we were passing on, frankly, when we recommended the amount in the bill.

That whole thing, though, as I pointed

out earlier in the argument as to the \$200 million, is subject to negotiation, and this whole \$800 million would be subject to negotiation as between Lockheed and the Air Force and the Department of Defense, as to where the line is as to whose obligation this is, and to what point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is clear that \$800 million would not be, if we stick by the contract, the obligation of the Federal Government at all. This is an additional obligation beyond the contract, as I understand the committee report.

Mr. STENNIS. No, I do not think we can assume finally that it is going to cost the Government that much, because that is assuming that the obligation has already been defined. The committee does not agree to that, and the contractor claims that it is going to be due more than that sum under the contract, more than the Air Force claims will be due.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The words of the report—just one short sentence—are as follows:

In other words, after the \$344.4 million owed under the contract is authorized, additional funds of \$800 million will be required for 50 additional planes resulting in an average cost—

And so forth.

In other words, it seems that this is the present estimate of the committee. The Senator says it may be less than that, but that is subject to negotiation; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Well, we wanted to be certain to present the whole picture to the Senate. So that \$800 million there, in our judgment, is the most that it will cost the Government additionally.

Now, if the Lockheed people, though, are able to prove that they are entitled to more money under the contract than the Air Force now admits, then they will have that much, whatever they prove, as a matter of right and not as a contingency. But it is going to cost the Government about \$800 million more.

However, as I emphasized, Lockheed claims that it has a right to some of the \$800 million under the contract, even.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So that, altogether, after we authorize an additional \$344.4 million, which is what the contract calls for, then there would be another \$800 million. That \$800 million may partly be due under the contract, if this is the court's interpretation; but in any event, that seems to be what is required to complete the 81 planes?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct about it being the approximate amount that we think now will be required to finish the contract. Negotiation, or the court, will say how much Lockheed is entitled to under the contract.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the military authorization bill is a very intricate and meticulous one. It has received the most careful consideration in the committee, and at this time, I should like to commend the able chairman for the splendid manner in which he handled this bill in the committee, and also for the succinct and, I think, comprehensive

explanation that the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has presented here on the floor today.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. We feel that this bill has received every possible fine combing, and that it should be approved now by the full Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from South Carolina, and in the same breath I want to thank him, too, for the very valuable aid that he has given all year in getting at the facts in the case and putting this bill together. His attendance record has been good, and he has expressed himself well, and I hope that he seeks now and obtains the floor and gives us the benefit of his version.

May I mention again our obligation and indebtedness to the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), who is certainly a big part of this bill. She attended the hearings faithfully and was at every session of the markup. With her usual good judgment, commonsense, and special preparation, we want her to be back before action on this bill is completed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I speak in favor of the fiscal year 1971 military authorization bill and I commend the able chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for his succinct, yet comprehensive, explanation of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, notice should be taken of the absence of the distinguished and able ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine. Senator SMITH had an operation earlier this month, but in recent correspondence with her I was pleased to learn that she is well on the way to a complete recovery.

Her counsel and leadership will be missed during the debate on the military authorization bill, but I hope and expect that she will be able to join us here on the floor prior to final passage. The scene in the Senate will not be complete until this truly remarkable lady is once again at her desk in the front row of this august body.

Mr. President, as the ranking member of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and one of the senior members of the full committee, I can say without fear of contradiction that few pieces of legislation have been studied reviewed, or debated by the committee members more than H.R. 17123. This thorough study was outlined a few minutes ago by our distinguished chairman.

While I support the committee bill, it is not without some misgivings and reservations. It is my opinion that this bill has been cut too much.

The Senate and Congress should not lose sight of the fact that the defense budget for fiscal year 1971 is only 34.6 percent of the total 1971 budget, the lowest percent going to defense since fiscal year 1950.

It should also be remembered that funds allocated for defense by the Nixon administration are down \$9.8 billion from the fiscal year 1970 budget submitted by the Johnson administration.

Also, defense spending fell from 9.5



percent of the gross national product in fiscal year 1968 to 7 percent in fiscal year 1971, the lowest share since fiscal year 1950.

The impact of these sharp cutbacks has been felt in both the Defense Department and the defense industry. More than 640,000 employees in defense industries have been affected by the reductions of the past 2 years and 682,000 military and civilian employees have been laid off by the Department of Defense in the past 2 years.

Further, it should be noted that cutbacks in the nonpersonnel portion of the budget are even greater. Purchases of goods and contractual services will decline by over 20 percent from fiscal year 1969 to fiscal year 1971.

With this background it should be easily understood why there is reason for concern in connection with the cuts in the committee bill.

Some programs have been eliminated and others cut back without my support. We should be meeting our responsibilities for our national security in a more adequate manner.

The Senate must remember that Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and his associates sent to Congress requests for 1971 of some \$2.5 billion below last year's budget. Thus, we can see that the Defense budget is falling rapidly despite the continued engagement of U.S. forces in Southeast Asia.

The fiscal year 1971 budget submitted by Secretary Laird totaled \$71.2 billion. Of this amount, \$20.2 billion fell into the category of military procurement and research and development. The committee bill deals with this \$20.2 billion.

Of this amount, the Armed Services Committee cut the requests to \$19.2 billion. The committee shifted from the military construction account some \$333 million in the Safeguard program so that all of the Safeguard costs could be dealt with in one bill. Thus, the committee made cuts of some \$1.3 billion.

One final point on the figures in this budget. Of the \$19.2 billion approved by the committee, only about \$12 billion is for weapon procurement, the remaining \$7 billion being for research and development.

Mr. President, it is worth while to call attention to the fact that when Secretary Laird presented his requests, he called it "a rock bottom budget."

While he fully recognized the obligation of Congress to examine this bill very closely and work its will, he nevertheless issued this warning:

I believe that the National Security would be jeopardized by any further reductions in our Fiscal Year 1971 Defense budget request.

These are strong words from a former Member of Congress. I am confident that he would not have uttered them unless he felt deeply such caution should be sounded.

Therefore, I say to the Members of the Senate that we are treading on thin ice when it comes to the national security of this country as provided for in this bill. To cut further may well send us plunging into depths from which a recovery would not be easy.

It would be my hope that before any Member of the Senate offers an amend-

ment to further cut the military procurement bill he examine very carefully the consequences of such an action. The Senate Armed Services Committee and Department of Defense should be contacted in order that the Senator have as complete a set of facts as possible, including any secret information which might bear on his amendment.

Mr. President, this bill comes to the floor with the United States still committed to more than 40 nations by treaties or other formal agreements. It is the responsibility of the Senate Armed Services Committee to see that our Defense Establishment is able to meet these commitments as well as to provide for our own defense.

There has been much talk about cutting back on defense and cutting back on military activities abroad. However, the matter of treaty obligations is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We cannot cut back too much on one without cutting back on the other.

Personally, I would welcome a review of these commitments by the Foreign Relations Committee. But that is in the purview of that committee. The point I wish to make here today is that so long as these commitments exist, it is the responsibility of the Armed Services Committee to see that we have the defense strength to meet them.

Added to this requirement is the question of the Soviet threat. Today the Soviet threat is far greater than it was 1 year ago. We are scaling down our Military Establishment while the Russians are charging ahead in many areas.

They are building a naval force to control the seas by going underwater. They already have many more attack submarines than the United States. Soviet Navy ships are appearing in waters around the world.

Further, the Soviet Union has passed the United States in the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles and are building more every day as well as deploying them around that country. Their SS-9 missiles are the most powerful of any nation. The United States has not built any new ICBM's for a number of years, although we are converting our older ICBM's to make them more effective and accurate.

Mr. President, in favoring this legislation, I speak in the interests of our national security. In a period during which it is fashionable to attack the so-called military-industrial complex and defense programs, I urge caution lest the Senate emasculate our country's defense.

Most of all we must not lose sight of the fact that the weapon systems we are deciding upon today may not actually enter the inventory of the services until 5 or 10 years from now. Thus, we are providing today for our defense in the late 1970's and early 1980's. Who better than the Defense Department can say what conditions might exist at that time? We must be prepared—we must assure the American people that they will not be faced with nuclear blackmail in the years ahead.

Of particular importance is the preservation of our strategic offensive capability. This is the area in which our deter-

rent capability can assure a long period of peace for the American people and the world. The strategic advantage we have enjoyed since the close of World War II has been allowed to decline under the McNamara policies of the 1960's. The goal then was to permit the Soviets to achieve parity with the United States in this area.

This point has been reached in many areas during the past several years but the Soviets have kept right on building and deploying ICBM's, missile launching submarines, orbiting missiles and other frightening weapons. It is clear to me that they desire superiority, not parity. If we fail to realize this situation and make unwise cuts in this bill our own generation may live under the fear of nuclear blackmail.

Mr. President, those who are attacking the military budget say they are not anti-military. They contend their interest is merely to save money so it can go to more worthy programs. In this connection, I am puzzled by their lack of interest in examining waste in domestic programs where equally large sums of money are being spent.

No one seems interested in doing a cost analysis of programs initiated by the Office of Economic Opportunity or similar programs. I would like to see some of our domestic programs receive equal and intensive review as that being applied to the military. For several years the Congress has been shoveling out money in domestic areas where the benefits are more pipedreams than reality.

Also, Mr. President, I wish to say a word in defense of our Military Establishment. Our officers in uniform are the favorite whipping boys of critics who have shared neither their responsibilities, risks or sacrifices. They seem to forget that the man in uniform is carrying out the orders of his civilian superiors.

The vitriolic tone of this attack on the military and the weapons builders, all of whom are acting on authority from the Congress and civilian officials was demonstrated in a book review written by a former Member of this body, Senator Joseph S. Clark. This book, authored by one of our colleagues, was seen by Mr. Clark as an expose. He said:

It exposed, with a devastating array of irrefutable facts, how an incredibly arrogant but equally stupid military-industrial complex, with little regard for integrity, has diverted the major part of our federal tax resources into a wasteful and utterly unnecessary arms race to the great damage of our domestic economy.

These comments by Mr. Clark were placed in the RECORD by another of our colleagues July 9. In referring to the Defense Department he called it a "huge money wasting Goliath." This critical chorus does little to enhance public confidence and does much to obscure the realities of today.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say that no one claims the cost of defense is cheap. It would be wonderful if we could use all this money to build houses, roads, recreation centers, parks, education facilities, and so on. But we must realize that none of these things will be safe or enjoyable in the face of nuclear blackmail.

The recommendations of the Senate Armed Services Committee were decided upon only after a most searching and far-reaching study of the threat and the alternatives. These minimum requirements are needed to deter what we know our enemy is capable of doing, not what he might do. To cut further or delay these needed weapon programs is tantamount to acceptance of mediocrity. Even worse, in some defense areas additional reductions would amount to unilateral disarmament.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, first, let me commend my distinguished colleague who is today representing the ranking minority member on the committee. I do not believe there is any committee in the Senate that operates with less partisanship than the Armed Services Committee. I have listened carefully to his remarks. I realize some of the vital questions that bother him when we begin to try to reduce what many consider to be the "fat" that has crept into the budget, but I know, speaking for the Subcommittee on Research and Development, that we have tried hard not to cut what we believe are important matters for the future. We have also tried to make the cuts and reductions as selective and as intelligent as possible.

I think, too, Mr. President, that I would be remiss if I did not say a word about our distinguished chairman, to mention the esteem which all of us on the Armed Services Committee hold for the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), for his leadership, his fairness, and his patience, which are such that it is really a joy and an education to work with him on what is a difficult and complex authorization bill.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege during this past year to serve again as chairman of an ad hoc Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Armed Services Committee.

Serving with me on the subcommittee have been the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE).

In the performance of its duties, the subcommittee devoted over 70 hours to briefings by Defense Department officials in support of the Department's R.D.T. & E. budget estimates. These briefings were supplemented by many additional hours of informal discussion with persons outside the Department with expertise in defense matters. In addition, the subcommittee held 4 days of public hearings on S. 3003, a bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER) to revamp Defense Department administration of its contractors' independent technical effort programs.

