

many now in business, industrial, and research positions. Considerable (50-100%) gain in efficiency will accrue to the credit of he who can eliminate the paperwork involved in medical practice.

V. There is a crisis, if you wish to use the term, in medical care costs, now approaching \$70 billion annually in total expenditure. This is not importantly due to the inefficiency of hospitals, which are in the majority non-profit, and whose labor costs have risen astronomically; it is not importantly due to the avarice of physicians, most of whose hourly wages are not inappropriate to the skills and responsibilities involved, and whose total fees comprise less than one-quarter of total medical costs. Discounting inflation, the two major factors (which must be controlled) are the vastly increased complexity of services, and the loss of control of utilization.

The growth over the last two decades of third party payment for services, together with recent institution of Medicare and Medicaid programs have eliminated natural restraints on expenditure. Deductibles and co-insurance provisions have been of limited effectiveness. Since the physician has traditionally worked primarily for the benefit of his patient (a role we feel proper) he is committed to the provision of all reasonable diagnostic and therapeutic services. The suggestion of some that the expansion of medicare-like programs will result in a solution to the cost problem seems at very least unrealistic. Clearly, if cost to the patient is no longer to serve as a practical limit to services, the limits must be set by administrative officials, medical professionals or otherwise. We feel this is undesirable, but possibly the only solution for those whose medical care must be completely subsidized. Hopefully the size of this group can be minimized.

Another old fashioned tradition in the medical profession is that there is a moral and ethical obligation to use all means at the doctor's disposal in attempt to maintain life or health. But as science has advanced, medical technology has exploded,

and with it cost. Today's office call and today's patient-day are not comparable to those of twenty years ago, nor should their cost be. A reasonable projection of present trends would place total medical expenditures in 1980 near \$200 billion, or about 15 percent of the GNP. It seems dubious that the taxpayer will accept this. If he does not, the physicians' duty will then be to provide such services to the patient as expense will be justified by the probable benefit, including both medical and social considerations, notwithstanding the patient's desires. The doctor will thus be an agent of the state, rather than of the patient, an uncomfortable role for most of us, and we think for our patients.

VI. In summary, the Alaska State Medical Association feels that the present method of medical care delivery is not so bad as it has been painted in many quarters; that violent change in the system may very well produce more problems than we now have and may well result in the babies being flushed with the bath water. Of the two major problems visible at present, lack of personnel and facilities is probably more important, and few of the presently proposed plans make adequate solution for this deficit, the correction of which will in any case take some time. We would expressly caution against adoption of any system that would through financing abruptly increase demands for medical service.

The solution of the rising cost problem is most importantly one of over-utilization and over-sophistication of services; to suggest that real economies can be achieved by the substitution of bureaucracy for our present system is difficult for most of us to accept with the great previous projects of the government everywhere at hand for comparison. Under a monopolistic or government-paid plan, economies can indeed be affected, but at the expense of the patient's loss of any control in his management. We would venture to predict that the patient, in this case the taxpayer, under these circumstances would not have great

gratitude for those who imposed this system upon them. Many of us feel that the sick patient still needs a doctor, and cannot be well satisfied by a mass production of medical industry.

We would further caution that systems that have evolved over considerable time, though rarely immune to improvement, are very likely to have more virtues than may be recognized, and that elegant systems concocted de novo from the heads of bright young planners are very likely to have more defects than are obvious in the planning state.

Finally, a medical care system deals primarily with human beings, as patients, as doctors, as technicians, and as administrators and planners. A shrewd and realistic estimate of the capacity of this cast for self-interest, pettiness, inspiration and ingenuity, may optimize the design.

ROBERT D. WHALEY, M.D.,

Chairman, Subcommittee for National Health Legislation, Legislative Committee, ASMA.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SENATE—Wednesday, September 15, 1971

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

PRAYER

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

O Lord God Almighty, guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom has been committed the government of this Nation and grant to them special gifts of wisdom and unflinching devotion to righteousness. May their leadership and their legislation be such as will promote the common welfare, succor the poor, relieve the oppressed, redress social wrongs, subdue terror and tyranny, raise our national ideals and goals, and bring in the era of brotherhood.

O Thou Redeemer of Life, we beseech Thee to mend the brokenness of our common life. Mitigate the tensions, fears, and anxieties of the people and bring healing to their wounded spirits. By the power of divine love, expel the hate and bitterness which blights the life of our society and destroys all that is good and beautiful. Correct and reform those who pay the penalty of their misdeeds. Support and strengthen the custodians of the law, the protectors of our safety, and

all keepers of public order. Unify us in common cause for a better Nation and a better world under Thy rulership.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT ON FEDERAL-INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR THE HUDSON RIVER BASIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 3 of Public Law 89-605 as amended by Public Law 91-242, I am pleased to transmit a report by the Secretary of the Interior on the progress which has been achieved in negotiations on a Federal-Interstate Compact for the Hudson River Basin.

The Secretary of the Interior will continue to work with the States of New Jersey and New York to find a viable method of managing the environmental problems of this significant river basin.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 15, 1971.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education is submitted herewith.

This Council, authorized by Public Law 89-329, has reviewed the administration and effectiveness of the program authorized by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

Several of the Council's proposals are highly commendable, especially those reflecting a concern for innovation and reform in post-secondary education, including the proposed National Foundation for Higher Education, and its recommendation that programs directed to continuing education for adults be coordinated and consolidated.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 15, 1971.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Winston L. Prouty, late a Senator from the State of Vermont.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 234) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of detention camps, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 234) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of detention camps, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 14, 1971, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT OF ELECTORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 357, S. 2495, which has been cleared on both sides and all around.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 2495, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Election Act (Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699) as amended, D.C. Code 1-1100 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (2) of section 2 is amended as follows:

(a) Clause (A) is amended by striking "one-year period" and by inserting "thirty-day period" instead.

(b) Clause (B) is amended by striking "twenty-one" and inserting "eighteen" instead.

(2) Paragraph (7) (A) of subsection (a) of section 10 is amended by striking out "on the twenty-first day following such election" and by inserting instead "not less than two weeks nor more than six weeks after the date on which the Board has determined the results of the preceding general election. At the time of announcing such determination the Board shall establish and announce the date of the runoff election, if one is required."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-361), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, S. 2495, is to establish a 30-day-residency durational requirement in order to be a qualified elector in the District of Columbia. In addition, the bill would amend the District of Columbia Election Act to provide that a qualified elector must be 18 years old to conform the language of the act to the present law.

The bill would also authorize the Board of Elections to establish a runoff election date not less than 2 weeks nor more than 6 weeks after the Board has determined the results in a general election for members of the Board of Education, if such a runoff is required. This flexible 2- to 6-week period replaces the mandatory requirement that such a runoff be held 21 days after such general election.

The bill is the embodiment of recommendations made to the Senate District Committee by the Board of Elections of the District of Columbia.

NEED FOR THE BILL

The District of Columbia Election Act provides in part that a qualified elector—that is, one who is qualified to register and vote—must be a U.S. citizen who has resided or has been domiciled in the District of Columbia continuously since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day of the next election.

This 1-year residency requirement has been part of the election law since 1955, and until at least recently, has been considered to apply to voting in all elections.

During recent years, the durational residency requirements for voting have been shortened in a number of jurisdictions throughout the country, sometimes by legislative action and sometimes by court action.

In June 1970, the Congress in Public Law 91-285, determined, in effect, that in the case of presidential elections, a durational residency requirement of more than 30 days was

constitutionally abhorrent. In that legislation, Congress directed that each State provide by law for the registration of its duly qualified residents at any time up to 30 days before a presidential election.

That legislation specifically included the District of Columbia in its definition of the word "State"; and so there is at the very least a clear congressional statement of policy that the 30-day residency requirement should be applicable in the case of presidential elections.

The statute was, of course, national in scope; but its precise language leaves considerable doubt as to whether in the case of the District of Columbia it was in fact entirely self-implementing, since the statute did not either specifically amend the District of Columbia Election Act or delegate regulatory authority to any District of Columbia agency to shorten the residency period.

Legislative clarification of this point in the case of presidential elections in the District is therefore important, and the matter should be put to rest well before next year's presidential election.

The applicability of the 1-year residency requirement in the case of elections for the District of Columbia's Delegate to the House of Representatives was also challenged in 1970, in this case by court action. Last November, a three-judge Federal court struck down as unconstitutional the 1-year residency requirement in the case of persons who had resided here for less than 1 year and who wished to vote in the elections of the Delegate to the House.

This case, *Lester v. Board of Elections* (319 F. supp. 505 D.C.D.C. 1970), was by its terms applicable only to the election of Delegate to the House of Representatives.

The District Government requested the court in *Lester* to clarify the scope of its opinion and order, in an effort to get a ruling as to whether its decision applied to other elections; but the court, in denying the District government's motion, stated that it had "held only that the District of Columbia 1-year durational residency requirement applied to elections for nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives (citations omitted) was unconstitutional."

The court in the *Lester* case specifically upheld as constitutional other provisions in the District of Columbia Election Act which prohibited registration for any 30-day period prior to an election.

The *Lester* case was decided in November of 1970, and was applicable to the initial party primary elections for District of Columbia Delegate held in January 1971, and to the initial general election for District of Columbia Delegate held in March 1971, for the short initial congressional term which ends in January 1973.

As a result of *Lester*, a number of people registered here who had lived here less than a year before one or the other of these Delegate elections. Many of these people will not have resided here for a full year by this November, at which time the District will have regularly scheduled Board of Education elections.

Since the *Lester* case quite clearly does not rule on the residency requirement for Board of Education elections, it would appear that unless the 1955 statutory residency requirement is changed before November of this year, voting will be forbidden in the School Board election by those registered voters who will have been here less than a year but who nevertheless were able to vote in January and in March for the elections for Delegate to the House of Representatives.

A possibly even more confusing residency problem will arise in connection with the party elections on May 2, 1972. On that day there will be two different closed party elections, and unless the residency period is changed by statute, there will be two sets of residency requirements for all persons who have lived here less than a year.

There will be a closed party primary election under the 1970 act to choose party candidates for Delegate to the House of Representatives—to which the 30-day residency requirement will apply under the authority of the *Lester* case.