The R.D.T. & E. program is perhaps the most difficult and challenging of all appropriations to understand, much less to examine and recommend for authorization.

To the layman, it represents a very substantial amount of money—\$7.4 billion in this year's administration request—which too often is assumed to be utilized for vague and ill-defined "research."

To the scientist it is the seedbed of

knowledge from which grows all of our superior weaponry.

To the man in uniform it is the promise of the future guns, tanks, ships, airplanes, and missiles which he will need to protect our country, our families, and our lives.

But, to those who are responsible for formulating, managing, and executing the research and development program, including the broad range of military organizations and industries which are involved, it represents at all times a balance, within limited dollars, between the basic sciences which advance man's knowledge, the building blocks of technology represented by exploratory and advanced development, the prototypes of new weapon systems which evolve from engineering development, and finally the operational developments which provide complete weapon systems for test and then employment by our military forces.

The fiscal year 1971 request includes some 495 separate and distinct programs, referred to as program elements or budget subactivities. These are divided among the Army, Navy—including the Marine Corps—Air Force, and the various defense agencies.

These 495 programs consist of literally thousands of individual projects which in turn include thousands of tasks and then subtasks. These tens of thousands of single efforts are spread by contract and grant to thousands of companies of all sizes, to colleges and universities, and to not for profit institutions to buy the best brains, skills, and ingenuity which our society produces.

The following is a list of the major categories into which these varied tasks are divided in the fiscal year 1971 request:

[In millions of dollars]	
Research .....	369.6
Exploratory development.....	897.4
Advanced development.....	1,112.7
Engineering development.....	1,406.9
Operational systems development.....	2,341.5
Management and support.....	1,167.5
Emergency funds.....	50.0
Financing adjustment.....	56.0
Total .....	7,401.6

Before proceeding to an explanation of the committee's action on this total budget, I would like to say a few words about each of these major categories:

"Research," as its name implies, involves the advancement of knowledge in those areas of the basic sciences with potential military relevance. Contrary to popular impression, only 5 percent of the total R. & D. budget is expended on such research.

The categories of "Exploratory development" and "Advanced development" represent the next two building blocks on the way to procurement items. "Exploratory development" is really synonymous with applied research. It might consist, for example, of work on certain component parts of a possible avionics system for a new aircraft. "Advanced development" involves the final definition of subsystems of new possible weapons systems. It would be here, for example, that the new avionics system itself would finally be put together. "Exploratory" and "Advanced development" consume 12 per-

cent and 15 percent, respectively, of the fiscal year 1971 R.D.T. & E. budget request.

"Engineering development" and "Operational system development" involve the putting together of individual subsystems into major new weapons systems. Which of the two categories a given system falls into hinges on whether a production go-ahead has been given to it by the Department of Defense. Fifty percent, or \$3.7 billion, of the fiscal year 1971 R.D.T. & E. request falls into these two categories. Included in them are all the major weapons systems on which our security will depend for the next decade and more.

About 15 percent of the R.D.T. & E. budget, or \$1.2 billion is devoted to "Program management and support." These funds pay for the operation, management, and maintenance of the defense research establishment. Included are the salaries of some 88,000 civilian scientific engineering, technical, administrative, and maintenance personnel who man the 130 Government-owned installations also supported by this program. Another 32,000 military personnel engaged on R. & D. work at these facilities are paid from another appropriation.

The "Emergency fund" and "Financing adjustment" involve much smaller funding—\$50 million and \$56 million, respectively—but considerable attention has been devoted to them by the committee.

The committee has recommended approval of the former and disapproval of the latter. Inasmuch as these decisions were closely interrelated, and because the emergency fund request was the subject of an amendment on the floor last year, I would like to say a few words about our reasoning at this time.

Emergency fund: This account is precisely what its name implies—a pool of money to which the Department can turn to meet emergencies which arise during a fiscal year and which cannot be foreseen in advance. Surely it must be recognized that emergencies—arising perhaps as a result of new data gathered by our intelligence organizations—are an inevitable part of the defense business. Unless a special fund is available to meet such emergencies, they have to be met by a reprogramming of funds originally allocated to other programs. Such reprogramming can result in a serious disruption of ongoing efforts, with the benefits of the uncompleted research and the services of the men conducting it being lost in the process. It is for these reasons that the committee recommends approval of the Department's \$50 million emergency fund request. This action has been coupled, however, with action designed to squeeze well over \$100 million of "water" from the Department's R.D.T. & E. budget.

Financing adjustment: The first part of this "squeeze" involves elimination of the financing adjustment. This \$56 million request represents the Defense Department's estimate of the amount of R.D.T. & E. funds authorized and appropriated in fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1971 which will remain unobligated as of June 30, 1971. These are funds, in other words, already in the Department's hands



for which no use is planned at any time during the coming fiscal year. Nonetheless, the Department, for reasons set forth in more detail on pages 13-15 of the committee report, has requested reauthorization of these funds. Because no adequate justification of this request has been made, the committee recommends a disapproval of it.

The committee has also conducted a thorough investigation designed to uncover those programs the implementation of which has so been delayed that fiscal year 1970 funds, provided for those programs, have not been used and are available for use in fiscal year 1971. It has then reduced the fiscal year 1971 funds requested for these programs by an appropriate amount. A list of several smaller programs with respect to which this action was taken—for savings of \$50.2 million—is shown on page 76 of the committee report. The same principle has played a role in the committee's action on several major weapon systems, among them SCAD and the B-1.

It is the opinion of the committee, and certainly of this Senator, that these actions have been far more effective and efficient in their elimination of essentially discretionary defense research funds than would the elimination of, or a cut in, the Department's "Emergency fund" request.

As I indicated earlier, the R.D.T. & E. budget consists of 495 individual program elements which include literally thousands of projects and tasks. Consequently, despite the familiarity of subcommittee members with many of these programs as a result of last year's work, and despite the expenditure of literally twice the time and effort this year as opposed to last, the subcommittee was obliged to concentrate on programs which fell into the following categories:

First. Large dollars requested.

Second. Large increases over fiscal year 1970.

Third. New programs in fiscal year 1971.

The subcommittee did not attempt to compensate for this inevitable lack of comprehensive coverage by directing broad percentage cuts at those areas of the budget it did not review in depth. It resisted this temptation for several reasons, and it would be well to spell them out at this time.

The first was the subcommittee's awareness of the constantly increasing Soviet research and development program. During the past decade, Soviet research and development in all areas has been growing at a rate of about 10 percent a year, while U.S. research and development across the board has essentially leveled off.

The comparison is even more dramatic when one examines only those research and development expenditures related to military, atomic energy, and space work. During the 1960's, Soviet military research and development increased by about 60 percent while U.S. military research and development increased by roughly 30 percent. And estimates for 1970 show the Soviets ahead of the United States by more than 20 percent in absolute dollar terms.

The validity of these statistics is not

without question. And there is no necessary relationship between the amount of funds expended and the quality of work produced. But trends of such persistence should make one pause before slashing away blindly at areas one has not reviewed.

A closely related second reason for the subcommittee's disavowal of broad percentage cuts has been the changes in the size of the R.D.T. & E. budget in the 2 short years of the subcommittee's existence. Last year the budget submitted to Congress totaled \$8.2 billion. This year's budget submission was \$7.4 billion, a reduction of \$800 million in dollar terms, and a reduction of even larger magnitude when the effects of inflation are considered.

The subcommittee was mindful, also, that the bulk of this reduction taken in precisely those areas it did not examine closely. The Defense Department, no less than other bureaucratic complexes, is subject to institutional pressures which often inhibit wise decisionmaking when periods of retrenchment occur. In such periods, it is a natural phenomenon for the services and the Defense agencies to do all they can to protect their largest and most prestigious programs. Cuts are focused, as a result, in the manpower area and in those basic research and exploratory development areas which have little institutional support behind them.

For all these reasons, then, the subcommittee believes that its decision to focus attention on large and fast-increasing programs was entirely proper and justified.

Not only have these large weapons system programs been less closely pruned by the Defense Department itself—they have been a major source of the past mistakes which have focused increasing criticism in recent years on our defense spending generally.

It is here that the cost overruns we have heard so much about have most often occurred. It is here that we have spent billions on highly touted new programs which offered only marginal improvements over those programs they were designed to replace. It is here that we have seen the development of systems so complex and sophisticated that they have never been able to function adequately even in the performance of their primary task. It is here that we have seen costly and undue duplication, as each service has sought its own version of a given system, to avoid reliance on similar systems in the hands of others. And it is here, it seems at times, that we have seen the development of systems, even absent duplication, which add more to the prestige of their service sponsors than to the defense of our country.

It is in the supervision of these major weapon systems developments that not only the Office of the Secretary of Defense, but the Congress as well, must have a major impact. It is on these systems that the subcommittee has focused its attention.

As a result of its investigations, the subcommittee recommended and the committee accepted a total reduction in the funds requested of \$464.1 million, or 6.3 percent of the \$7.4 billion requested of the Congress. This reduction was par-

tially offset by a transfer of \$79 million for the purchase of two S-3A test aircraft from the procurement to the R.D.T. & E. account, where the funds properly belonged in the first place. The resulting net reduction of \$385.1 million will provide an authorization of \$7.016 billion. This is \$249.1 million lower than the amount authorized in the House bill, notwithstanding the impact of the funds transferred for the S-A test aircraft.

The details of the specific reductions made are set forth in the committee report, where they are addressed in far better depth than I could hope to address them at this time. I would like to highlight, however, what I regard as the most significant of these reductions.

First. A cut of \$50 million from the \$100 million requested by the Air Force for the B-1.

Second. A denial of the \$17.6 million requested by the Army for the Cheyenne helicopter, together with a cancellation of the Cheyenne development contract.

Both of these actions are of sufficient significance that I would like to address them separately at another time.

Third. An elimination of the \$15.7 million requested by the Army and Air Force for Project Mallard. Mallard is an ambitious international communications program with long term implications in the billions of dollars.

The committee believes it inappropriate for the Department of Defense to embark on an international development program of this nature and magnitude when a militarywide tactical communications system has never been developed for the military services of the United States itself and when the DOD inventory is replete with communications equipment having a lack of commonality.

Fourth. A reduction of \$27 million in the \$77 million requested by the Air Force for the Minuteman rebasing program. This is a program involving several options, in addition to those being explored under the Safeguard and advanced ballistic missile defense programs, for improving the survivability of our land-based ICBM deterrent.

The \$31.6 million of the funds requested are for use in research on hardened silos, with hard-rock silos receiving considerable attention. Hard-rock silos do not appear to be a promising option. Not only would they be terribly expensive, but they would become increasingly vulnerable to improvements in the accuracy of attacking missiles. The committee report directs an orderly termination of hard-rock silo research. This action, if implemented, will insure that we never become committed to the multibillion dollar costs which a hard-rock silo program would entail.

Fifth. A reduction of \$20 million in the \$158 million requested by the Army for the advanced ballistic missile defense program. This program involves research on the frontiers of ABM technology, and the funds requested represent a substantial jump from the \$110 million approved by Congress last year. The bulk of this increase, however, is accounted for by projects devoted to improved Hardsite development, and these projects are fully supported by the committee.

Sixth. A reduction of \$15 million in the \$89.3 million requested by the Army for the SAM-D surface-to-air missile program. The effect of this reduction will be to postpone all engineering development work on SAM-D until fiscal year 1972. In conjunction with this reduction, the committee calls upon the Defense Department, during fiscal year 1971, to conduct an extensive review of the system's specifications, with particular emphasis on its horizontal and vertical ranges. Consideration should be given, during this review, to the performance capabilities of the Air Force F-15 aircraft which is planned to be employed in conjunction with SAM-D to assure air superiority to our Army in the field. The objective of this review should be the elimination of all inessential SAM-D capabilities which should result in reduced procurement costs if and when the system is authorized for procurement.