On the same day there will be closed party elections also under the original 1955 Election Act for candidates for delegate to the presidential nominating conventions, for national committeemen and national committeewomen and members of local political parties, as well as voting on the so-called party questions.

The statutory 1-year residency requirement would appear to apply to this second group of elections, unless the period were amended by legislation.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the confusing situation in regard to the durational residency requirements for qualified electors in the District of Columbia and because of the prospective difficulty in administering the elections in November, 1971, the committee urges the enactment of S. 2495.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a morning business, not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

QUORUM CALL

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

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

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATIONS, 1972

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I am supporting the 1972 defense authorization bill, now before the Senate, with mixed feelings. Let me first say that I consider that it has lowered our national defense and national security to a dangerous level. It is the latest step in the steady, uninterrupted trend to making the United States a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people.

It is the latest step in the shifting balance of military power in favor of the Soviet Union. The first basic step came a few years ago with the advocacy of paring down our military strength to no more than parity with that of the Soviet Union in order to convince the Kremlin that we were really sincere about peace.

Given the justifiable and understandable concern of the American people for a greater allocation of our national resources to domestic and welfare needs—and given the public repugnance to the Vietnam involvement and the unfair spin-off of backlash against the military—there is a desperate need for a wider public understanding not only that the balance of military power is shifting against the United States, not only that

it is the first duty of the National Government to "provide for the common defense" of our country, but as well that our domestic and welfare priorities mean nothing if we grow so militarily inferior that the enemy takes over.

In our free democracy—where dissent is almost unlimited even in its extreme forms of violence as contrasted to the complete intolerance of dissent in a totalitarian regime, the ultimate defense posture is determined by the will of the people. But the will of the people is shaped by what they know and what information they have.

In this time of disillusionment with international responsibilities and an intense concern with pressing domestic needs—of putting our own house in order before looking outward to our national defense and national security—it is obviously difficult to achieve the desperately needed public understanding and consequent support of the American people for an adequate national defense and national security.

The only way to overcome this difficulty is to get the facts to the American people and to bring home to them the clear consequences of second-rate military status.

As the President has said:

If we are less strong than necessary . . . there will be no domestic society to look after.

Military weakness and national insecurity literally invite diplomatic blackmail and the strategy of terror from the Soviet Union. Military weakness and national insecurity increase the chances of overconfidence and miscalculation by the enemy to trigger war.

These are not just the views of a senatorial "hawk" or "warmonger." They are the warnings that have also been eloquently expressed by the blue ribbon defense panel composed of outstanding private citizens.

There is a desperate need to remind the American people of the continuous external pressures exerted against our Nation and people. There is a desperate need to remind the American people that the road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament, negotiation from weakness, or scaling down to parity to prove sincerity.

History is precisely to the contrary. There is a desperate need to remind the American people that among the great nations, only the strong survive, and that weakness on our part in military capability and national will would be the greatest threat to the peace of the world.

The most serious question is the will of the American people. It is my opinion that the only reason about any doubt in that will is the fact that the serious situation has not been gotten across to the American people. I have no doubt about their will if they know and realize how serious the situation is.

But they do not. Since they do not, and in view of the existing pressures and drives against the military, I have reluctantly concluded that this bill is about the best we can hope for despite its deficiencies in national defense and national security. And so I am supporting it but without any great enthusiasm.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Mississippi, is to be commended on his dedication, patience, thoroughness, guidance, and outstanding leadership.

He has clearly done the best that he could in anticipation of the inevitable vigorous attacks on the bill to be made on the Senate floor. I commend the subcommittees and the committee staff on their sincere efforts and work.

In concluding, I want to express a very concerned hope that next year's bill will be much stronger and much more realistic—simply because by that time the American people will have been adequately informed, alerted, and awakened to the serious weakening of our national security and the ominous shifting of the balance of military power in favor of the Soviet Union.

I hope that in their awakening they will have so expressed themselves to their representatives in Congress that there will be no doubt about the will of the American people and that there will be a genuine and accurate response to that expressed will.

The day of reckoning is approaching. Let us pray that recognition and action on the frightful truth comes sufficiently in advance to bolster our national security to such strength as to save our Nation and people.

QUORUM CALL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

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

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

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations: George Bush, of Texas; Christopher H. Phillips, of New York; CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., U.S. Representative from the State of Michigan; EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, U.S. Representative from the State of Illinois; and Daniel P. Moynihan, of New York, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 26th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Alan B. Shepard, Jr., of Texas; Arthur A. Fletcher, of Washington; Mrs. Gladys O'Donnell, of California; W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia; and Bernard Zagorin, of Virginia, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 26th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time

and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2516. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse owners of equines and accredited veterinarians for certain expenses of vaccinations incurred for protection against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2517. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2518. A bill for the relief of Anna Kolbraiasz; and

S. 2519. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Pareja Romualdo. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2520. A bill for the relief of Sung Tung Wang and Wen Fen Wang; and

S. 2521. A bill for the relief of Rosario O. Caladiao. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 2522. A bill to increase the Government National Mortgage Association purchase limit in high cost areas. Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2523. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risks of its fidelity losses. Referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for payment under section 6421 or credit under section 39 for gasoline used to operate concrete mixers and to provide for exemption under section 4041 for diesel fuel and special motor fuels used to operate concrete mixers. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2516. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse owners of equines and accredited veterinarians for certain expenses of vaccinations incurred for protection against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation that would authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse horse owners and accredited veterinarians for certain expenses incurred by them in connection with the vaccination of equine animals against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis, which struck Texas on July 9, 1971.

VEE, first diagnosed in Venezuela in 1935 and 1936, spread to other South American countries and into Central America in 1969 and into southern Mexico in 1970. In April 1971, the virus was identified in an area just south of Tampico, Mexico. Shortly thereafter it spread into south Texas, causing widespread death to the equine population.

On June 25, the Department of Agriculture approved and supplied vaccine to 13 counties in Texas which were hardest hit by the disease: Cameron, Willacy, Hidalgo, Starr, Jim Hogg, Kenedy, Zapata, Brooks, Kleber, Nueces, Duval, and

Jim Wells, along with one-half of Webb. At the time the vaccine was first available to animal owners, the owners had to pay veterinarians the fees for immunization. But on July 16, 1971, Secretary of Agriculture Hardin declared that a national emergency existed due to the epidemic and proceeded to take extensive measures directed toward halting the spread of the disease. He directed that as of the July 16 date the Government would pay the \$4 fee for vaccinations.

As a result of the massive efforts of the Department of Agriculture, public health officials, and the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga., combined with those of the Texas Animal Health Department and the Texas veterinarians, the disease was confined to the boundaries of the State of Texas, and the loss to the horse industry was also confined to Texas.

Mr. President, I think it is only equitable that the U.S. Government reimburse those individuals who first struggled with the disease and who suffered the greatest loss. My bill would provide that the expenses incurred in the application of the vaccine between June 25 and July 15 be reimbursed at the rate of \$4 per immunization.

Many States across the Nation have been allowed to vaccinate without expense, and I feel that those who fought the disease when it was running rampant in my State and prevented it from spreading to other States should certainly not be financially penalized. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this legislation for those deserving individuals who helped to accomplish a nearly impossible feat during the month of July in Texas.

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

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

S. 2516

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse owners of equines and accredited veterinarians for certain expenses of vaccinations incurred for protection against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to reimburse owners of equines and accredited veterinarians for certain expenses incurred by them in connection with the vaccination of equines against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis. Such expenses must have been incurred within the State of Texas during the period beginning June 25, 1971 through July 15, 1971 after which period the expenses of equine vaccinations against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis were paid by the Federal Government upon a determination by the Secretary of Agriculture of an emergency animal disease outbreak threatening the livestock industry of the United States.

Sec. 2. The amount of reimbursement shall be \$4.00 for each equine vaccinated against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis which was the amount paid by the Federal Government for such services beginning on July 16, 1971. Payment will be made to each owner upon submission of a record satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture of each equine vaccinated and a certification by the owner that payment was made to an accredited vet-

erinarian. Payment will be made to each accredited veterinarian upon submission of a record satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture of services performed in administering Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis vaccine and a certification that no payment was received for such services. Payments made to owners of equines and accredited veterinarians shall relieve the Federal Government of any and all claims in connection with the equine vaccinations covered under this Act.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse owners of equines and accredited veterinarians pursuant to this Act.

Sec. 4. All claims for reimbursement under this Act shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture not later than six (6) months after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2517. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services. Referred to the committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to alleviate a problem in regard to the moving allowance provided to the serviceman with a mobile home. As it now stands, there is a limit of 74 cents per mile on a trailer move for a permanent station change. I am informed by members of the service that this ceiling results in them having to pay some moving costs themselves, which has two adverse effects as far as the public's interest is concerned.

First, this extra cost of being in the service amounts to a reduction in pay, and makes the service somewhat less attractive as a career. Second, the Government is interested in promoting mobile home ownership as a means of closing the housing gap that exists today, and the penalty that the present law effectively imposes on servicemen who prefer to own mobile homes tends to deter mobile home ownership.

My bill would give the Defense Department sufficient authority to make sure that the serviceman does not find himself financially penalized for owning a mobile home. I recommend this measure to the Senate for its thorough consideration.

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

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

S. 2517

A bill to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 409 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 409. Travel and transportation allowances trailers;

"(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and in place of the transportation of baggage and household effects, a member, or in the case of his death his dependent, who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage and household effects under section 406 of this title, may transport a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United

States, within Alaska or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence by one of the following means—

"(1) transport the trailer or dwelling and receive a monetary allowance in place of transportation at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, but not more than 20 cents a mile;

"(2) deliver the trailer or dwellings to an agent of the United States for transportation by the United States or by commercial means; or

"(3) transport the trailer or dwelling by commercial means and be reimbursed by the United States for the expense, including the expenses of necessary tolls, charges, and permit fees.

However, the cost of transportation under clause (2) or the reimbursement under clause (3) may not be more than the cost of transporting the maximum weight allowance of baggage and household effects prescribed by the Secretaries concerned for the member or his dependent. Any payment authorized by this section may be made in advance of the transportation concerned. For the purposes of this section, 'continental United States' means the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

"(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member who is ordered to make a change of permanent station from a place inside, to a place outside, or from a place outside, to a place inside, the continental United States or Alaska is entitled to both the transportation of his house trailer or mobile dwelling and the transportation of his baggage and household effects within the continental United States or Alaska. However, the total cost of moving his baggage and household effects and his house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States or Alaska may not be more than the cost of transporting the maximum weight allowance of baggage and household effects authorized for the member or his dependent from—

"(1) the old duty station in the continental United States or Alaska to the location to which the house-trailer or mobile dwelling is transported at the expense of the United States thence to the port of embarkation through which household goods would have been transported from the old duty station; or

"(2) the greater distance of either—

"(A) the port of debarkation to the new duty station in the continental United States or Alaska; or

"(B) the location where the housetrailer or mobile dwelling was transported at the expense of the United States to the new duty station in the continental United States or Alaska."

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 2522. A bill to increase the Government National Mortgage Association purchase limit in high cost areas. Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill that would enable home buyers in California and other States with high construction costs to get a larger share of the \$2 billion now available nationally for interest subsidies.

My bill would authorize the Government National Mortgage Association—"Ginnie Mae"—to pay part of the interest on FHA-insured mortgages up to \$26,000 in high cost areas.

The present ceiling is a universal one of \$22,000, with no differential in States where building costs are over the national average.

Only 11.3 percent of the FHA homes

sold in California during the last quarter of 1970 were priced below \$22,000 and thus were eligible for "Ginnie Mae" aid. That statewide figure was considerably lower in areas like Los Angeles where a mere 2.6 percent fell below the \$22,000 ceiling.

In contrast, he estimated that 40.7 percent of FHA homes nationally are priced low enough for buyers to qualify for interest subsidies.

The average price nationally of an FHA-insured new home at the end of 1970 was \$24,402, but in at least six States, the average was \$26,000 or more. The States were California, Illinois, Minnesota, Nevada, Michigan, and Virginia.

Home building costs in Minnesota ranked highest of the 31 States reporting, with an average price of \$28,786. Connecticut is believed to be still higher, but that State does not report its figures to the Federal Housing Administration.

The average FHA home in California costs \$26,386, and the figures go up to \$27,112 in San Francisco; \$28,097 in and around Los Angeles, and \$30,943 in Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove.

Average home prices in other California standard metropolitan statistical districts are: Oxnard-Ventura, \$27,775; Sacramento, \$25,333; San Diego, \$25,637; and San Jose, \$24,927.

President Nixon has released \$2 billion effective August 17 for Ginnie Mae to use for interest subsidies on FHA homes. But very few would-be home buyers in California and other high priced States will be able to share in these funds under present regulations.

In only six reporting States is the average FHA home priced under \$22,000, and these homes account for only about half the number built in those States.

A ceiling differential has been part of the special assistance provisions of the GNMA law ever since it was enacted in 1958. At that time the mortgage ceiling was set at \$16,000 generally and \$19,000 in high cost areas.

The differential was maintained through successive amendments raising the ceiling but through some oversight, the differential was dropped in December 1969, when the ceiling was raised to \$22,000.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2523. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risks of its fidelity losses. Referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risk of fidelity bonds for civilian employees and military personnel of the Federal Government.

This legislation is an official request of the Secretary of the Treasury referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in April of this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury on this recommendation.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of proposed legislation, "To provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risks of its fidelity losses."

The proposed legislation would repeal the statutory requirements for bonding Federal civilian employees and military personnel charged with accountability for public funds or public property, and establish a self-insurance program for the Government's fidelity losses by permitting agencies to charge their appropriations for such losses. Enactment of the legislation would result in savings to the Government since bond premiums have consistently exceeded amounts recovered from surety companies. The proposal is also consistent with the Government's general policy of assuming its own insurable risks—a policy stemming from the fact that Government has the resources to assume such risks. In the financial area, the risks are minimal because of extensive systems of financial checks and balances that limit the opportunities for fraud or negligence in the handling of Government funds.

Under Public Law 323, 84th Congress (6 U.S.C. 14), the head of each department and establishment in the Executive Branch is authorized to procure a bond at Government expense to cover military and civilian personnel of his department who are required by law or administrative regulation to be bonded. Prior to enactment of this law these individuals were required to pay their own fidelity bond premiums. During fiscal year 1955, the last full fiscal year prior to enactment of Public Law 323, the amount of the bond premiums paid by Federal employees was \$1,732,748. Although the foregoing statute eliminated this inequity, experience under the law in procuring blanket and position schedule bonds to cover large groups of employees has focused attention on the practical and economical aspects of the requirements for bond coverage.

These experience factors can be highlighted from the consolidated annual reports to the Congress on agency fidelity bonding activities which the above Act required of the Secretary of the Treasury. The most recent report, covering the fiscal year 1970, showed that as of June 30, 1970 there were 963,269 employees covered by fidelity bonds; the total computed annual cost of premiums of bonds in effect on that date was \$425,753. For the 14½ fiscal years that the Government has borne the expense of the bond premiums, the premiums have exceeded claims filed by \$1,188,263. The Comptroller General, in a report to the Congress in December 1964 (B-8201) recommending discontinuance of the bonding of Federal employees, estimated that annual savings of \$190,000 could be achieved thereby. A recent decision by the Post Office Department to significantly reduce the number of their employees covered by bonds would lower this estimate; however, the Department's move in this direction stems from a recognition that the cost of bond coverage is becoming prohibitive, and lends support to the self-insurance concept proposed in the draft bill. Additional savings could be expected from elimination of certain administrative expenses in connection with the procurement of the bonds, and related operations—expenses that have aggregated \$730,008 over the last 14½ fiscal years.

Generally speaking, the only positions required to be bonded are those involving the disbursement and safe-keeping of public funds. Individuals assigned to these positions are responsible for public funds far in excess of the coverage provided by the bond. For example, the statutory bonding requirement for the Treasurer of the United States has re-

maintained at \$150,000 since establishment of that position in 1789, although the incumbent of that position is responsible, in terms of cash alone, for average balances of approximately \$6 billion in the Treasurer's general account. An accounting and finance officer in a military department is ordinarily bonded for \$10,000, but annually disburses many times this amount. The cost of complete coverage for most disbursing officers would be prohibitive, and in many cases complete coverage would not be available—as a practical matter. Clearly, this situation results in only "token" coverage in those accountability areas where the potential for the largest monetary losses exists. Actually, of the almost \$7 million in total losses incurred since 1956, approximately \$1.9 million of such losses, or about 28 percent, exceeded the limits of the bond coverage.

The proposed legislation would eliminate the requirement for procuring fidelity bonds, thereby saving the Government the net excess of the premiums and other expenses over the net recoveries on claims. Agencies would self-insure against fidelity losses, and, to the extent that any such losses proved to be uncollectible, would charge the applicable appropriation for the amounts of such losses. Agency practices in restoring or adjusting the accounts of any defaulting employee would be performed under regulations promulgated by the Comptroller General of the United States. Agency experience under the self-insurance program would be reported annually to the Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury for the five full fiscal years following the date of enactment of the draft bill.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and the Comptroller General join in sponsoring this proposed legislation under the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program established under section 111(f) of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 65(f)). I am transmitting the proposal in behalf of this joint program. It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. An identical bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. CONNALLY.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. PEARSON, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1311, The Newsmen's Privileges Act of 1971.

S. 2134

At the request of Mr. HARTKE, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2134, the Office of Constituent Assistant Act.

S. 2380

At the request of Mr. HARTKE, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2380, to amend the act of November 5, 1966 (80 Stat. 1309), providing for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 79

At the request of Mr. HARTKE, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 79, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 135

At the request of Mr. TOWER, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 135, to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating one day of each year as "National Law Officers Appreciation Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 145

At the request of Mr. TOWER, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 145, to designate the period beginning June 18, 1972, and ending June 24, 1972, as "National Engineering Technicians Week."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO EXTEND CONGRATULATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

(Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) I introduce, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to extend congratulations to the University of Arkansas on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

As one who has been associated with this institution for well over 50 years, I have watched it grow and develop into one of this country's finest State universities and I take pride in the fact that, as one of its graduates, I was able to return to serve it as both a professor and as its president.

The University of Arkansas is both the State university and the land-grant college of Arkansas. Established and supported by the people of the State, it is one of 69 land-grant institutions throughout the Nation. It came into existence on March 27, 1871, as the Arkansas Industrial University by action of the Arkansas General Assembly, with the assistance of a grant of Federal lands as an endowment from the National Government. This land was sold under the provisions of the Morrill Act passed by Congress in 1862 and the proceeds were used to help establish the school at Fayetteville, Ark., the home of its main campus today.

Mr. President, the original Organic Act of 1871, which established the Arkansas Industrial University—the name was changed to the University of Arkansas in 1899—was a truly remarkable piece of legislation, coming at a time when the State was beset with critical problems of Reconstruction. Despite the magnitude

of these problems, the people of Arkansas had faith in their ability not only to build a university, but to build a good one. Thus the legislation created a board of trustees with sufficient freedom and authority to carry out "those things proper to the full operation and well-being of a first class university."

Displaying this same faith and looking forward into the future, the board of trustees resolved that "the University should be made worthy of the State whose name it bears."

From its beginning in a reconconditioned farmhouse with eight students and four faculty members including the president, the university and all who have been associated with it have continually worked to live up to these standards. The result has been growth and development in enormous proportion. Today, the university's 14 colleges and schools serve over 17,000 students, and its physical properties total almost \$100 million.

This growth and development are consistent with the land grant concept. Institutions like the University of Arkansas must continue to grow and prosper if the States which they serve are to grow and prosper. In this connection, the decade from 1960 to 1970 is particularly significant for it reflects this university's ability to keep pace with a rapidly changing State, a State very much on the move in terms of its culture, economy, and its people.

In 1960, the year in which the current president, Dr. David Mullins, assumed office, the enrollment at the Fayetteville campus of the University of Arkansas was 5,862. By 1970, this figure had increased to well over 11,000, which represented the addition of the equivalent of a fair-sized college every year in that period. That unprecedented rise in enrollment compelled the university to augment greatly its staff and facilities and thus it embarked in 1960 upon an ambitious development program designed to provide a margin of greatness in the university's programs of instruction, research, and public service.

In those 10 years from 1960 to 1970, over \$37.5 million was spent on construction of academic, housing, administrative, and service facilities at the university, the total university expenditures for research increased from \$4.8 million to almost \$15.5 million, and the total budget of the university rose from approximately \$20 million in 1961 to more than \$61 million in 1970.