Seventh. A reduction of \$1.8 million in the \$5.7 million requested for foreign military security environments studies and of \$1.3 million in the \$4.2 million requested for policy planning studies. This amounts to a reduction of 30 percent in the funds requested for these two social and behavioral sciences study programs. Both of these programs were subject to criticism in last year's debate, on the grounds that the work involved could be undertaken more appropriately by the State rather than the Defense Department. It was hoped that arrangements could be developed during fiscal year 1970 for the transfer of much of this work to State. Recently, an agreement was reached for the joint State-DOD use of some \$500,000 of fiscal year 1970 funds. It is the committee's expectation that its action this year will underscore the need for additional such steps both within the State and Defense Department themselves and at the Bureau of the Budget.

Eighth. A denial of the \$33.6 million requested by the Air Force for contract definition and initiation of development on the propulsion, navigation, and decoy electronics subsystems of the Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy—SCAD. While the committee does not contest the importance of this system in improving the penetration capability of our manned bombers, formal approval of the program has not yet been received by the Air Force from the Secretary of Defense, and there is no indication as to when such approval will be given. Assuming that approval is forthcoming, there are \$9 million of unused fiscal 1970 funds remaining and these should be sufficient to support requirements during fiscal year 1971.

In addition to its review of the budget request, the subcommittee drafted regulatory language in three areas of interest. These provisions were also accepted by the committee.

There are three provisions dealing with the controversial area of chemical and biological warfare.

The first, section 506(a) is a reenactment of a provision in last year's bill which would continue for another year the prohibition of procurement of delivery systems specifically designed to dis-

seminate lethal chemical agents or for the procurement of delivery system parts or components designed for this purpose. While research and development work on new binary chemical munitions will not be prohibited under section 506(a), its reenactment will insure that no binary or other chemical munitions of a lethal nature are used without the expressed consent of Congress.

A second provision, section 506(b), is an amendment to the permanent restrictions on CBW activities contained in last year's bill. Section 506(b) would insure that the disposal of biological stockpiles which will be required as a result of the President's decision of last November 25, as well as the disposal of any lethal chemical stockpiles determined to be necessary in the future, would not be undertaken until the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service had reviewed the proposed plans for their disposal and determined what precautionary measures, if any, were required to protect the public health and safety. Section 506(b) would insure also that foreign governments were notified prior to the disposal of any biological or lethal chemical agents within their countries. Section 506(b) is necessary, the committee feels, because the disposal of stockpiles was not addressed in the permanent restrictions in last year's bill.

The third provision, section 506(c), calls for a study, to be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, into the ecological and physiological consequences inherent generally in the use of herbicides and also into the specific ecological and physiological effects which have followed from our use of herbicides as defoliants in Vietnam. Section 506(c) authorizes the use of funds authorized for the fiscal year 1971 CBW program, for use in the financing of this study. The committee believes that such a study is essential in light of the disturbing evidence which has been uncovered in recent years on the possible effects of herbicides. It commends the recent decision of the Defense Department to suspend further use in Southeast Asia of herbicides containing 2,4,5-T.

The other regulatory provisions concern Department of Defense funding of its contractors' independent technical effort and the reenactment, as section 204, of section 203 of last year's bill, prohibiting the expenditure of defense funds on any research projects which lack a direct and apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation. I would like to comment on each of these provisions more fully at a later time.

Mr. President, it has been a privilege to serve again as chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Research and Development.

The subcommittee was aided in its selection of programs for detailed review by the excellent work of the Tactical Air Subcommittee chaired by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) and that of the Bomber Defense Subcommittee, chaired by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS). In almost all

instances, the R. & D. subcommittee deferred to these subcommittees for the review of research and development programs within their jurisdictions. The R. & D. subcommittee deferred, also, in the case of the Army tank program, which was reviewed in great depth by the full committee.

I would like to say a word of thanks at this time, also, to Mr. Hyman Fine of the Armed Services Committee staff and Mr. Ross Hamachek of my own staff, both of whom aided the subcommittee in its often thorough and painstaking review of this extremely complex and intricate budget.

In conclusion, I believe that the committee's actions in the research and development area will provide the Congress with the type of control of research and development expenditures which all of us so strongly desire.

Perhaps the reasons for some of the committee's actions in the area will be unclear to Senators who did not participate in formulating them.

No doubt other actions will give rise to honest differences of opinion regarding their underlying wisdom.

There will be ample time for both clarification and the joining of debate in the weeks ahead. In order that misunderstandings may be avoided and in order to facilitate the process of debate, I would greatly appreciate it if all colleagues with questions or amendments to the R. & D. portion of the bill would bring these to my attention at the earliest possible time.

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. I yield to my good chairman.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to again thank the Senator from New Hampshire for the intensive work he has done on the bill. I think his remarks today show how comprehensive that work has been. The Senator and his committee have defined in depth, I think for the first time, this massive part of the bill, covering research, development, testing, and evaluation. He has dug in and has given us a figure for the first time as to how much of it is for basic research and what is the cost of operating the extensive testing facilities that we have so that it is really an understandable item.

An evaluation of the research to be passed on is interesting. When we started out, we did not have any research and development in the bill at all. Then we first started authorizing appropriations for missiles and planes. Then we put in research for planes, missiles, and hardware.

Then we finally ended up by putting in all research. That is when it got so large and made it so difficult to analyze.

I am sure the proof of the work of the subcommittee will live for years. I know it has strengthened the research department rather than restricted it but, at the same time, it is saving money, too. I think that is a milestone in legislative history.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I thank the chairman. The Senator from Mississippi already knows how I feel about working with him on the committee.



Mr. STENNIS. I certainly appreciate the Senator's feeling. It is a mutual feeling. I want the Senator to be here during all of the debate.

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

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I, too, commend the Senator from New Hampshire on an excellent job. He has given a clear and incisive picture of military research and development expenditures, and I think has taken a very responsible action on it.

As I understand the Senator from New Hampshire, he cut \$464 million, below the President's request, if we allow for comparable figures, a cut of about 6.7 percent.

Mr. McINTYRE. That is about right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is a very substantial reduction. I think the Senator and his committee have made a responsible reduction.

I am interested in a statement made in the course of the Senator's speech in which he said the Soviet Union is now spending more on military research in actual dollars than the United States is.

Is that correct?

Mr. McINTYRE. It is. I am not sure about the validity of my precise figures, but I do know that Dr. Foster, who is Director of Defense Research and Engineering, is very concerned about maintaining our strong technological base, and the indications are that the Russians have been moving up considerably in this field.

As I tried to indicate to the Senator from South Carolina, this trend was always in the back of our minds. We did not want to make blind cuts of 7 or 8 percent in all areas. We tried to go to those areas when we could take a hard look and where we could operate with something more than intuition. We were always conscious of the recent research, development, test, and evaluation efforts of the Soviet Union, and we may be approaching a level of effort in research, development, test, and evaluation below which we do not want to go, particularly when we take into consideration inflation and real dollars. The Defense Department felt that the cuts in this area were very deep. Dr. Foster is quite disturbed about them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If our level of research is lower than that of the Soviet Union, then it seems to me it is a matter of misplaced priorities by the Defense Department, because, in absolute dollars, there is \$72 billion in the overall budget, and military construction, AEC and military aid spending brings overall defense expenditures up to \$75 billion. The London Office of Strategic Studies has stated that Russia is spending \$40 billion military total, if we adjust both for the lower cost of living and lower salaries paid in the Soviet Union and for the difference between dollars and rubles. So all together we spend almost twice as much as the Soviet Union does on our defense. Yet the Senator from New Hampshire says we spend less in absolute dollars for military research.

Military research is the name of the game. After all, if we are going to have an effective military force, we have to

have military research that bears a very large share of all military expenditures.

I would think we would want to reconsider our overall military priorities, perhaps moving some of the resources we have devoted to other military areas into research.

Mr. McINTYRE. That may well be. I think what we all realize on the subcommittee is that we must maintain our technological base and do it in a most efficient manner.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with that wholeheartedly.

I would like to make one other point with the Senator from New Hampshire. This refers to independent research and development. As the Senator knows, I offered an amendment last year, which was accepted in part, very graciously, by the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) and the Armed Services Committee, and it was held in conference. Senator STENNIS suggested I introduce a bill, on which hearings could be held. As the Senator has stated, it is enormously important—\$625 million is involved. I understand 95 percent goes to 50 companies, or an average of \$12 million to a company.

Of course, it is very lucrative and highly profitable to have thousands of dollars for independent research and development. There is no line item; the accountability has been vague in the past. I am delighted that the Senator, as I understand it, has made this an identifiable item and put a ceiling on it—a ceiling which, as I understand, is below the ceiling we have had heretofore. So I think this is a very commendable improvement over our past operations, and I think the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) and other members of the committee, but especially Senator McINTYRE, who is responsible in this area, deserve a great deal of credit and the thanks of the Senate.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the Senator. As I indicated to the Senator privately, I shall have a more detailed statement later on I.R. & D. I will say now, however, that most of the committee agreed that independent research and development is one area where we get great value for our research dollars.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What bothers me about the independent research and development is that there is no accountability. We were not able to see what we got, and in case after case, it turned out that the money was spent on matters which have no connection whatever with the military. In one case it was spent on urban development, as I recall. I believe that if the taxpayer is paying for one purpose, he should have the money spent for that purpose devoted to it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As long as we are speaking about where the credit goes, the Senator from Wisconsin is entitled to a great deal of credit on the item of research as a whole, and that specific part to which he has just referred, the independent research. In the Proxmire amendment and then in the Proxmire bill, he has not only

brought a fine, intelligent focus on and presentation of it, but he has spurred us on in our work as well, and I want to publicly thank him now, as I have already done in private.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. Surely no one in the Senate can speak more authoritatively than he on the subject of research and development.

Mr. President, what I should like to do this afternoon is try to put this bill in an overall perspective, and try to show the necessity for reductions in the bill, not only from the point of view of our military strength, but of our overall national strength in terms of our having a healthy society and a strong country, which is, of course, of fundamental importance in terms of our trying to defend ourselves.

#### THE MILITARY BUDGET—MISDIRECTED PRIORITIES

We have before us the military authorization bill, which covers chiefly the future procurement of planes, tanks, ships, guns, and missiles, and the funds we intend to spend for military research and development. Involved are budgetary requests for about \$20 billion of the \$72 billion military budget for fiscal year 1971.

But in fact we have before us a series of far broader issues. How do we really protect the security of the United States of America? How large a military budget do we need to do this? How does the military budget fit in with the domestic needs of the country and the political, as opposed to our military, needs abroad? What effect does military spending have on our economy?

We should ask what are the real capabilities of our potential enemies. How strong are they and how strong can they become? Do we need all the bases we have scattered around the world in order to protect the security of the United States? What are the real purposes of many of the weapons we are asked to authorize? Are they really needed for the security of the United States or do they result from economic pressures, inter-service rivalries, or the lack of control of military spending, past and present, on the part of the President, the Defense Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress itself?

What we need to ask ourselves is whether we are not spending a disproportionate amount of our treasury and our resources on the military establishment.

I say that given the need to protect the country, the capabilities of our potential enemies, the strength of our allies, the social needs we have at home, the cruel effects of excessive military spending on our economy, the requirements for prudence and efficiency in procurement, the need to provide for domestic tranquility, and the overwhelming importance of gaining from all groups and sections of our society the fundamental support of our government and our system and the democratic processes, we are now spending far too much on the military.

It is my purpose to elaborate many of these points and to argue that issue here today. That is the setting, and in my view, the only setting in which we can

intelligently judge this bill and the military appropriations bill which will carry out the authority in this and previous bills and acts of the Congress.

#### OUR STRATEGIC FORCES ARE MORE THAN SUFFICIENT

The purposes of our strategic forces are, as I understand it, two in number.

We must be so strong that if an enemy launches an all-out attack on us, we can strike back. He must know that if he does this, he will destroy himself in the process. That is what is called "assured destruction capability."

Mr. President, we have that in spades. It is unfortunate that we and the Soviet Union rely on a state of mutual terror to prevent an all-out nuclear war. Since they too have the atom and hydrogen bombs and the means of delivering them, the nature of both our deterrence and their deterrence must be such as not to goad each other into a preemptive first strike.

#### HUGE STRATEGIC ARSENAL

Since 1960 we have spent between \$15 and \$18 billion a year on our strategic nuclear forces. We have a triple deterrent. We have built up our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. There are now some 1,054 of these ICBM launchers.

We have built up our submarine fleet. We have a force of 41 Polaris submarines and at least some 656 SLBM launchers.

In addition to that, we now have some 581 intercontinental bombers capable of delivering nuclear warheads, in our strategic arsenal. None of this is secret. These figures are all outlined in the annual posture statement of the Secretary of Defense.

These three strategic deterrents can deliver some 4,200 nuclear warheads—what are called "total force loadings."

In addition to all of this, we have ringed the Soviet Union with a large number of medium range missiles and we have Navy and Air Force medium range bombers and other tactical aircraft which can also carry nuclear weapons.

#### CAPABLE OF INFLECTING HORRIBLE DAMAGE

But what do we need to provide an "assured destruction capability?" Secretary McNamara published a damage table in 1968 giving some of the assumptions on which our deterrent is based.

He believed there was an unacceptable level of damage which we could inflict on the Soviet Union after a nuclear attack on us. Such an ability to retaliate would therefore deter them from attack. This has generally been taken as a level of damage which would include 25 percent of the population of the Soviet Union and approximately 75 percent of their industry. Surely that should be sufficient to deter the Soviet Union from attacking us.

According to Secretary McNamara's table, the equivalent of 400 one-megaton delivered warheads could achieve this purpose. That number could wipe out 74 million Russians or 30 percent of their estimated 1972 population. It would also wipe out more than 75 percent of their industrial capacity. This is the horrible state of the world.

#### TEN TIMES NUCLEAR FORCE NEEDED TO INFLECT UNACCEPTABLE DAMAGE

Without counting medium-range missiles or bombers, or any increase in strength due to the MLRV'ing of either the Minuteman or Polaris submarines, we now have at least 4,200 total force loadings. This is 10 times the number needed to kill 74 million Russians or 30 percent of their population and to destroy 75 percent of their industry.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is that we now have 10 times the number necessary to achieve that destructive capability which Secretary McNamara defined as being sufficient to assure an effective deterrent.

I ask unanimous consent that a table made up from the annual Posture Statements giving the numbers of our launchers, bombers, and force loadings, be printed in the RECORD, together with figures from the damage table first published by Secretary McNamara in January 1968 but updated for the 1972 Russian population.

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

TABLE 1.—U.S. STRIKE FORCES, DOD POSTURE STATEMENTS

	Oct. 1, 1966 (1)	Oct. 1, 1967 (2)	Sept. 1, 1968 (3)	Sept. 1, 1972 (4)
ICBM launchers.....	934	1,054	1,054	1,054
SLBM launchers.....	512	656	656	656
Total.....	1,446	1,710	1,710	1,710
Intercontinental bombers.....	680	697	646	581
Total force loadings: Approximate number of warheads.....		4,500	4,200	4,200

TABLE 2.—SECRETARY McNAMARA'S DAMAGE TABLE ESTIMATE OF SOVIET POPULATION AND INDUSTRY DESTRUCTION

[Assumed 1972 total population of 247 million; urban population of 116 million]

1 MT equivalent delivered warheads	Total population fatalities (millions)	Percent	Industrial capacity destroyed [percent]
100.....	37	15	59
200.....	52	21	72
400.....	74	30	76
800.....	96	39	77
1,200.....	109	44	77
1,600.....	116	47	77

#### MOVING TO INCREASE CAPACITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Now we intend to increase our destructive capability. Now we are MIRVing certain of our Minuteman missiles and equipping many of our Polaris submarines with multiple weapons.

A very conservative public estimate of the additional nuclear warheads to be added to our strategic offensive weapons as a result of these actions is 5,400. This will bring the total to some 9,600 warheads by the 1974-75 period. And this does not include the additional number of warheads that could be delivered by some 4,000 tactical aircraft and medium range missiles.

#### DIMINISHING RETURNS

One interesting aspect of all of this is that, according to Secretary McNamara's

damage table, a doubling of the number of delivered warheads from 400 to 800 does not double the damage. A doubling of the number of delivered warheads will increase the population fatalities by only 9 percent—or from 30 percent to 39 percent. A doubling of the delivered warheads from 400 to 800 hardly increases the amount of industry destroyed. It raises that figure by only 1 percent—from 76 percent to 77 percent, or a figure which is too small to be important. We double the missiles, but only raise the amount of industry destroyed from 76 percent to 77 percent, or a figure which is too small to be important.

There is, therefore, a very definite law of diminishing returns which operates with respect to the size of our nuclear deterrent.

Yet with 4,200 weapons in our intercontinental arsenal (and some believe we already have more than 6,000) plus those which can be delivered by medium range missiles or tactical aircraft, we are now moving on through this bill and other bills to increase our official nuclear force loadings from 4,200 to 9,600, or by 129 percent.

#### FANATICISM

As George Santayana once said, fanaticism means redoubling one's efforts after having lost sight of one's aims.

What possible reason is there to move on this way? If 400 delivered warheads will inflict an unacceptable damage on the Soviet Union, why do we need 25 times that many? Why after spending \$15 to \$18 billion a year to produce this massive destruction and this horrible genie, should we continue to spend \$18 billion a year for these purposes?

#### ARGUMENTS REFUTED

There are two reasons which are often given which I think should be refuted now and refuted outright. One was made by Joseph Alsop, only this week. The other has been made on numerous occasions by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird. I am certain that neither of these able men will confuse an intellectual argument with them as a personal attack upon them, as my only purpose is to attack their arguments and assumptions and not their persons.

Mr. Alsop cites the fact that the "near monopoly of nuclear weapons which this country enjoyed" at the time of the Korean War has vanished. But he also complains that:

With feckless shortsightedness, the 5-to-1 margin in nuclear strategic weapons that this country still possessed in President Kennedy's time has also been allowed to vanish. In intercontinental missiles today, the U.S.-Soviet ratio is in fact 1 to 1.2, and it will be 1 to 1.4 in no more than a year or so.

He continues:

#### RATIOS MISLEADING

In short, a continuous deterioration of the balance of power between this country and the Soviet Union had been permitted for some years.

There is the argument. What is the answer?

First of all, the figures and ratios may be somewhat misleading, for it appears that Mr. Alsop has left out of his calculations and his ratios our submarine and



bomber fleets, our medium range missiles, and our tactical aircraft. He talks only of "intercontinental" missiles. In addition to that, he has left out the fact that as of the latest posture report, we have 4,200 "total force loadings" as opposed to 1,350 for the Soviet Union, or one-third our number—page 102, Secretary of Defense 1971 posture statement. But let us overlook that. Let us accept the fact that his figures are accurate and are not misleading.

What are we supposed to do about it? We have 10 times the number of deliverable warheads that are needed to inflict an unacceptable level of damage on the Soviet Union. Does Mr. Alsop want us to spend billions of dollars more so that we will have 50 times instead of 10 times the number of warheads we need? And what good would that do? For a few months or years in time, we might once again have a ratio of 5 to 1 over the Soviet Union. But soon they, too, would increase their numbers to a level equal to ours.

Then both of us would have 50 times, instead of 10 times, the number of deliverable warheads needed to inflict an unacceptable amount of punishment on the other.

#### ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

I would think that enough is enough. We both have enough to blow up the world many times over. Why do we need more in order to match each other in unneeded and excessive capacity?

This is one place where the talk of ratios or the balance of power is both irrelevant and misleading. Enough for Mr. Alsop's argument on that point.

#### SOVIET FIRST STRIKE DOES NOT EXIST

But Mr. Laird has used another argument. He has said that the Soviet Union is going for a "first strike" capability, and make no doubt about it. On that basis he, too, has argued for this vast increase in nuclear launchers and warheads and other strategic nuclear systems.

But it turns out that the Soviet Union does not have nor is it going to have a "first strike" capability. A "first strike" capability is the ability to knock out our retaliatory forces and to inflict such initial punishment on us that we would be unable to deploy the weapons of our "assured destructive capability."

What Mr. Laird was talking about was the Russians' SS-9 missile, the fact that it may have multiple warheads even though they may not be "independently targetable," and its destructive capacity. But it is not a "first strike" weapon. The Soviet Union does not now have nor does anyone I know argue seriously that it will soon have a "first strike" capability.

The SS-9, if launched, could inflict damage on our fixed land-based missiles. But our submarine-launched ballistic missiles remain invulnerable. Our intercontinental bombers are about as effective as they have been in recent times, and the medium-range missiles and medium bombers and other tactical aircraft are still a powerful backup force to our main strategic systems.

When pressed on this point, Secretary Laird backed down. The Russians do not have a "first strike" capability, as it has always been defined, even with the SS-9.

#### WE CAN SAFELY CUT STRATEGIC BUDGET

We are now spending \$18 billion a year on our strategic forces. The President's budget proposed that amount for next year. The report by Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, of which I am proud to be a sponsor, points out that we can maintain our three separate deterrent forces, keep an overwhelming and awesome assured destruction capability, assure ourselves of more than 7,000 deliverable warheads, and still cut \$4 billion from the strategic budget.

That would not only be a "sufficient" deterrent but by any calculation it also would be an "overwhelming" deterrent.

In their judgment and in my judgment we could cut \$4 billion from the strategic budget and remain as secure as it is possible to remain in a nuclear world.

As so many have pointed out, if we erect ABM's, MIRV our land-based missiles, procure a new manned strategic bomber, or double the number of our deliverable warheads, we do not increase our security.

As Herbert York so ably proves in his new book, "Race to Oblivion," while the military power of the United States has been steadily increasing, the security of the country has been rapidly and inexorably decreasing.

Under the proposal of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, we could cut \$4 billion from the proposed \$18 billion strategic budget and still carry out the research and development for the ABM, the B-1 bomber, and the ULMS system—which, of course, is the newest underwater system and is in advance even of the Poseidon operation—and continue but not speed up the Poseidon MIRV program. All of this would be in addition to our present overwhelming nuclear capability. Why do we need more?

#### GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES

The Department of Defense, the chairman of the Senate committees, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have all told us in times past that in addition to the policies for our strategic nuclear forces, we were operating on what has been called the two-plus war strategy. What that meant was that we aimed to have sufficient general purpose forces to fight at any one time a major war in Europe, a major war in Asia, plus meeting a small brush-fire situation or contretemps elsewhere.

This fact was used to justify the huge defense expenditures we have been making. When we argued that the military budget was too large, we were told that nothing substantial could be done about it until we changed our two-plus war strategy. That argument was made here on the floor of the Senate last year, during the debate on this bill, by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. STENNIS.

#### SHIFT TO ONE-PLUS WAR STRATEGY

But now Secretary Laird has announced that we no longer follow a two-plus war strategy. That has been revised. We now have a one-plus war strategy.

When in turn we have asked why there are no savings in the defense budget due to the shift to the one-plus war strategy, and why the reduction in

the budget figures—I will not say reduction in military spending for that has not yet occurred—reflects only the reduction in incremental costs of the Vietnam war, we are given the following answer. We are told that while the two-plus war strategy was in effect, we never appropriated the funds to carry it out. As a result, the military experts argue, the shift from the two-plus war strategy to the one-plus war strategy will not bring any actual reduction in costs. That is what they say.