Yet, the ability to keep pace with changing conditions is only one yardstick with which to measure the greatness of a university. The greatness of a State educational institution must also be viewed in terms of its total contribution to the society it serves. The research and service contributions of this university have been well documented, and the number of graduates, totaling over 42,000 for the first century is a matter of record. In numbers, this is a significant and measurable contribution to our human resources, but the more elusive measure, in terms of people, their aspirations, and their accomplishments reflects a different and higher dimension. The distance which these graduates have traveled from

information to insight, from formal training in higher education to a life of human fulfillment, is perhaps the greatest measure of the stature of this university.

Indeed, Mr. President, the university today may very well have exceeded the hopes and aspirations of its early founders, but this is only the beginning. As President Mullins noted in a letter commemorating this centennial year:

The challenges and opportunities which will be presented to the University of Arkansas over the next 100 years defy the imagination. They include, of course, opportunities for institutional self-improvement. However, in a larger sense, the most important meaning of the Centennial lies in the University's concern with its role in preparing leadership and conducting research and public service programs. Only a challenge of this magnitude befits a major university today.

In this spirit, President Mullins this year assumed the presidency of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

The centennial year opened officially on March 27, 1971, commemorating the 100th anniversary of legislation creating the university, and will extend through commencement, May 20, 1972.

On June 8, 1971, a special ceremony was held in the National Cathedral in Washington giving special recognition to the centennial celebration, and to the land-grant concept and its contribution to higher education through congressional support.

Mr. President, I know that my colleagues in the Senate will want to join me in extending congratulations to the University of Arkansas on the occasion of the celebration of this, its centennial year.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress sends congratulations and greetings to the University of Arkansas on the occasion of the One Hundredth Anniversary of its founding on March 27, 1871, and extends the hope of the people of the United States that the University of Arkansas will, in its new century, continue to grow and prosper.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 79

At the request of Mr. PERCY, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 79, relating to the need for compensation of certain ethnic Germans who have become citizens of the United States.

DISPOSITION OF THE JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF CERTAIN INDIANS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 422

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. METCALF) submitted an

amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2042) to provide for the disposition of the judgment in favor of the Shoshone Tribe or Nation of Indians and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes in Indian Claims Commission dockets 326-D, 326-E, 326-F, 326-G, 326-H, 366, and 367, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON EFFECTS ON SMALL BUSINESS OF ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION IN THE PROPRIETARY MEDICINE AND COSMETIC INDUSTRIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Select Committee on Small Business will continue hearings into the effects of advertising on the viability and opportunities for small business in the proprietary medicine and cosmetic industries.

The hearing will be held on September 22 in room 318—Caucus Room—of the Old Senate Office Building starting at 10 a.m.

The witnesses will be the seven members of the Federal Communications Commission.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FUTURE HEARINGS ON S. 343 AND S. 344 TO REQUIRE DISCLOSURE OF ASSETS, INCOME, DEBTS, AND SO FORTH, BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF ALL BRANCHES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections will schedule public hearings in the near future on Senate bill No. 343, introduced by Senator CASE, and on Senate bill No. 344, sponsored by Senator SPONGE.

Senators and others who may desire to testify or submit written statements on these measures are requested to contact the staff of the subcommittee in room 310 of the Old Senate Office Building on extension 55647.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in accordance with the requirements of section 111(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, I announce that the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity will hold hearings on the following days:

September 21, 22, 23: room 1114, New Senate Office Building; 10 a.m.

September 28, 29: room 1318, New Senate Office Building; 10 a.m.

September 30 and October 1: room 1114, New Senate Office Building; 10 a.m.

The subjects will be education finance, inequality in educational resources, and the implications of the recent decision of the California Supreme Court holding that State's system of financing education unconstitutional.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITIES OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, on July 30 I wrote to the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, requesting an investigation of the public relations activities of the Atomic Energy Commission. I was specifically interested in the AEC's activities in promoting the Milrow and Cannikin underground nuclear tests in Alaska.

On September 10 the Comptroller General's office sent me a complete report on "Public Information Activities Relating to the Atomic Energy Commission's Underground Nuclear Tests at Amchitka Island, Alaska."

In that report GAO pointed out that its authority to prosecute for misuse of funds in connection with public information activities is strictly limited. The GAO can proceed with prosecutions only if funds are used "for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress."

In essence GAO's hands are tied.

The AEC can continue to propagandize about the underground nuclear test program so long as it does not exhort the public to defeat specific legislation pending before Congress.

The investigation, however, was worthwhile. It confirmed many of my allegations. Most important, the GAO uncovered a report by the AEC written after the Milrow test in 1969. That report confirms my worst suspicions about the dangerous attitude within the agency which discounts all legitimate criticism of its programs.

Throughout its report on the 1969 test the AEC justifies its extensive public relations effort to "sell" Milrow on a basis of "good guys" versus "bad guys." Nowhere in the report is there a recognition that opposition to the test may be based on scientific accuracy or that it may be honestly motivated.

The AEC propaganda effort was explained in detail in the report; explained, justified, and virtually institutionalized by publication of a "How To Do It" manual for "next time."

"Next time" is here. The Cannikin test is tentatively scheduled for next month, and the AEC is selling again—on a larger scale than ever before.

Meanwhile, legitimate questions go unanswered, reports are kept secret and misleading statements are made.

The same lack of candor was evident before Milrow and throughout the operation and was appalling. And the AEC report on Milrow admits such deception.

For example the AEC report states that:

During the preliminary phase of the Milrow public relations effort—policy did not permit confirming that a nuclear test would be detonated on Amchitka. Public statements were framed in such language as "determining the feasibility of Amchitka for possible use in underground nuclear testing."

Their public relations report admits that:

Once the construction buildup began and contracts in the millions of dollars were being let, it became less credible that the AEC was merely "investigating the feasibility of the site" or that the AEC had not made definite plans to use Amchitka. An announcement that Amchitka had been found geologically acceptable and that the AEC was moving ahead with plans for an initial test would have eliminated some of the suspicion with which news media—knowing that we had let a \$12 million drilling contract—accepted our statements that we still were "investigating."

The Milrow report applies only bad faith and questionable motives to those who expressed opposition to the test.

They accuse myself and others of blowing up "items of minor importance from other parts of the world—out of proportion to make antitest headlines."

The AEC accuses those of us who are in opposition to the test of being motivated by and I quote:

Antitestng, anti-ABM, and antiestablishment ideology, politics and a desire to get publicity. The opposition leaders curtailed their real motives and staged a campaign designed to promote fear—fear of earthquakes, fear of tidal waves, fear of economic damage to the fishing industry, fear of damaging foreign relations, and to a minor extent fear of radioactivity.

It is degrading to people in Alaska and California and Hawaii and those throughout the Nation who oppose underground testing to have their efforts dismissed and ridiculed such as is done with tax dollars by an agency of the Federal Government.

Two examples particularly incense me. One is a detailed report on how the AEC "enlisted the aid" of Karl Armstrong, editor of the Kodiak Mirror, to convert him from a critic to a friend.

The report says:

By associating Editor Armstrong with distribution of the sea otter film and setting up the exhibit, providing him with informational materials, and keeping in contact with him by correspondence and telephone, he was converted from a vociferous foe of the AEC and project Milrow to a friend of the AEC, still fearful of Milrow effects but willing to accept and print AEC statements that the Alaskan public would not be endangered.

I know Karl Armstrong very well. He says what he believes—always—without fear or favor. I resent the inference that he can be manipulated by a slick campaign.

Marty Farrell, a well-known Anchorage attorney, was opposed to the Milrow test for a variety of legitimate reasons, motivated by the highest purposes.

The AEC report refuses to accept his legitimate opposition. Instead it says:

There was no indication that his opposition was founded on moral or ideological grounds, or that he was actually concerned about dangers.

Farrell was quoted as talking about the "substantial response," which later in the same news item was mentioned as 350 answers to his newspaper advertising. It appeared conceivable that Farrell was working as paid representative for a client and spoke as directed rather than from personal convictions.

The accusation is slanderous. The thinking that went into such an evalua-

tion is dangerous to the public interest—apart from the underground test issue.

The AEC's attitude throughout the campaign was that despite the cold facts of the matter the opposition would not listen.

The agency refused to accept the idea that the opposition was legitimate, that it had facts on its side as well, and that there were, indeed, two sides to the controversy. Today, we are faced with another well-financed public relations campaign by the AEC. This time the test is larger, the potential danger greater and so, in form consistent with its past activities, the selling job is more extensive and expensive.

Public relations operations are being conducted from an expensive hotel suite in Anchorage.

Glamorous all-expense trips to Las Vegas were financed by the AEC for Alaska State officials and legislators.

Movies have been produced. No expense has been spared to "sell" the test in Alaska and nationally.

The opposition has only the strength of its convictions to support its campaign.

Public hearings were held in Alaska last May. Dozens of AEC officials were flown to Alaska to be on hand. Those in opposition had to pay their own way. Afterwards, the AEC refused to make transcripts available because of the expense.

The AEC is running a well-oiled, well-financed, well-coordinated machine to sell Alaskans and other Americans about the need for Cannikin.

That is not public information—it is propaganda. And if it violates no existing law then the law must be changed.

I call this situation to the attention of the Senate not to beat ghosts of past errors, but because the issue is very much alive today. Cannikin is upon us and the selling job is all too familiar. Detonation Day is nearing and the test has still not been canceled. Time is running out.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the portions of the AEC's report entitled "Information Actions, Project Milrow, Amchitka, Alaska 1967-1969," so that we can all judge the AEC's information activities.

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

PROJECT MILROW—PUBLIC AFFAIRS REPORT

Basic plans for handling public affairs for Project Milrow were established in an Amchitka Public Information Plan issued April 12, 1967. These were supplemented and augmented by an "Annex A" which was circulated on June 23, 1969. Headquarters approval for Annex A and an addition to Annex A outlining plans for accommodating newsmen on the aircraft carrier Princeton were given to NVOO by TWX on September 24 at which time the complete plan, as revised and updated, was sent to NVOO by courier.

When the plans were prepared, there was no indication of the degree of opposition that would appear in Alaska and elsewhere as the time approached for the first AEC underground nuclear detonation in the Aleutians. There was no knowledge that the Princeton would be available for AEC use, and no anticipation that newsmen or official observers

would be permitted on Amchitka at shot time. Thus, throughout the operational phase it was necessary to adjust dates of program actions, intensify emphasis in various program areas, and improvise arrangements to fit circumstances.

In reporting and evaluating the Milrow public affairs program, distinct phases or periods must be considered, i.e.:

Preliminary phase—December 1966 through July 14, 1969.

Field operations phase—July 14 through October 8, 1969.

1. Intensified public information and good will building period—July 14 through September 20, 1969.

2. Organized opposition period—August 11 through October 2, 1969.

Event coverage phase—September 22 through October 8, 1969.

PRELIMINARY PHASE

Possibility of opposition to testing on Amchitka was recognized by the NV Office of Public Affairs from the start. More than three months before the first announcement (on December 20, 1966) of AEC studies to determine the feasibility of using Amchitka for nuclear tests, OPA Director Henry G. Vermillion discussed this with then Governor William Egan and in his reports stressed Governor Egan's opinion that there was the likelihood of opposition from conservationist groups and the Governor's advice that the AEC be entirely frank and open about its activities and give widespread advance publicity to its plans.

In early February, 1967, Vermillion made a reconnaissance trip to Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau to discuss the proposed Amchitka program with government, civic and conservationist leaders and news media representatives. Repeated contacts with Alaskan officials also were made by W. D. Smith, Jr., NV Assistant Manager for Engineering and Logistics. There was no indication, at that time, of concern about testing other than in conservationist circles. A number of sources stressed the importance of avoiding the appearance of secrecy.

Because of National policy, the Alaskan public information program was conducted on a "low key" basis with a minimum of public exposure. Between the December 20, 1966 announcement that investigations were to be made on Amchitka and June 18, 1969, a total of 31 public announcements were issued. Twenty concerned construction and support contract actions, two were about the sea otter transplant program, and one each was about native hire, archaeology, a survey of the Brooks Range area, and the activation of a Masonic Lodge on Amchitka.

Throughout this period, policy did not permit confirming that a nuclear test would be detonated on Amchitka. Public statements were framed in such language as "determining the feasibility of Amchitka for possible use in underground nuclear testing."

On June 18, 1969, NV was able to refer in a public announcement to "the AEC's planned underground nuclear tests at Amchitka," and on July 18, 1969, NV could confirm (in response to inquiry) that "An underground nuclear detonation to determine the suitability of Amchitka Island in the Aleutians for larger underground tests is tentatively scheduled for the fall of 1969."

Throughout this period, briefings for the Governor of Alaska, the Commander of CINCAL, and the Alaskan Congressional delegation were provided by NV staff and DMA on a continuing basis, whenever there was a change of personnel in these positions, and whenever new developments made additional briefings advisable. Thus, these leaders were kept aware of Amchitka progress and plans.

Frequent contacts also were made with State of Alaska agencies with responsibility

and interests which could be affected by the program—i.e., Fish & Game, Health & Welfare, etc. There also were briefings for individual members of the State Legislature and for native and conservationist leaders.

On July 31, 1967, an initial news media visit to Amchitka (for two hours) was made by two Seattle reporters, who were the only newsmen who had requested the visit. During the next two years similar visits under escort of NV or HQ personnel were made by Alaskan news media, Seattle reporters, reporters, representatives of the Audubon and National Geographic Magazines, and NBC and CBS TV crews. In each case the initiative for the visit came from the news media representatives. For the most part, reports on the visits were friendly and the only concern expressed was based on conservationist and ecological considerations.

During the summer of 1968, a documentary film was made of the sea otter transplant program and made available on a limited basis in Alaska. In 1969 a public information type film was edited, printed and made available for widespread general use.

Originally it had been believed that possible injury to the sea otter population would be of greatest concern to Alaskans and might provide the most serious problem in connection with the Amchitka program. Widespread publicity given to the sea otter transplant program, and hundreds of showings of the sea otter film in Alaska, appeared effective in convincing the public that the AEC-State cooperation in the transplant program was an important contribution and that the Amchitka sea otters would not be placed in jeopardy.

The first intimation that there might be opposition to the test on other than conservationist grounds was observed in April 1969 when Senator Mike Gravel of Alaska visited Las Vegas (reportedly as the guest of the Howard Hughes interest) and requested a briefing on underground nuclear testing. He was briefed at the Nevada Operations Office, and shortly thereafter he and his staff were given an additional briefing in Washington by NV and HQ officials.

Statements attributed to the Senator in the press indicated that he was concerned primarily about seismic effects in Nevada and California but thought that the transfer of all high yield testing to Amchitka would be advisable, and would be an economic contribution to Alaska. (As time progressed, Senator Gravel assumed the position of a concerned Alaskan and publicly asked for information on the possibility of earthquake triggering, tsunamis, damage to the fishing industry, possible escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere or the sea, etc. Eventually, he emerged as the most vocal foe of Project Milrow and spearheaded Congressional opposition.)

The first open opposition to Milrow appeared in May 1969, in the form of a letter to Governor Miller of Alaska from the Alaska Sportsmen's Council citing conservationist considerations and the possibility of venting into the ocean, endangering the Alaskan fishing industry; a letter from Senator Gravel to the U.S. Geological Survey inquiring about the possibility of triggered earthquakes or tsunamis, and an editorial campaign in the Kodiak Mirror suggesting that the test would create a serious tidal wave danger to Kodiak.

To provide facts to Alaskans, a team consisting of Commissioner Francesco Costagliola; NV Manager Robert E. Miller; Dr. Fred Tesche, Deputy Assistant General Manager, DMA/HQ; NV Assistant Manager W. D. Smith, Jr.; Dr. Melvin Merritt of Sandia Laboratory; and NV Public Affairs Director Henry G. Vermillion went to Alaska, briefed Governor Miller and met with interested citizens. Public meetings were held between June 24 and 27 with Governor Miller, State officials and interested citizens at Juneau, and with interested citizens, news media and

conservationists at Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Kodiak. The level of concern did not appear high, and apparently stemmed largely from conservationist considerations. Even in Kodiak, despite the newspaper campaign, attendance was small and the amount of serious public concern appeared minimal.

The most frequent complaints had to do with a lack of information about the Amchitka program, i.e., that AEC was operating behind a veil of secrecy and classification, that Alaska wasn't being told what was going on, and that there was nowhere in the State to get information, ask questions or make complaints.

As a result of the briefings, it was decided that an AEC Alaskan Office of Information should be established and continued until after the Milrow event.

Observations, Conclusions, and Suggestions:

The long delay in admitting that anything more than a feasibility study was underway at Amchitka, and failure to link the Amchitka program with national security requirements led to widespread complaints of secrecy and non-disclosure. With a less restrictive policy, more effective efforts might have been made to gain understanding, acceptance and support.

Once the construction buildup began and contracts in the millions of dollars were being let, it became less credible that the AEC was merely "investigating the feasibility of the site" or that the AEC had not made definite plans to use Amchitka. An announcement that Amchitka had been found geologically acceptable and that the AEC was moving ahead with plans for an initial test would have eliminated some of the suspicion with which news media—knowing that we had let a \$12 million drilling contract—accepted our statements that we still were "investigating."

FIELD OPERATION PHASE

Intensified public information and good will building period

The Alaskan Office of Information was established in Anchorage on July 14, 1969, with instructions to make information about Project Milrow available to the people of Alaska, and to make active efforts to carry the information to news media, organizations, groups, officials and individuals.

News media were advised that the office had been established to serve their needs, and that printed materials, motion picture films, slide presentations and displays were available.

Organizations, groups and schools were invited to contact the office for motion picture or slide showings, talks, briefings and conferences about AEC activities including safety precautions taken to assure that testing would not damage man, man-made structures, or the environment. During the ensuing 80 days before the Milrow detonation, intensive efforts were made to provide the Alaskan public with full information about the AEC activities in Alaska, the importance of the program, AEC safety programs, and the opinions of outstanding scientists that Milrow would not pose a tangible hazard.

The activity included meetings with government, civic and conservationist leaders in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kodiak, Homer and Seward, talks before Chambers of Commerce, civic and women's groups, appearances on radio and TV, and showing of films on the sea otter transplant, Plowshare, and the underground test program on TV stations throughout the State. (Copies of the sea otter film were made available to the public through newspapers in Kodiak, Juneau and Fairbanks, and copies of this film and supplies of "Understanding the Atom" series booklets were distributed to all State junior and senior high schools through a State sponsored educational resources organization.) Arrangements were made to estab-

lish an AEC film library at the University of Alaska near Fairbanks as a permanent means of making AEC educational material available throughout the State.

Free exhibit space was obtained at the State's two biggest fairs—the Tanana Valley Fair at Fairbanks (August 14-17) and the Alaska State Fair at Palmer (August 22-September 1)—and two attractive exhibits were constructed for display. One dealt with archaeology on Amchitka, and the second was a pictorial story of nuclear testing and development of the Amchitka site.

AEC movies (Amchitka Revisited, The Warm Coat, Plowshare, and Underground Nuclear Weapons Testing) were shown on a virtually continuous program throughout the afternoon and evening hours.

The two fairs are estimated to have attracted a combined attendance of 100,000 persons. Allowing for persons who attended on more than one day, or did not visit the exhibit halls, it is estimated that more than 50,000 persons were exposed to the AEC story. Thousands of AEC publications (Amchitka Background Book, Why We Test, Safety of Underground Nuclear Testing, and Understanding the Atom series booklets) were distributed and booth attendants discussed the Amchitka program with hundreds of Alaskans.

Another AEC exhibit on the Understanding the Atom series of TID publications was sent to Kodiak and through the cooperation of City Manager Roy Goodman, Kodiak Mirror Editor Karl Armstrong, and Chief Journalist McClung of the Kodiak Naval Base was used at several locations on Kodiak Island.

By associating Editor Armstrong with distribution of the sea otter film and setting up the exhibit, providing him with informational materials, and keeping in contact with him by correspondence and telephone, he was converted from a vociferous foe of the AEC and Project Milrow to a friend of the AEC, still fearful of Milrow effects but willing to accept and print AEC statements that the Alaskan public would not be endangered.