#### ONE-PLUS STRATEGY HAS BEEN COSTED OUT

But that is not the case. There are very explicit figures for the cost of the two-plus strategy and the one-plus strategy. Mr. Charles L. Schultze, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has given these costs in detail. In his book entitled "Setting National Priorities, the 1971 Budget," which the Brookings Institution published early this year, those figures are given.

The cost of the two-plus war strategy, given in 1971 prices, is estimated at \$44 billion. Mr. Schultze describes three different postures and their costs. As he writes on page 25 of his book:

First is the possibility of shifting the broad planning assumptions to allow for only one major conflict and one minor one at any one time—or shifting to a low-budget general purpose force.

Mr. Schultze then compares the cost of the one major conflict—one minor conflict assumption with the two-plus war assumption. This is what he says:

The resulting decline in expenditures would be at least \$10 billion a year (at 1971 prices) below the pre-Vietnam baseline of \$44 billion, to a level of about \$34 billion a year. . . .

#### SPENDING REQUEST \$10 BILLION TOO HIGH

The 1971 budget, however, requests \$43.3 billion for our general purpose forces, which is almost precisely the two-plus war figure.

In spite of the fact that the Secretary of Defense has stated that we have shifted from a two-plus war strategy to a one-plus war strategy, he and the President are requesting in the budget we have before us this year enough money to fund our general purpose forces at the level \$10 billion higher than needed for a one-plus war contingency.

And this budget, I should point out, also contains \$11 billion in additional funds for the incremental costs of the Vietnam war for fiscal year 1971.

If we were to genuinely move from the two-plus to the one-plus war contingency, the 1971 budget should be almost \$10 billion below its present estimate.

The question is, why is this budget \$10 billion above the strategic estimates on which the Secretary of Defense says it should be based? We now have a one-plus war strategy. But we have a general purpose budget which is \$10 billion higher—or something approaching a two-plus war budget.

#### THE INCREMENTAL COSTS OF VIETNAM

In addition to the budget request for our strategic nuclear forces of \$18 billion, and the \$43.3 billion budget request for general purpose forces, which is \$10 billion above that needed for the one-

plus war strategy, Mr. Schultze estimates that there is an additional \$11 billion item in the fiscal year 1971 defense budget for the incremental costs of the Vietnam war. So far as I know there is no argument over that figure. It is essentially the same figure the Defense Department itself uses for the "incremental" costs of the Vietnam war. That is \$11 billion.

All of this adds up to just a little more than \$72 billion, or precisely what the President requested in his 1971 budget.

#### SUMMARY

The \$72 billion budget the President has requested includes funds for \$18 billion in strategic nuclear weapons, \$43.3 billion for general purpose forces, and \$11 billion for the incremental costs of Vietnam.

Far from a reduction in our overall military forces, it steps up our strategic nuclear forces by providing for phase II of the ABM, by continuing the Poseidon MIRV program, by deploying Minuteman III MIRV's, and by providing funds for a new manned bomber.

It asks for \$10 billion more for general purpose forces than the one-plus war contingency should cost. This is true even though the Secretary of Defense has told us are are now on a one-plus war contingency.

What one can conclude is this:

We could cut \$10 billion from the present budget and still meet every assumption on which the Secretary of Defense says it is based. We can take them at their word and take their assumptions and still cut it \$10 billion.

In addition, we could cut the \$18 billion for the strategic nuclear forces in this year's budget by up to \$4 billion, and still have more than 15 times the deliverable nuclear weapons which could destroy 30 percent of the Russian population and 75 percent of her industry, or some 7,000 deliverable nuclear weapons.

Based on the administration's own verbal assumptions, we could have a budget of \$62 billion instead of \$72 billion.

Based on some additional small reduction in the proposed nuclear strategic program, but which would still increase our existing strategic strength, we could cut another \$4 billion, or to a level of about \$58 billion. And this total amount would include the \$11 billion incremental cost of the Vietnam war.

#### OTHER AREAS TO CUT

There are those who will acknowledge the facts about the 1971 budget but who will nonetheless say that it takes time to shift from old assumptions, to cut back on weapons and manpower, and to bring a shift in policies. They will therefore attempt to justify this year's high level \$72 billion budget with these arguments.

Of course, there is something to this. To move from the \$72 billion level to a \$58 billion level all at once would be a difficult job. It may well be that a smaller reduction would be more possible and practical to accomplish. But we must reduce expenditures.

In addition to the strategic assumptions on which the budget should be based, there are numerous other reasons why we can cut back and should cut

back. Let us examine some of those which are not included in the assumption I have just enumerated.

#### OVERRUNS AND WASTE IN PROCUREMENT

We have shown through hearings and evidence over the last 18 months that there is colossal waste in the procurement programs of the Defense Department.

The General Accounting Office indicated to me last winter that on 38 major weapons systems costing \$100 million or more, the increase in costs or overruns had amounted to some \$20 billion. Since that time, or in a nine month period, those costs have increased by another \$3.6 billion.

Mr. President, as the distinguished chairman of the committee differed with me on the conclusions regarding the increase in cost, I intend to answer the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on Monday next; but I think my original position was correct. I think we can clarify that in the discussion I expect to have with him on this issue on Monday next.

We have yet to find a major weapons system that is not at least 50 percent more than originally estimated. We have yet to find one that has been delivered on time. And we have yet to find one in which the system met its original specifications. Invariably the systems cost more than estimated, are delivered a year or two late, and fail to meet their specifications. The situation with respect to the avionics systems in the weapons is especially bad as detailed in the Stubbing report some months ago.

#### TIGHTEN PRACTICES

Many hundreds of millions, indeed billions, could be saved through tightening up on procurement practices. But the Defense Department seems intent on firing their efficiency experts who point out, truthfully, the increase in costs rather than changing the system to bring reform.

The imposition of uniform accounting standards could, in the estimate of Admiral Rickover, save \$2 billion a year. My amendment to carry that out is in the Defense Production Act which will shortly be in conference. We must fight to keep that provision in the bill. The President supports it. The Defense Department supports it. The Budget Bureau supports it. The GAO supports it, the Senate supports it. I might point out to the Senate that that provision is in jeopardy. It might well be dropped out. It will take a fight to hold it in. It is vital to cutting back on costs.

We need to institute more competitive bidding and to increase the shameful rate of having almost 90 percent of all procurement done on a noncompetitive basis.

There is gold plating in our defense procurement. This is especially true in this age of sophisticated machines and computers and excessively complicated electronic systems. We need to simplify our weapons not only to reduce the cost but to make them work.

#### PROPERTY AND SUPPLY SYSTEMS

Few people realize that the Defense Department is the largest landlord in the world. It owns over \$40 billion of real property based on its acquisition cost. It

also holds some \$162 billion in personal property, or a total well over \$200 billion.

In addition to this, we have 429 major bases and almost 3,000 minor bases scattered in 30 countries throughout the world. Many of these are obsolete. Many of these were established for reasons which may have been right 20 years ago, but which are now outdated. Most of these are leased and do not show up in the real property figures.

But more than 1 million men and some 500,000 of their dependents live on them or near them. The United States hires about 250,000 foreign employees to man them. They cost the U.S. Government about \$4.5 billion a year. Of this amount, it is estimated that mechanical maintenance alone costs \$660 million a year. They drain about \$2.5 billion from the U.S. balance of payments. The time has come when these costs must be pruned. Many of these bases should be closed down. Many of them have outlived their purpose and their usefulness.

#### TROOPS IN EUROPE

We have some 320,000 troops in Western Europe. The original design for NATO called for our allies to share the burdens and costs of defending Western Europe against a potential Russian attack.

Because of the ravages of the war, our Allies in the early years could not afford to contribute their share economically or militarily. But now they are prosperous. Now most of them have no balance-of-payments problems—or at least not as severe as ours have been. Western Europe has more people than does the United States. Taken together, they are as strong as we are, economically. But they still refuse to carry their fair share of either the military burden or the economic burden for the defense of Europe.

If they are unwilling to do so, why should we shoulder disproportionate burden. I therefore believe that we should withdraw a significant proportion of our troops from Western Europe—as the distinguished majority leader has proposed, with the cosponsorship of many Senators on a resolution—and do it while we continue to provide the nuclear umbrella for NATO as well as air and naval support and a substantial combat presence.

But our obligations to Western Europe have shrunk. The American taxpayer should at long last receive some reduction in this burden.

#### THE REAL SIZE OF THE SOVIET THREAT

There are those who will say that we cannot reduce our military forces because of the threat from the Soviet Union and China. But what is the size of that threat?

Last year the Joint Economic Committee held a series of hearings on that subject. We called in the leading experts on the Soviet Union. Our panel included both the hard liners and what might be called the soft liners. But all were experts on the Soviet Union, the most outstanding experts, I think, in the Nation.

There was general agreement that the Soviet Union's economic capacity was roughly one-half that of ours. It was agreed that she was putting a disproportionate amount of her resources into agriculture.

In these circumstances, to the degree



that she spends excessive amounts of her national product on the military, it will prevent her from increasing her industrial capacity and her productivity. Thus, while she may spend large sums on the military in the short run, if she does this for any lengthy period of time, she can do so only at reducing her general economic strength.

The Russians are not 10 feet tall. If we are 6 feet tall, then economically, the Russians are 3 feet tall. And the Chinese, in terms of their economic strength, are only 6 inches tall.

A military budget in the \$60 billion range should certainly be adequate for the United States to play its proper role in the world.

#### ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

But there are additional reasons why we should cut back on military spending. Some are economic; some are social.

Economically, military spending is the most wasteful method or way to spend. When we build a house or train unskilled men, some needed goods are or will be produced or some needed service such as health or education which adds to the productivity of our people is purchased. But when we pay billions for planes, tanks, guns, ships, and missiles, no direct economic need is met. As a consequence this is the most wasteful way to spend money.

All of us agree that a certain amount of this is necessary. But we should all agree that we should do no more than we are required to do. And that means balancing our needs rather than giving every dollar to the military which they demand.

#### FAILURE TO MEET WAR COSTS INDUCED INFLATION

Furthermore, the failure to pay for the Vietnam war itself through increased taxes or a decrease in other expenditures, was the direct cause of our present inflation. It is hard enough to pay for a war which is popular by increasing taxes or foregoing other expenditures. It is impossible when the war is highly unpopular and vigorously opposed by a very large proportion of the society. Thus military expenditures in general are wasteful and inflationary but the additional military expenditures for Vietnam have been disastrous. The time has come to call a halt to excessive military spending. We must cut back below the President's budget and sharply below.

#### REORDER PRIORITIES—MEET HUMAN NEEDS

The argument for military budget costs rests not only on the size of our strategic and general purpose forces and on the savings we should make by bringing more efficiency into military procurements.

What is at stake is the very nature of our society and the well being of our people.

Excessive military spending has distorted our priorities. Billions are spent on weapons systems to meet every alleged threat while the President threatens to veto funds for schools and hospitals.

We are urged in this bill alone to bail out a company which has failed to meet every schedule, but we must fight for small sums to end poverty, to build houses.

Our lakes and streams are no longer safe to be used for the recreation needs of our people. Our cities are clogged with highways and automobiles which pollute the air, poison our lungs, and irritate our eyes.

#### VAST UNMET PROBLEMS

We need a minimum of 11 million new housing units now just to house those who live in rat infested, broken down, dilapidated buildings or which are highly overcrowded.

The crime rate in the country is rising at an unprecedented rate. We need more and better paid policemen. We need to speed up in our court systems. We need better penal institutions. And we need funds to attack the drug traffic.

Unemployment is high and excessive, among both blacks and whites. Conditions in the ghettos are no better and probably worse than during the riots of 1967 and 1968.

Everywhere we look there are vast unmet needs. Meantime we are asked to spend enough on nuclear weapons to double our present capacity, to be prepared to fight 2½ wars abroad, and to carry an excessive military and economic load in Vietnam.

And because of this misplaced and misdirected use of our resources and of our priorities, our society is in disarray.