The assistance of Chief McClung of Kodiak Naval Base was typical of the cooperation and support AEC received from the military throughout its program in Alaska. The public affairs staff at Elmendorf Air Force Base in Anchorage responded to every request for assistance and the editorial support given by the Armed Forces Network (which has the largest share of Alaska's radio and TV audiences) was invaluable.

Prior to the fairs, on August 4 and 5 a news media trip to Amchitka was arranged at the request of Anchorage radio reporters. Invitations were issued to news media in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and Kodiak for what was planned as a one-day trip (7:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.) Fifteen reporters representing newspapers, radio, TV and magazines made the trip. Bad weather made it impossible to land at Amchitka and the group spent the night and most of the following day at Adak, awaiting improved weather. This worked to AEC's advantage since it provided many hours of extra time for briefings, individual interviews, and becoming better acquainted with the newsmen. Late on the second day the group continued to Amchitka and made the scheduled four-hour stay visiting the Milrow site, other drill sites, archaeological digs, the sea otter holding tanks and the camp.

The 12-hour trip stretched to more than 40 hours, but the news media representatives made no complaints and appeared to have found the trip worthwhile. Some of the reporters were intrigued by the archaeological work on the island and featured this in their stories, and at a later date the Amchitka archaeologist was invited to appear at a well-attended public meeting in Anchorage. Resultant news coverage was

favorable to the AEC and its program to prevent damage to Amchitka artifacts.

The first organized opposition to Amchitka was revealed during the second week of August, 1969, with the appearance of newspaper advertisements and the broadcast of stories about the self-styled "Save Our State" Committee. An attorney who had lived in Alaska for approximately 10 years, Mike Farrell, was the spokesman for the group. Immediate contacts with him by the Alaska Office of Information, requests to meet with him and leaders of his group, offers to bring authorities to Anchorage to talk on any phase of the Milrow detonation (ground shock, earthquake, triggering, tsunamis containment, or ecology) were met with polite promises to contact the AEC "later" but no such contact ever was made. Despite repeated telephone calls, letters and sending of Amchitka background and safety information, Farrell and his committee indicated no interest in learning anything about the AEC or Project Milrow. Even when advised of facts which showed charges, statements and advertisements untrue, the Committee continued to publish the original misstatements.

The reasons and motivation for Farrell's activity remain unknown. There is nothing to substantiate suggestions that he has political ambitions and was seeking publicity. There was no indication that his opposition was founded on moral or ideological grounds, or that he was actually concerned about dangers. There also was no indication that the SOS Committee had any real support from the public. (Farrell was quoted as talking about the "substantial response," which later in the same news item was mentioned as 350 answers to his newspaper advertising. It appeared conceivable that Farrell was working as paid representative for a client and spoke as directed rather than from personal convictions.)

Significantly, the Save Our State group made no showing of strength in Alaska. Senators Mike Bradner of Fairbanks and Bill Ray of Juneau both quoted SOS and attacked AEC on occasions but both generally were dismissed by news media as headline hunters. SOS managed to recruit 32 pickets to march at the AEC briefing of the Legislative Council but within an hour the group had shrunk to six, amid complaints about the pay. An SOS-organized "vigil" of youthful protestors against Milrow, staged in a downtown park just before shot day, attracted only about 100 persons. There was none of the type of impassioned protest action which was promoted in Canada and British Columbia with marches on U.S. consulates and attempts to block the border, which produced sensationalized newspaper, radio and TV coverage. There were few published "letters to the editor" in support of SOS, and Anchorage reporters and newsmen privately have expressed the belief that the Farrell group had little support.

A State Representative from Anchorage, Charles Sassara, achieved news headlines soon after SOS entered the picture, by announcing that he had telegraphed a demand to Chairman Seaborg for a briefing of the State Legislature. Contacts with legislative leaders soon got this into channels with the announcement that the AEC had made arrangements to brief the State Legislative Council on September 26. Sassara never again appeared in the news in connection with Milrow.

Throughout this period, efforts were made to counteract the attacks, false statements and questions about hazards which were circulated by opponents. These efforts included personal contacts with editors and correspondents, radio and TV appearances, talks to civic clubs, and correspondence with opponents. Generally the correspondence was ineffective since it became clear that it was directed to men who had their minds made

up and did not want to have contrary information.

As programmed, a visit to Amchitka by governmental, civic and conservationist leaders and interested news media was scheduled for Saturday, September 13. About 80 guests, nominated by the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce and conservationist groups in Fairbanks and Juneau made the trip by chartered plane. Briefings were given on the plane en route to Amchitka, on the island, and on the return flight. Bus and other motor transportation was provided to take the visitors to the Milrow Surface Zero, the archaeological digs, the sea otter tanks and other places of interest. After approximately six hours on the island, the party returned to Anchorage. The response and reaction was excellent, and most of the guests expressed themselves as well pleased with the trip and the opportunity to know more about the program. The only well publicized exception was Senator Bill Ray of Juneau, who did not make the trip but gained newspaper headlines with a criticism of it as being too brief, and Senator Bradner who did make the trip and who indicated support for his colleague.

Plans had been considered for taking a group of Alaskan news media representatives and official observers to the Nevada Test Site to observe the Jorum detonation (September 16) in the belief that observing a test in the same general yield range as Milrow from 30 miles distant would give observers a better understanding of the test and safety programs—and impress on them that no hazard could be anticipated at areas hundreds of miles distant from Milrow.

Uncertainties and delay in the scheduling of Jorum and conflict with the Amchitka tour made this impossible. However, a representative of Governor Miller was flown to Las Vegas to serve as an official Alaskan observer at Jorum. The observer, Ben Hilliker of the Alaska Fish & Game Department, attended pre-shot briefings, watched the shot on closed circuit TV from the Control Point, and participated in a post-shot tour of the Test Site.

On his return to Alaska, Hilliker made a report to the Governor which is believed to have influenced the Governor to continue his support of Milrow. He also talked with Juneau news media representatives about the trip and expressed his confidence in the safety precautions with which AEC surrounds its test program.

Observations, Conclusions, and Suggestions:

In general, the activities during this period were valuable in making friends for the AEC, getting the AEC story before the public, and in gaining a measure of acceptance and support which was of prime importance in offsetting the efforts of opponents to build up widespread opposition to and fear of the Amchitka program.

Each of the major activities—the visits to Amchitka, the Jorum observation by Governor Miller's representative, participation in the two Fairs, and the widespread showing of AEC films—contributed to the success.

No effective means seemed available to prevent individuals and organizations from getting wide publicity through their attacks on the AEC and its programs, but there was a measure of success in the fact that opponents were not able to achieve widespread public support. From the standpoint of winning news media exposure, the test opponents had great success; from the standpoint of influencing others to join them, they apparently had little success. Conceivably, closer personal contact with reporters and editors and speedy and convincing denials of false statements could have been advantageous had news media been interested in fully responsible journalism. It appeared more likely that for the most part

the media would not be persuaded to check the truth or accuracy of statements and charges prior to printing them, but would use denials from AEC sources only to make another headline or to attract attention to a controversy.

Organized Opposition Period

The final fortnight before detonation was the most intensely active of the Milrow public information program. The information staff was increased as shot day neared and eventually included Henry G. Vermillion, John Wright, Dixon Stewart and Wynona Joy of the NV Public Affairs staff, James S. Cannon of DPT/HQ, and Marjorie Allen of the ALO Information staff, plus photographic, communications and clerical personnel from the AEC, Pen American World Airways, Inc., and Holmes & Narver, Inc.

Principal activities included the establishment of a Public Information Center in the Anchorage Westward Hotel (see Annex A), a briefing for the Alaska Legislative Council at the State Court Building in Anchorage, arrangements for newsmen to be on the aircraft carrier Princeton off Amchitka at shot time, establishment of a "pool" reporting arrangement on Amchitka, and press conference, TV and radio appearances by Representative Chet Holifield, Chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Routine contacts with reporters and editors for issuance of AEC announcements or to answer inquiries increased as news media coverage of Milrow was intensified.

NV Manager Robert E. Miller and Public Affairs Director Henry C. Vermillion conferred with Publishers Robert Atwood of the Anchorage Times and Larry Fanning of the Anchorage News. The Times was a strong supporter of the AEC throughout the months preceding Milrow and characterized opponents as "merchants of fear" and "headline hunters," as well as pointing out that the news media was being naive in publishing any charge made by test opponents without regard to truthfulness of the charge or the stature, motive or reliability of the person or organization quoted. (The Times continued its strong support through Milrow and during weeks following the detonation published several editorials criticizing test opponents.)

Publisher Fanning of the News, which had played up test opposition strongly, admitted in the conference that his opposition to Milrow was based on opposition to the ABM and the accepted national policy premise that a strong nuclear deterrent is necessary for security. Shortly thereafter, Fanning published an editorial spelling out his opposition on these grounds.

Editorial support (both pre- and post-event) also was forthcoming from the influential Fairbanks News-Miner and the Ketchikan News. (Outside the Anchorage News, the only expressed editorial opposition during this period came on conservationist grounds from the Juneau Empire—which later reprinted an Anchorage Times editorial supporting Milrow.)

A small Fairbanks paper which had opposed the test on conservationist grounds went out of business during the period. The Kodiak Mirror which raised the tidal wave spectre many months earlier, expressed no editorial opinion during the final month before the detonation. No other Alaskan newspapers are known to have commented editorially.

Regardless of editorial expressions, all Alaskan news media gave extensive news coverage to anti-AEC and anti-test propaganda. Seemingly anyone who wanted to get his name in the newspapers or on radio—regardless of expertise or qualifications—could do so by making a statement against the test. Items of minor importance from other parts of the world were blown out of proportion to make anti-test headlines. Senator Gravel had become an avowed opponent of the test and at-

tracted support from Senator Fulbright, Senator Magnuson and other anti-ABM members of Congress. His suggestion that all Pacific basin areas might be endangered brought the Hawaiian Senators and Members of Congress into the anti-test camp, and presumably was the inspiration for public protests in Hawaii, and the near-hysteria which developed in parts of British Columbia. Marches on U.S. consulates and border closing attempts along the U.S.-Canadian border apparently were anti-nuclear weapons motivated. Although his efforts to get Senate Foreign Relations Committee or White House intervention did not succeed, Senator Gravel kept his name before the Alaskan public almost constantly and became the spearhead of the anti-test group.

The September 26 briefings of the Alaska State Legislative Council became AEC's most important Alaskan pre-event public forum. This briefing had been arranged, at AEC request, more than a month before. As the date neared, test opponents came into the picture with suggestions that the briefing be expanded to include Hawaiian, Canadian and Japanese officials and that the Save Our State Committee provide anti-test speakers.

NV Manager Robert E. Miller discussed procedure with Legislative Council officials to make it clear that the planned session was a briefing by AEC and not, as some news stories intimated, a hearing in which the Council would approve or disapprove the detonation. It was further agreed that the session be conducted under the Council's normal ground rules—the AEC to make its presentations and then to answer questions only from members of the Council. (As a courtesy, the question privilege later was extended to Hawaiian legislators and other Alaskan legislators.) It was agreed that the Hawaiian legislators could participate and that the SOS Committee could provide a briefer with a scientific background.

The briefing, extensively publicized by newspaper, radio and TV, was held in the State Court Building in Anchorage, starting at 9 a.m., September 26. It was planned as a three hour session but developed into a three hour morning session, and an afternoon session of approximately two hours. All Anchorage news media were represented with reporters and cameramen, but there was no out-of-town news coverage. The audience of approximately 100 persons completely filled the small conference room (and a larger room used for the afternoon session), but the number of persons unable to get into the room was small. The total turnout did not appear to exceed 175 persons. The audience was well behaved and did not vocally participate in the sessions.

Some thirty placard-carrying pickets—mostly teenagers—appeared outside the building shortly before noon, were photographed for press and TV and talked with reporters. Within the hour, the pickets dwindled to six and the discarded signs were stacked against the building. (A member of the Council was quoted later in his hometown newspaper as saying that the pickets were hired by an anti-test group.)

Eight scientists associated with the Milrow program (see Appendix B for agenda) participated in the briefings and joined with NV Manager Robert E. Miller and Effects Evaluation Director Elwood Douthett in answering questions. The briefer for the SOS was Dr. Michael Friedlander of the Committee for Environmental Information, from St. Louis, Missouri.

The AEC briefings appeared to be effective. Dr. Friedlander did not dispute AEC effects predictions, but opposed the test on the grounds that there still were many "uncertainties" and that there should be an "independent scientific investigation."

Questioning by the Alaskan and Hawaiian legislators ranged from apparently sincere seeking of knowledge and additional in-

formation to "loaded" or openly hostile inquiries from members who had publicly opposed the test.

It appears unlikely that the briefing changed any attitudes among the legislators. Those who had spoken against the program previously continued in opposition. Legislators known to have been favorable remained that way. The briefing did provide a widely publicized forum and the resultant news coverage and impression on the public appeared favorable.

News media pressure for a pro or con statement about testing apparently influenced the Council to make a statement, although the AEC had made it clear in advance that the appearance before the Council was in no way a "hearing" or intended to seek Council approval, but solely a means of acquainting the legislators with the Milrow program.

On the day following the briefings, the Chairman of the Council did issue a statement. There was no general agreement on what it said or meant, even among the members of the Council, some of whom were quoted as expressing diametrically opposing views by the two Anchorage newspapers. The Daily News headlined that the Council opposed Milrow. The Daily Times headlined that the Council approved Milrow. When pressed for an interpretation, Chairman Eugene Guess was quoted as saying that there was no general agreement and that an effort had been made to draft a statement which would be approved by all members. The resultant statement was interpreted by each member as he saw fit—and by news media and others according to their own convictions, beliefs or understandings.

It became apparent that a number of the legislators who were listed in the "opposing the test" group were motivated by political considerations. Democratic leaders took the occasion to send a telegraphic statement criticizing Republican Governor Miller for his support of Milrow and to suggest that he had failed to study the question thoroughly. Some Democratic office-holders said privately that they did not "really" oppose Milrow but "went along" with the Milrow-oriented criticism of the Governor as a matter of political expediency.

In the final days before the shot it appeared that Milrow was being used as a political football, with the Democrats and anti-ABM groups lining up with Senator Gravel, and the Republican Alaskan political figures (Senator Stevens, Congressman Pollock and down to the State legislative level) backing the Milrow approval of President Nixon and Governor Miller.

The Legislative Council did not communicate with the AEC after the briefing, but was reported in the press as desiring to have an observer on Amchitka at shot time. The AEC telephoned Chairman Guess and asked whether the Council wished to name an observer. There was no further contact and no indication that the Council actually wanted to be represented at Amchitka.

Observations, Conclusions and Suggestions:

In this period, news media again seemed ready to publish or broadcast any statement and then seek the denial and correct statement as a second sensation. (An example: An "inside news" column in a monthly construction magazine printed an alleged rumor that the USGS was in disagreement with the AEC over the safety of testing on Amchitka and was an important source of opposition to Milrow. The Associated Press carried the item from Juneau and it was widely printed. At the time he sent out the story, the AP correspondent had, in his desk, correspondence between Senator Gravel and Commissioner Peccora of USGS which was proof that the "inside news" story had no basis in fact. When it was pointed out to the correspondent that responsible reporting would have

required that he check the "rumor" with USGS or AEC in which case he would have been reminded of the Gravel-Peccora letters, he responded that he would now reprint the facts and thus have two stories instead of the "no story" which he would have had if he had made the check.)

It was estimated by some Alaskan newsmen that not more than 50 percent of the residents were actively aware of the Milrow program; that of that number thirty percent had no real concern or pro and con opinions; that the remaining 20 percent probably were pretty evenly divided as "for" or "against" and that the strongly vocal opponents of Milrow probably included less than five percent of the State's population. (In this respect, there never was a successful effort to get out a sizeable crowd of protesters in Alaska, despite generally good weather during the period.)

The opposition expressed in Hawaii, and the hysterical anti-test campaign in British Columbia and other parts of Canada could be a valuable subject for research. Currently we know little of the motivation or the types or numbers involved. It seems unlikely that the activity in Canada was entirely spontaneous, or that it resulted entirely from news coverage—although as news media gave attention to developments, the activity in Canada appeared to mushroom. A study might reveal how the protests were inspired or financed; by whom; whether they resulted from a generally anti-U.S. attitude; or were centered entirely on AEC.

Overall, the Legislative Council briefing probably benefited the program but it was not entirely satisfactory because of the political undertones. It is suggested that on any future programs, the approach to the Legislature be made at Juneau and at a much earlier date with serious consideration of the statewide political situation.

EVENT COVERAGE PHASE

Milrow Press Headquarters and the Public Information Center were opened at the Anchorage Westward Hotel on September 24. The Information Center attracted active news media attention and was visited by many Anchorage visitors and residents. News media had been advised that all reporting of Milrow would be from the Information Center and they made preparations for intensive coverage.

However, early in September a Seattle newsman learned, apparently from Naval sources, that the Aircraft Carrier Princeton would be off Amchitka at shot time and that personnel evacuated from the island would be aboard the ship. The newsmen requested permission to cover Milrow from the carrier. Similar requests were received later from national television stations.

NVOO requested approval from HQ for permitting newsmen to be on the Princeton and to helicopter back to Amchitka following the detonation. Discussions of this possibility continued for approximately three weeks. It was not until September 24 that approval was given to proceed with planning. Formal approval for the trip was received on September 26.

Final arrangements required close cooperation with the Test Manager's staff on Amchitka, the Commander of the Princeton, and the support contractor, Holmes & Narver, Inc., since it involved an extra unscheduled flight to Amchitka, helicopter transportation to the Princeton and some interference with the Amchitka evacuation plan.

Nevertheless, arrangements were completed and on September 30 a total of 19 newsmen escorted by NV Public Affairs Director Vermillion and DPI/HQ representative James Cannon, together with nine AEC officials and/or official observers flew to Amchitka. (Details of the Princeton activity are contained in Annex C.)

A decision made on September 29 to permit

news media representatives on Amchitka during Milrow was made at the recommendation of Congressman Holifield, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Congressman Holifield arrived in Anchorage on Sunday, September 28, en route to Amchitka where he had been invited to be in the Milrow control room at shot time. He agreed to a press conference in the Milrow Information Center on the morning of September 29. The Congressman gave strong verbal support for Milrow and the AEC test program and expressed complete confidence in the NVOO safety program and the effects forecasts of AEC scientists. He was highly effective and persuasive and made a good impression on the news media, both at the conference and in individual TV and radio interviews. He fielded questions from newsmen effectively and convincingly.

When a newsman inquired why news media representatives were not permitted to cover Milrow from Amchitka, the Congressman responded that he thought they might be permitted to do so under a pool arrangement. After discussion between Congressman Holifield and NV Manager Miller, arrangements were made with the Milrow Test Manager, R. H. Thalgot, to permit two reporters, under Office of Public Affairs escort, to be on Amchitka and witness Milrow on closed circuit TV.

Wallace Turner of the New York Times served as representative for the written media, and Merl Severn of CBS-TV was the TV-radio pool representative. Because of the long experience of the networks with pool coverage there were no difficulties with the TV-radio materials. However, with only a few hours between selection of a pool representative and the plane departure, adequate plans were not made for reception and distribution of Turner's dispatches. With a misunderstanding at the New York Times about making copy available to other news media and inadequate planning for copying and distributing at Anchorage—plus equipment failures—dispatches were not reproduced and distributed speedily and the pool was far from satisfactory. Afternoon newspapers had a legitimate complaint in that the dispatches were timed for morning newspapers and missed evening deadlines.

(The D minus 2 through D plus 1 day Public Affairs actions on Amchitka, including handling of pool representatives, official guests and shot time control room activities are detailed in Appendix D.)

The event day (October 2, 1969) operations of the Information Center in Anchorage were the most elaborate and effective public affairs activities ever conducted by NV and resulted in favorable nationwide publicity.

Starting at 9 a.m., local time, nearly 100 invited guests and news media representatives observed the final preparations and the actual detonation of the widely publicized Milrow calibration event—even though they were more than 1400 miles from Amchitka.

The program (detailed in Annex A) held the attention of the guests and the more than 250 persons who gathered in the hotel lobby where they could hear and watch the proceedings by TV and over a public address system from the Information Center.