#### THREATENS FABRIC OF SOCIETY

Excessive military spending has distorted our priorities. It has threatened the fabric of our society. It has torn the country apart.

There are vast human, economic and social needs which must be met here at home. We must reorder our priorities and reduce the excessive claims of the military in order to redress the balance and meet our glaring social problems. We must follow a course of action which cannot only protect our physical security but which can unite this country again.

The course of action which we should follow to achieve all those ends means that the military budget must be cut and cut substantially. Some of the savings should be allocated into more productive domestic needs—housing, schools, and the fight on pollution. And some of the savings should be returned to the American taxpayer who, because of rising inflationary costs for the goods he needs and rising taxes at the State and local level, has suffered a harsh and unfair burden.

In my judgment this is the way to increase the real security of the people of the United States.

Therefore, at an appropriate time during the debate, I intend to offer an amendment which would place a ceiling on the total amount which the military can spend this year. I am not talking about the total amount in this bill; I am talking about the total amount the Pentagon, the Defense Department, will be empowered to spend. I have not yet determined the exact amount, but after consultation with a number of my colleagues, I intend to take that course of action.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I enjoyed his remarks. I gave attention to them except when I was called

to the telephone. I shall challenge the correctness of some of his conclusions, as well as his figures, but I shall look over his remarks and we will be battling over this matter in days to come.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I appreciate that very much. The Senator is always extremely fair and very accurate. I am somewhat shaken that he would challenge my figures but I think we can get together and determine who is right. Whether the Senator is right or whether I am right, we will both learn something and I am sure we will both benefit from it.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be able to read into the record the following notice of hearing by the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF).

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the notice of hearing reads as follows:

#### NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization will hold hearings on Reorganization Plans Nos. 3 and 4 of 1970 on July 28 and 29. On the first day the hearing will be in room 33C2 New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m., and on the second day it will be in room 457 Old Senate Office Building at 10:30 a.m.

#### NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a notice concerning nominations before the Committee on the Judiciary by the senior Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND).

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

#### NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Juan C. San Agustin, of Guam, to be U.S. Marshal for the District of Guam for the term of 4 years, vice Francisco R. Santos, resigning.

Johnny M. Towns, of Alabama, to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of Alabama for the term of 4 years vice Roy Lee Call, retiring.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the Committee, in writing, on or before July 31, 1970, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

(At this point Mr. PROXMIRE assumed the Chair.)

#### INCREASING AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Mary-

land (Mr. MATHIAS), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which he has prepared.

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

#### INCREASING AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the financial problems of American higher education should be a matter of grave concern to all of us. A combination of factors, including soaring costs and inadequate increases in Federal support, have driven many of our finest colleges and universities into the red for the first time in their experience.

The strains being felt by private colleges in particular are illustrated in an article in yesterday's Washington Post, which reports that many of the fine institutions in Maryland are facing substantial operating deficits and are being compelled to reassess their longrange prospects.

One of our nation's greatest strengths has been our wide range of opportunities for higher education of real quality. If financial problems should significantly narrow these opportunities, we would suffer irreparable national loss. It is incumbent on us, therefore, to examine soberly the alternatives available, and to develop sound strategies for putting American higher education on a durable financial foundation. Approval of this year's education appropriations bill is a first step, but only a first step.

#### MARYLAND PRIVATE COLLEGES FACE HIGHER OPERATING DEFICITS

BALTIMORE.—Johns Hopkins University has announced that it faces a \$4.3 million operating deficit in the coming academic year—the first major deficit in the school's 94-year history.

Hopkins is not alone. Many private colleges in Maryland, as elsewhere in the nation, are having lean financial years.

The president of Hood College in Frederick recently warned that his all-girl institution faced a deficit of up to \$300,000 for 1970-1971.

Gaps between income and expenses were also reported by St. John's College in Annapolis, Loyola of Baltimore and Goucher College in Towson.

At Hopkins, Robert F. Kerley, vice president for administration, said that the projected deficit represents 4½ per cent of the university's budget of \$87 million.

"At this rate, we cannot be sustained very long," Kerley said. "We'll just have to work harder. We will have to look to the private sector as never before for a commitment to higher education."

In a belt-tightening move, administrators have been asked to make "selective reductions," cutting requests for more instructors, secretaries, technicians and equipment.

Kerley said there have been sharp increases in salaries for both faculty and non-professional personnel. At the same time, he added, federal aid is shrinking.

Charles Elzey, treasurer of St. John's, said the liberal arts school in Annapolis will enter the coming academic year \$177,000 in the red.

This, he said, is the college's largest deficit in a decade and \$100,000 more than in each of the past two years.

"It just means we'll have to go out and raise that much more money," he said.

"We'll be taking a long look at expenses to see what can be cut for the following years. We may have to raise tuition again—it was \$3,400 this year. We're going to put off construction of an infirmary-dormitory that was due to start in a few months."

Hood College has increased tuition, and officials there feel the school, where enrollments are dropping, may eventually price itself out of existence.

A similar fear was voiced by Rev. Daniel McGuire, vice president of Loyola, which is facing a \$100,000 deficit and has raised its tuition from \$1,300 to \$1,500.

Elzey, Father McGuire and officials at Hood all say that state-supported institutions with lower tuition charges are becoming more attractive, especially to parents with more than one child to educate in a time of inflation.

Frederick Wehr, director of development at Goucher, said that although the girls' school has "not been badly burned yet," tuition will reach \$3,500 this year, up \$300.

#### FREE TRADE AND FAIR TRADE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in the growing debate over U.S. trade policy in both this and the other body, the local news media has cried foul at the very mention of quota legislation.

Protectionism, they call it, although the legislation proposed would not stop or severely limit imports but merely set some reasonable levels above which imports could be controlled if found to be injuring a domestic industry or its workers.

This issue has been debated for a good many years and the most recent liberalization of U.S. trade laws was in 1962 when the Trade Expansion Act was passed.

Since then we have proceeded to negotiate away what little protection our industry and agriculture had left, and the free traders keep crying for elimination of all barriers.

They would force American industry and agriculture to compete with products from all over the world with little or no customs tariffs or quota limitations on amounts that could be brought into the country.

Free trade advocates claim that any such quota laws, or even the authority granted the President to impose such quotas, would bring on an epidemic of retaliation by our trading partners in Europe, Japan and other parts of the world.

The Washington Post in its frenzy said that the President must veto the trade bill as tentatively approved by the House Ways and Means Committee; that the bill would make a major contribution to inflation; chill prospects for continued expansion of world trade, and abuse the interest of many trading partners among both developed and less developed countries. The Post was almost frantic when the committee included an amendment on oil.

Blazoned across their front page were three top stories—all on oil and its evils as imagined by the publishers of the Post. A story more than 10 years old was dragged out of their morgue and dusted off for resurrection. Even at the time of the alleged incident or since the time of the incident, any connection with the oil import program it attempted to condemn was so remote as to be absurd.

Their contention that the oil import quota system was costing the American consumer billions of dollars a year for petroleum products did not take into account the fact that foreign oil from the Middle East and North Africa now costs more delivered to U.S. east or west coast ports than domestic oil. And were

the tariff plan the Post advocates in effect, another \$1.35 per barrel could be added to that price.

But even should the Middle East situation stabilize and world oil prices go back to former levels, is it really a bargain?

Inasmuch as England and Western Europe are largely dependent upon Middle East and North African oil, recent events that have resulted in skyrocketing tanker rates and curtailed supplies have already caused higher gasoline and heating oil prices there. Fortunately, the United States is not largely dependent on these sources, but the effects are being felt and may result in shortages and higher prices this winter if the situation continues or worsens.

England and Europe are searching for oil and gas in the North Sea and can appreciate the prospects of more dependable sources.

In an editorial last year, the Financial Times of London commented on the Libyan coup:

So far, at least, the change of regime seems to have been carried through peacefully and the British Government's speedy decision to recognize the new government was a wise one in circumstances where the Arab radicals have been trying to associate Britain with the deposed King Idris. The oil has also continued to flow. It is to be hoped that this state of affairs continues. However, the coup has once again demonstrated the fundamental instability and political unreliability of the countries on which Britain and most of the rest of the industrialized world, apart from the U.S., depend for oil.

Secondly, security of supply should be given a higher priority than cheapness. In the short run, this means that no one country should be allowed to secure a dominant position among Britain's suppliers. In the longer run it may mean that if relatively expensive oil is discovered either in Europe's offshore water, or elsewhere—the Canadian Arctic, for instance—in a politically secure country, it should be exploited to our advantage if at all possible, even if it is more expensive than oil from the Middle East and North Africa.

So it is amazing to me, in view of recent events that have boosted some foreign oil prices above our own, that some of our own news media, economists and ecologists are not more concerned with more dependable sources of supply—even if it is more expensive than oil from the Middle East and North Africa.

Dr. Wilson Laird, Director of the Office of Oil and Gas of the Department of the Interior, was a U.S. delegate last month to the NATO Petroleum Planning Committee Conference in Brussels.

Laird, whose office is responsible for emergency petroleum planning, reported that tanker rates from the Persian Gulf to the east coast rose last week to \$3.30 per barrel.

In May of 1967, before the Suez Canal was closed, the average spot tanker freight cost was 52 cents a barrel. By July, following the 6-day war, the spot rate hit \$2.72. The lowest it ever got back to after that was 86 cents in April 1969.

By April of this year, just before the shutdown of Tapline halted the flow of 500,000 barrels per day of Saudi Arabian oil to the Mediterranean, the rate had climbed back up to \$1.69 per barrel. The



subsequent closure of Tapline, plus the cutback in production in Libya, brought the rate to \$3.30 as of last week, Laird said.

Before the most recent Libyan cutback, Laird reported, there was a "very delicately balanced but still feasible, relationship between shipping availability and requirement."

The problem is still workable, in his view, for the time being. But things are getting tighter, and the future looks ominous as relations between Arab nations and Israel worsen.

The Interior official noted that the United States is importing only about 3½ percent of its total oil supply from Arab nations, about the same as in 1967. Then, as now, East Coast refineries depended on Arab sources for about 20 percent of inputs.

But the loss of this supply, he warned would have serious local and regional problems—more serious than the bare figures suggest.

There is another difference between our ability to respond to an oil crisis today and the capability we had in 1967.

Laird pointed out:

Then, the fields in Texas and Louisiana were able to increase production by a million barrels per day over a period of 7 weeks. This adequately supplied our own requirements and eventually made 25 million barrels available to Canada and Western Europe.

Today, however, production in Texas and Louisiana is already well above the peak rates achieved in August 1967. We are caught in a bind between steadily rising production rates and declining productive capacity.

Also, a report just completed by FPC shows gathering-line bottlenecks would prevent use of 523,000 barrels per day in spare productive capacity in an emergency.

Laird said the Government does not yet know the implications of the takeover of company marketing and distribution facilities by the Libyan Government earlier this month. He added:

It doesn't take a detailed assessment, however, to know that this bodes no good for the future.

Late in June, Laird reported, the petroleum security subcommittee met with representatives of the Office of Oil and Gas, and other Federal agencies, to consider requirements and supply for national security.

A classified report of the committee's finding has gone to the Department of Defense. Laird said:

So we continue to watch and wait as the thunder continues to roll out of the Middle East.

But oil is only one part of the fight over trade legislation, although by far the most important because of national security implications. The bill started out as a textile quota bill but is now being called a Christmas tree bill. Some are saying that import quotas are not in the interest of the United States. Others are saying that addition of anything other than quotas to protect their own regional industries are not in the interest of pass-

ing the bill, as it was at first reported as tentatively approved.

I would think the New Englanders who attacked the oil amendment in the bill would, in view of the prices now prevailing for oil from the Middle East, now favor the amendment which would assure that the imports would continue to come in under quotas and not be further increased by a proposed \$1.35 a barrel tariff. The tariff is presently 10 cents a barrel. That oil would now be costing more than \$5.60 a barrel rather than the \$4.25-\$4.75 it has been delivering for. And that compares with a domestic delivered price of about \$3.75 a barrel.

One of the real trade experts in Washington, D.C., O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, has recently made a study of the effects of import quotas on domestic prices. His study, I believe, pretty well refutes the arguments that oil product prices and prices of other products under import quota control have risen at a rate higher than the price index for all commodities.

I have been attempting to convince some of my good friends and colleagues of this fact for sometime now, and I hope Mr. Strackbein's review will be more convincing than my argument apparently has been. He includes a number of products including textiles in his study. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Strackbein's letter to me and his review of import quotas and prices be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE  
ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY,  
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1970.

HON. CLIFFORD HANSEN,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLIFF: I thought you might be interested in the attached account of prices on products that are under import limitation by quota or similar device.

The record is rather surprising, considering the general impression created by columnists, editorial writers, etc., to the effect that import quotas mean gouging of consumers.

In the paper I did not trace beef prices since 1964, which was the year the import ceiling was established. From 1964 when the average price was 18.00 the price for the first half of 1970 was 27.78, representing an increase of 54.3%. This looks like a sure case of the effect of an import limitation. However, the price of hogs rose from 14.80 in 1964 to 24.87 for the first six months of 1970. This was an increase of 68.0%. Yet, pork was not subject to an import limitation.

The data are from the Department of Agriculture.

Once more, the theory of import restriction as a price stimulus is not borne out.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

O. R. STRACKBEIN,  
President.

IMPORT QUOTAS AND PRICES—A REVIEW

(By O. R. Strackbein, president, the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, July 6, 1970)

A constant patter of comment tells us that import quotas will raise domestic prices of the products that are the subject of such quotas.

It should be possible to test the soundness of this unsubstantiated theory. To do so we should trace the wholesale price trends of products that are "protected" by import quotas compared with the price trend in general and the price on particular products that are not so "protected."

PETROLEUM

A favorite whipping boy is oil, or petroleum. An import quota was established in 1958, first on a voluntary basis, followed by a mandatory quota, effective March 1959.

The wholesale price of refined petroleum products expressed in an index form, where 1957-59 equals 100 has risen to only 100.3 in 1968 and 101.8 in 1969. A very recent rise carried the level to 104.2 in May 1970.

This compared with an index for all commodities, where 1957-59 again is 100, of 108.8 in 1968, 113.0 in 1969 and 116.8 for May 1970.

"All commodities," of course, include those on which we have import quotas. Therefore it will be desirable to compare the refined petroleum price level with that of other products that are not subject to an import quota. If we select another fuel, namely, coal, which has no import quota and should therefore not be free to move upward in price because it is not "protected," we find a sharp contrast. The wholesale price index had reached 107.1 in 1968, rose to 116.2 in 1969 and zoomed to 146.9 in May 1970.

Surely if there were an import quota on coal, the quota would be blamed for this runaway price. Obviously other factors were at work.

We find, in other words, that the wholesale price of refined petroleum increased distinctly less than wholesale prices of all commodities and very much less than the price of its competing energy fuel, namely, coal. (For confirmation, see Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, June 1970, p. S-8.)

COTTON TEXTILES

Another product that is the subject of an import quota or its equivalent is cotton textiles. An arrangement was made with Japan alone, effective January 1, 1957, whereby that country restricted its cotton textile exports to this country. This arrangement was superseded October 1, 1961 with the so-called Long-Term Arrangement negotiated under GATT. This arrangement covered some 30 countries and about 90% of our total cotton textile imports.

The wholesale price of cotton products (1957-59 equaling 100) was 105.2 in 1968. In 1969 it remained at 105.2 and in May 1970 stood at 105.8.

Once more we encounter a very moderate price rise compared with the general commodity wholesale price-level, which, as we saw, had risen to 116.8 in May 1970. (Reference: same, p. S-9.)

Wool products, which are not under quota restrictions, had an index level of 103.7 in 1968, compared with 105.2 for cotton products or only 1.5 below cotton products. The index rose to 104.6 in 1969 but fell to 103.8 by May 1970. It thus stood only 0.1 higher in May 1970 than in 1968. In the case of cotton products the increase from 1968 to May 1970 was only 0.6. Thus there was little to choose between the wholesale price movement in cotton and woolen products. Yet the one was under an import quota or its equivalent while the other was not.

In the case of man-made fiber textile products there was a decline in wholesale prices since 1957-59, accounted for by increased productivity. The index stood at 90.8 in 1968 and moved lower to 89.5 in May 1970.

The downward trend of man-made fiber textile products has been of long standing. Measured on the 1947-59 base, as compared with the 1957-59 base as used here, the wholesale price in 1959 had already declined to 81.1. This was before imports reached a

significant volume. Thus the further price decline on the 1957-59 base to 89.5 in 1970 merely represented a continuation of the cost reduction process that had already dropped prices in the decade of 1949-59 by nearly 20%. (Survey of Current Business, October 1961, p. S-8).

There is nothing in this record to show that the price of cotton textiles rose as a result of the import limitation. In any event the price increase through May 1970 was comparatively modest, lagging distinctly behind the general commodity wholesale price index.

In a pamphlet recently issued by the United States-Japan Trade Council it is asserted (p. 10) that "Textile Quotas Would Have Slight Benefit but Very High Cost."

"In sum," it says, "proposed textile quotas would be enormously costly to the United States."

"Quotas would accelerate inflation, raising clothing prices to consumers."

"They would boomerang against U.S. export sales and harm the economies of port cities," etc.

Against this cry of alarm, the wholesale price trend of cotton textiles of the past ten years while these products have been under import limitation, stands as a complete rebuttal.

#### SUGAR

Yet another product that is under import quota control is sugar. This quota has been in effect antedating World War II.

In 1955 the retail price of sugar was 10.4¢ per lb. Ten years later (1965) the price was 11.8¢. In 1968 the price was 12.5¢. In 1969 it was 12.7¢ and in April 1970 it was 13.4¢. In 15 years the retail price increased only 28.8%. (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 512, p. 350; and Survey of Current Business, June 1970, p. S-29.) Compare this increase in retail sugar prices since 1955 with the all-consumer price increase of 34.6% on the 1957-59 base, a period during which all food prices rose 32.4%—also a period during which public transportation cost rose 66.6%, medical care 63.6%. Keeping in mind that 1955, the base of our retail sugar price, antedated the index base of 1957-59 by several years, it is clear that the consumer paid distinctly less for sugar in terms of price increase than he paid for consumer goods in general, or for food in general, and much less than for transportation and medical care which were not pinched in point of supply by an import quota.

It follows that the sugar quota also cannot be used to demonstrate that import quotas raise prices unreasonably, or even as much as the rise in other prices.

#### WHEAT

Wheat is under a severe import restriction that permits less than 1% of domestic production to be imported, in pursuance of a limitation imposed under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1941.

The price of wheat (hard winter, No. 2, Kansas City) has fallen quite sharply in recent years. The price per bushel was \$2.22 in 1950. In 1955 the price was \$2.25. By 1960 the price had dropped to \$2.00. In 1968 it had sunk to \$1.46 per bushel, and in May 1970 it was \$1.53.

Corn is not the subject of an import quota. The 1950 price (yellow, No. 2, Chicago) was \$1.50 per bushel. In 1955 the price was down to \$1.41. The decline, as in the case of wheat, continued. In 1960 it stood at \$1.15; in 1968 it was \$1.14 and in May 1970 it was \$1.30 (yellow, No. 3, Chicago). The difference from No. 2 is very slight, as note, that in 1968 the price of No. 2 in Chicago was \$1.14 while that of No. 3 was \$1.11). (See Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 504, p. 343; and Survey of Current Business, June 1970, p. S-27.)

Comparing the price trend in wheat with that in corn we find that from 1950 to May 1970 the price of wheat dropped 31% while

that of corn dropped only 13%. Yet it was wheat and not corn that was "protected" by an import quota. The wheat price dropped over twice as much in the 20 years as the price of corn.

Since 1960 the price of wheat dropped from \$2.00 per bushel to \$1.53 in May 1970, a decline of 23%. The price of corn, by contrast, rose from \$1.15 per bushel in 1960 to \$1.30 in May 1970. This was an increase of 13%. Thus while the price of the "protected" wheat dropped 23%, that of corn which was not under an import quota, rose 13%.

In comparison with other commodities the price of both wheat and corn has dropped while the other prices rose rather sharply, especially in recent years.

#### RAW COTTON

The price of raw cotton has also declined. The decline was greater than that of wheat and corn, dropping from some 36¢ per lb. to some 22¢, or by more than 38%. Yet raw cotton imports are limited under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to a quantity less than 5% of domestic production. (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 505, p. 344.) (There is some difficulty in reconciling the Statistical Abstract prices with those in the Survey of Current Business, but the discrepancy is not sufficient to destroy the value of the comparisons.)

#### DAIRY PRODUCTS

With a base of 1957-59 equaling 100, the wholesale price index of dairy products stood at 94.0 in 1955, at 105.0 in 1960. In recent years the price rose to 118.5 in 1966, to 127.7 in 1968 and on to 135.4 in May 1970. This was an increase of 29% since 1960, and compares with an increase since 1960 of 18.6% in wholesale price of "Farm Products, Foods and Feeds," which, of course, includes grains, on which the price, as we have seen, dropped considerably.

Dairy products enjoy an import limitation under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the price increase has outpaced that of other farm products, as mentioned, but did not outpace wholesale prices of many other products. Dairying has declined quite sharply per capita. Milk produced on farms was less than 1% higher in 1968 than in 1950, despite the considerable increase in population. The number of cows and heifers kept for milk declined by more than 50%. Unquestionably these factors have influenced the price of dairy products much more than the import quota.

The wholesale price of agricultural machinery and equipment on an index base of 100 for 1957-59 rose to 137.4 by May 1970. There is no import quota on this machinery and equipment. Moreover, agricultural implements are duty free! If imports exert such a salutary effect on prices the effect must have failed in this instance.

#### CONCLUSION

The foregoing recitation can leave little doubt that import quotas have not led to higher prices; indeed, quite the opposite. With the exception of dairy products, with respect to which other powerful factors, such as the public acceptance of oleomargarine, played a large part, the prices on products that are "protected" by import quotas have lagged distinctly behind average prices and far behind prices on some other products that were under no import quota limitation.

The cry that the imposition of import quotas would be costly to consumers is unfounded, and those who continue to raise the cry are guilty of misleading the public.

Mr. HANSEN. In joining with my New England colleagues recently in cosponsoring textile quota legislation, I said, among other things, that another fallacy in the free-trade philosophy is the argument that quota legislation is "protectionist." They say that the American

consumer is entitled to the prices at which foreign producers are able to sell their wares in this country.

The notion that imports should be given priority over domestic production to the extent of bulldozing the jobs of our workers out of the way and leaving it up to us to pick up the pieces and repair the wreckage of a system of adjustment assistance is a wholly unjustifiable philosophy, and represents an amazingly harsh attitude in point of public policy. I doubt that a New York City textile worker would be willing to trade his job for a relief check in order to buy a cheaper shirt made in Japan.

That foreign producers should be able to pay wages that would be illegal in this country and then build a destructive trade on that basis with the blessing of our Government, seems incredible. Yet that is the basic philosophy of adjustment assistance. It proceeds on the wholly untenable assumption that if an American producer cannot compete with imports he is necessarily inefficient. He is guilty without trial and must take the consequences. Yet, on a relative efficiency basis, which is to say, output per man-hour or per man-year, American industry continues to lead the world. This lead is shrinking, however, and the low foreign wages combined with rising foreign technological productivity produces the foreign competitive advantage.

We cannot hope to hold our own industrially in this type of competitive climate. The fact of our competitive defeat from the persistence of lower foreign wages can no longer be concealed by slight-of-hand statistics. The trend of rising imports will force a recasting of our obsolete trade policy.

As further evidence of the need for realistic revision of U.S. trade policy, the figures recently released by the U.S. Department of Commerce show a substantial and continuing deficit in the U.S. balance of payments for the first quarter of 1970. That deficit last year amounted to \$7 billion and at the rate reported for the first quarter, may well exceed the 1969 figure by the end of this year.

But even these figures do not tell the whole story. Figures used by the Department of Commerce include foreign aid shipments as exports and show imports at their foreign value without including ocean freight, insurance, and other charges. This practice is contrary to that of nearly all other leading nations and results in an understatement of actual costs of our imports by some 10 percent.

Mr. President, this country has been generous in assisting other nations, in financing the rebuilding of Europe and Japan after World War II, in furnishing the technology, money, and even manpower to many so-called emerging nations to establish agriculture and industry of their own. The next step has been that we are then expected to furnish the market for whatever it is they produce—shoes, textiles, oil, beef, electronic components, steel, and so forth.

Measured in relation to exports of all other countries American exports including foreign aid have lost ground in recent years. This means simply that exports from other countries have expand-



ed more rapidly than U.S. exports. In turn this suggests that their goods are more competitively priced in world markets. In 1960 our share of world exports was 15 percent; in 1967 it was 14.5 percent. Had our exports in 1967 enjoyed the same proportion of world exports as in 1960 we would have exported \$4.6 billion more in 1967 than we did export or \$35.8 billion instead of \$31.2.

The irrefutable fact is that we are in a weak competitive position in world markets and in our own market vis-a-vis imports.

The trend since 1960 is unmistakable. A trade policy that was based on competitive conditions as they existed before 1960 is no longer in focus. It is unrealistic.

What does our weak competitive position suggest with respect to our trade policy?

The problem of import competition would be more acute than it is were it not for the \$30 billion annual boost to our economy provided by the Vietnam involvement. Since our tariff has been cut to an ineffective level without present hope of reversal, some other instrument for control of our market and employment erosion attributable to imports must be provided.

Enactment of this legislation would provide assurance that imports, despite their cost advantage resulting from lower wages, will not be allowed to run wild and thus disrupt industry after industry. Instead of relying on first aid ministrations in the form of adjustment assistance, the injury to our employment and industrial expansion would be controlled ahead of time. Imports would not be awarded the right of eminent domain in our market, but would be given the opportunity to grow in proportion to domestic consumption.

We face an opportunity to adopt a trade policy that would achieve the undoubted benefits of world trade without incurring its unfair and destructive impact on a widening front.

And I hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues from New England will recognize the fact that oil imports last year—controlled and uncontrolled—ran at the rate of almost 30 percent of domestic production. This is twice the rate of 15 percent in the proposed Ways and Means bill which would direct a study by the Tariff Commission to determine whether an industry or its workers were being injured and whether the President should invoke quotas.

I hope my good friends from New England will realize that oil workers in the 31 oil-producing States have already been injured by imports that have affected the rate of exploration and development of new sources of supply to insure our continued self-sufficiency in case dependable sources should be cut off as, indeed, they have been recently. The Senators and Representatives from these 31 States are acutely aware of the effects of oil imports on our domestic producing industry, particularly the small independent operator who, in the past, has been responsible for the discovery of about three-fourths of U.S. reserves of both oil and gas.

If my good New England friends expect the support of those who represent

the 31 oil-producing States, they should certainly have as much concern for the workers in the oil- and gas-producing industry as their own textile, shoe, electronic, and sporting goods workers and their fishing industry.

Actually, none of those industries or their products could seriously affect the national security of the Nation should we become overly dependent on foreign substitutes or, at least, not to the extent that a cutoff of oil would mean to the entire U.S. economy.

And, Mr. President, I keep reading in the Washington Post and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the billions of dollars the mandatory oil import program has cost U.S. consumers—some \$5 billion a year according to the report of the majority of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control.

This charge is patently absurd and based on assumptions not even recommended by the majority of the task force. Other studies, Mr. President, have come to the conclusion that the program actually has had a net benefit to the Nation. One eminent economist recently analyzed this assumption in the Oil & Gas Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis made by Dr. Richard J. Gonzalez, "Fiction and Fact," be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### FICTION AND FACT

(By Richard J. Gonzalez)

##### THE FICTION

Oil-import controls cost \$5 billion a year and there is very little offset against this cost for the benefits to consumers and to national security.

##### THE FACT

The costs and benefits of oil-import controls can be calculated only on the basis of assumptions about what might happen if much more imported oil were used.

Since foreign oil can be delivered to the East Coast and West Coast for less than domestic crude oil, the conclusion is frequently drawn that consumers could save billions of dollars through removal of import controls on the erroneous assumption that everything else would remain the same.

Estimates that oil-import controls costs consumers about \$5 billion a year appear absurd in relation to total value of U.S. crude-oil production of \$10.3 billion in 1969. They are erroneous because they fail to evaluate (1) differences in transportation costs, (2) the effect on U.S. exploration and supply, (3) the higher prices for domestic natural gas that would result, (4) true economic costs to the nation, and (5) the benefits from the control program.

Domestic crude delivered to the East Coast is put at a disadvantage relative to foreign crude because it must be moved in American-flag tankers. Under current construction and labor costs, use of American-flag tankers may cost twice as much as foreign-flag tankers.

Thus, if security requires that all oil supplies to the East Coast, including imports, be moved in American-flag tankers, the cost saving from foreign oil for the East Coast could decrease by 50% from \$1.50 to \$0.76/bbl. This is based on a 100% increase in the transportation cost for foreign oil.

But assuming that national security is ignored and domestic oil is moved in foreign-flag tankers, the cost saving would decrease by 15% from \$1.50 to \$1.28/bbl if the cost of moving oil from the Gulf Coast to the East Coast drops 50%.

With import controls gone, it's most likely that foreign oil will not remain low-priced. A flood of foreign oil into this country would close down U.S. exploration and domestic reserves would dwindle as a result (Fiction-Fact, June 15). The tremendous demand thus imposed on Free World sources of oil inevitably would drive up the price of this oil.

Exploration for natural gas also would decline and the only way this could be averted would be an increase in the price of gas (Fiction-Fact, July 6). The price increase necessary to support exploration would erode any savings from imported oil by 40 to 70%.

There also are economic benefits from higher-priced domestic oil. The estimated cost to consumers of domestic vs. foreign oil is not a total loss the economy.

The report of Charles River Associates showed that cost to the nation is only 20-25% of the estimated cost to consumers from oil import controls.

Consider this situation then: if higher gas costs offset 50% of the assumed consumer savings from removing oil-import controls, and if only 20% of this cost reflects the real economic loss, then the widely quoted \$5 billion consumer cost becomes a true cost to the nation of \$500 million a year, an entirely different order of magnitude.

One very tangible benefit for the gas industry and consumers deserves emphasis. Gas reserves on the Continental Shelf were estimated at 34 trillion cu ft on Jan. 1, 1968, and these reserves are being produced at about 5% a year. So, about 1.7 trillion cu ft of gas produced in 1968, or 9% of domestic supply, resulted from offshore developments that would have been nonexistent but for oil-import controls. If these supplies of gas had not been available, consumers would have been forced to use less desirable and more expensive fuels.

Mr. HANSEN. In addition to this, Mr. President, those who demand more imports from Canada certainly must not realize that Canada is a net importer of oil herself and is affected by price fluctuations, such as the sudden escalation of the cost of oil from the Middle East and North Africa.

Most of Canadian production is in her western provinces, but most of her refining capacity is in her eastern provinces. Canada has no pipeline connections from her own producing areas to her eastern refineries. She imports as much oil as she exports to the United States and the price of that imported oil has suddenly gone up. Canada may, if this situation continues or worsens, find it to her advantage to use her own oil when the price differential disappears or becomes a minus rather than the plus it has been.

I do not mean to say that we should not develop a common energy policy with Canada which is, undoubtedly, our most secure source. But what I do want to point out is that Canada will certainly take care of her own needs first in an emergency, such as the 1967 embargo of Middle East and North African oil that followed the Arab-Israel war.

And I cannot conceive of the Canadians gazing benignly across the border as the U.S. Treasury rakes off a fat tariff for their oil without taking a cut for themselves. That's another fallacy of the academically inspired tariff proposal. With the ups and downs of tanker rates and the uncertainties of tomorrow in North Africa and the Middle East, we can be thankful that there were some who could foresee the risks involved in the task force—majority—proposal, and

that, finally, others are realizing that cheap foreign oil will remain cheap only so long as we do not have to depend on it.

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 2601**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 75, which is at the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to make certain technical corrections in the bill which was passed yesterday in the conference report on S. 2601.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE). The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) directing the Secretary of the State to make corrections in the enrollment of S. 2601.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

**S. CON. RES. 75**

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2601), to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, to revise the procedures for handling juveniles in the District of Columbia, to codify title 23 of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:

(1) In the third sentence of the proposed section 11-1527(a) (3) of the District of Columbia Code (as contained in section 111 of the bill), strike out "subsections (a) and (b)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (b)".

(2) In section 144 of the bill, renumber the paragraphs which follow the first paragraph (12) of such section as paragraphs (13), (14), (15), (16), and (17), respectively.

(3) In section 145(f) of the bill, renumber the paragraph which follows paragraph (13) of such section as paragraph (14).

(4) In section 156 of the bill, reletter the subsections of such section which follow subsection (f) of such section as subsections (g) and (h), respectively.

(5) In section 157(c) of the bill, designate the undesignated paragraph that follows paragraph (1) (B) of such section as paragraph (2).

(6) In section 163 of the bill, reletter subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (i) and (j), respectively.

(7) In the proposed section 23-561(b) (1) of the District of Columbia Code (as contained in section 210(a) of the bill), strike out "subsection (a) of" in the last sentence.

(8) In the proposed section 23-563(b) of the District of Columbia Code (as contained in section 210(a) of the bill), strike out "No" at the beginning of such section and insert in lieu thereof "A".

**PROGRAM**

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished acting majority

leader would give us some indication of the program for Monday and the coming week.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senate will shortly adjourn until 12 noon on Monday next. As I recall, no Senators have secured special orders to speak on Monday morning. We will have a period for the transaction of routine morning business, after which the Senate will again proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, the military procurement bill. It is my understanding the Senate will be debating this measure for some time.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Conference reports on various measures may be brought up from time to time, but this will be worked out by the leadership on both sides.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the Senator.

**ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,  
JULY 27, 1970**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 27, 1970, at 12 noon.

**NOMINATIONS**

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 24, 1970:

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

Robert Wells, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1970, vice Kenneth A. Cox, term expired.

Sherman Unger, of Ohio, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1964, vice Robert Wells.

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 1970:

**OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY**

Clay T. Whitehead, of California, to be Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy.

**U.S. AIR FORCE**

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. John S. Hardy, FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

**U.S. ARMY**

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. John MacNair Wright, Jr., U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of

importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. Edward Leon Rowney, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title, United States Code section 3962:

*To be lieutenant general*

Lt. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

**U.S. NAVY**

Rear Adm. Fred G. Bennett, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Dick H. Guinn, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel for a term of 4 years, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5141.

Rear Adm. Dick H. Guinn, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Ralph Weymouth, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Ralph W. Cousins, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Gerald E. Miller, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION**

Colston A. Lewis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the remainder of the term expiring July 1, 1972.

**IN THE ARMY**

The nominations beginning Gasper V. Abene, to be major, and ending Mary H. Yeakel, to be major, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 9, 1970; and

The nominations beginning Darrel W. Basom, to be major, and ending Wiley W. Walker, to be major, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 13, 1970.

**IN THE NAVY**

The nominations beginning Ralph P. Abenante, to be chief warrant officer, W-3, and ending Teresa Caruso, to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 9, 1970.

**IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE**

The nominations beginning Charles M. Bowyer, to be medical director, and ending Steven A. Coppola, to be senior assistant health services officer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 22, 1970.