Through the device of the Information Center it was possible to impress the invited guests—all leaders in the community—with the care taken in nuclear testing, and the extent of AEC safety programs.

Attendance remained on a "Standing Room Only" basis through the detonation and the post-shot evaluations. Most of the guests left when the formal program was concluded, about 2 p.m. Some news media representatives remained for interviews with the scientists who had participated in the program. The H plus 3 hour summaries on seismology, ecology, containment, radiation monitoring and tsunamis attracted some 10 reporters in addition to a few remaining members of the public.

Post-detonation newspaper, radio, and TV coverage was extensive and favorable. The Anchorage Daily News carried articles and editorials critical of the attitudes and actions of the AEC team and continuing opposition to the test program. For the most part, however, the AEC was credited with doing a good job, and with having proved the accuracy and truthfulness of pre-event effects predictions. Several newspapers (notably the Anchorage Times, the Fairbanks News-Miner and the Ketchikan News) published editorials ridiculing the pre-event campaign of fear conducted by test opponents and suggesting that the AEC had earned the confidence of the public. The Anchorage Times' editorial "Chicken Little's Old Tale" was inserted into the Congressional Record by Representative Holifield, who was joined by Congressman Hosmer of California in pointing out the results of Milrow and the earlier Rulison event in Colorado were precisely what the AEC scientists had predicted, and comparing the results with the pre-shot "horror stories" circulated by test opponents.

News media and public interest in Milrow fell off rapidly and by the middle of the following week it was apparent that there was no need for continued staffing of an information office in Alaska. Between that time and December 1, 1969, except for several pro-AEC editorials in the Anchorage Times and articles based on the AEC's preliminary report on Milrow effects, issued on October 22, Alaska news media appeared to have ignored Amchitka and the AEC.

The Alaska Office of Information was discontinued at the close of business on October 8 and Public Affairs personnel withdrawn from Alaska.

Observations, Conclusions and Suggestions:

The Event Coverage Period was a successful culmination of the Alaskan program. The principal desirable improvement would have been in the pool coverage on Amchitka. This phase did not work as well as desired, chiefly because there was not sufficient time between the decision to permit pool coverage and the departure of the press party.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

In retrospect, the Amchitka Public Affairs program was successful and provides the basis for making better plans and conducting a more effective program for future events.

The extent of news media exposure given to test opponents was not an accurate measure of the reaction of Alaska residents. Despite the prominence of some opponents and the sensationalized scare tactics which were used, there never was an indication of widespread public opposition. (This suggests the importance of not over-reacting to opposition.)

The primary opposition expressed to Milrow appeared to be based chiefly on anti-testing, anti-ABM, and the anti-establishment ideology, politics and a desire to get publicity. The opposition leaders curtailed their real motives and staged a campaign designed to promote fear—fear of earthquakes, fear of tidal waves, fear of economic damage to the fishing industry, fear of damaging foreign relations, and to a minor extent fear of radioactivity. This is a type of opposition the AEC has experienced for years and one which appears certain to continue. There appears to be no method of softening or minimizing this opposition, since for the most part those ideologically, morally or instinctively inspired to voice this opposition have their minds firmly made up, will not listen to facts, arguments or opposing views, and are determined not to let their minds be changed.

Originally, it was assumed that the chief opposition to Milrow from Alaskans would be on conservationist grounds. Concerted efforts were made to get all the information before leading conservationists and conservationist groups and to convince them

that the effects predictions were soundly based, and that bioecological study programs were detailed enough. The sea otter transplant program was thoroughly publicized. The success of these efforts is attested by the lack of any significant amount of open, organized conservationist opposition during the final months before Milrow.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. If future projects are programmed for Amchitka, the AEC should have a more open policy than in the build-up period for the Milrow test. During the weeks leading up to Milrow, the AEC demonstrated to news media and the public that it can operate openly, that its people know what they are doing, and that they are credible.

2. Some agency of the U.S. Government should seek to learn the motivation for the Milrow opposition engendered in Canada, as a means of judging whether similar opposition is likely in the future, and perhaps to find means to counteract such opposition.

3. A series of 10 to 20 minute film briefings based on "Safety in Underground Testing" and similar to the oral briefings made by AEC authorities to the Alaska State Legislative Council should be prepared several months in advance of any future Amchitka test. Such a series of safety briefing film presentations would make it possible to present safety briefings to officials, groups, organizations or the public as appropriate without the actual presence of the panel of briefers.

Each film should be self-contained and usable as an individual program. With a selection of briefings covering "Why We Test;" "Earth Motion;" "Containment;" "Radioactivity;" "Ecology;" etc., it would be possible to offer briefings on individual subjects; a combination of subjects, or the entire safety spectrum.

Some films might be usable in any area where a nuclear project was planned. Others might be specially tailored for the particular area.

JOHN GOBERT—OUTSTANDING DISABLED AMERICAN VETERAN FOR 1971

Mr. FANNIN, Mr. President, one of the perplexing problems facing Congress is how to encourage able-bodied but unwilling workers to take jobs.

But we also have inspiring instances in our Nation of severely handicapped persons who have fought not only to carry their own weight in society, but to help others.

Two instances have come to my attention recently. One is the story of a one-legged veteran who has helped to bring health service to the isolated Arizona Indian village of Supai. Because of his wonderful record, John Gobert has been selected as the Outstanding Disabled American Veteran for 1971.

The story was told in an Associated Press article which ran August 9, 1971, in the Phoenix Gazette. 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:

DAV'S OUTSTANDING MAN—ONE-LEGGED VET BRINGS MEDICAL AID TO INDIAN

DETROIT.—Overcoming the Vietnam war injury that took his left leg, husky Blackfoot Indian John Gobert has blazed a trail bringing health service to his Indian brethren in the isolated village of Supai, 2,400 feet below the rim of the Grand Canyon.

Now 29 years old, Gobert was born and

raised on an Indian reservation at Brown- ing, Mont. He joined the Navy in 1960, and during his second tour of duty in Vietnam in 1965 he lost his leg when he stepped on a land mine.

After 10 months in a Naval hospital learning to walk on a false leg, Gobert returned to civilian life.

In 1969, he took a pioneering assignment with the U.S. Indian Health Service in Arizona. The job was to bring medical care and public health programs to the 300 Havasupai Indians living in almost complete isolation down the steep cliffs of the Grand Canyon.

After hurriedly taking courses from the U.S. Public Health Service at Phoenix and Tucson, Ariz., on health care, Gobert spent 18 months in Supai offering what medical help he could and arranging to have the seriously ill removed to the nearest town—80 miles away—by helicopter.

As a result of his success, the U.S. Public Health Service has organized a program of training Indians to bring medical services to some of the most isolated tribes in the western part of the nation.

Gobert, who is helping to coordinate the training and placement of 10 new Indian medics, has been named the year's Outstanding Disabled American Veteran by the 350,000-member Disabled American Veterans.

Some 3,000 delegates of the group are in Detroit for their annual convention.

In addition to operating a medical clinic and public health program, Gobert spent many hours in Supai traveling the treacherous cliff trails on horseback to make house calls.

Gobert won the confidence of the villagers—"a real tribute" to him, explains Dr. Charles S. McCammon, medical director of the Phoenix area Indian Health Service. "For the Havasupai people are not noted for their acceptance of outsiders," Gobert modestly discounts any difficulties in achieving acceptance by the Havasupais.

"I could have had two heads and three arms on one side as long as I could look after their health," he said.

Gobert had to call in helicopters 16 times to take out seriously ill or injured patients. But often, after dark or when winds were too strong, the helicopter could not make the trip and Gobert had to do what he could with the guidance of a doctor on the telephone.

EDITORIALS FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials published in the Arkansas Gazette of September 12, 1971.

One editorial, entitled "Filling a National Void," concerns the opening of the Kennedy Center and emphasizes in an appropriate manner the significance of this fine institution.

The other editorial, entitled "The New 'Line' From Walt Whitman Rostow," is a perceptive and thoughtful analysis of some of the views of Mr. Kissinger's predecessor in the White House.

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

THE NEW "LINE" FROM WALT WHITMAN ROSTOW

Presidential advisers may come and presidential advisers may go (though some of them do not go often enough or soon enough), but the one thing that most of the think tank boys seem to have in common is an apparently congenial inability to admit that they might ever have been wrong.

Among the big ones, a partial exception would have to be Robert S. McNamara—no "think tank" product, as such, but one of them in spirit—whose commissioning of the "Pentagon Papers" grew out of a growing suspicion that he had been wrong. While he was hanging in there, though, McNamara had hung as tough as any of 'em, concurring in irrational actions daily in the name of what he was certain was pure reason.

More typical is Eugene V. Rostow, who now has simply shifted the terms of debate to argue that it was Japan and not China that was the real long-term threat in Southeast Asia all along. It goes without saying that he had known it all along, but just wasn't telling.

Walt W. Rostow, from his exile at the University of Texas-Austin, essays the more bravura touch, writing now in Life magazine that China was and remains the threat, all right, but going on to argue from there that *detente* with China, if it comes, will have come about because of, rather than in spite of, our bloody war in Indochina. It is an ingenious argument, but also a remarkably disingenuous one.

"Was it worth it?," W. W. Rostow asks rhetorically in summary of almost 50,000 American dead, unknown and unknowable hundreds of thousands of indigenous Asian peasantry dead. \$125,000,000,000 lifted out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. "Clearly the outcome of the common effort is still uncertain [*but*] if we mindlessly walk away from Asia, we shall make sure it was not worth it."

We can mindlessly walk in to the inherited French colonial war in the Indochina peninsula (against the explicit advice of General de Gaulle and other thoughtful Frenchmen) but to walk all the way out, many years too late, would be really mindless because it would, among other things, reveal more fully the essential mindlessness of the original action. That is not precisely the argument Rostow is trying to make, of course, but it is the argument, the only case that can be made for lingering. Learning nothing from the past, Rostow apparently is determined to repeat the nightmare history forever if it comes to that, even if all but he have fled and he has to do it single-handed.

One of the positive gains that Walt Whitman Rostow claims have come out of the Vietnam War is the "strength" of Japan, the same Japan that Eugene Victor Rostow sees as becoming again the long-term threat in Southeast Asia and in the Far East generally.

Another is what he calls the "greatest rice crop in (South Vietnam's) history." It is true that the South Vietnamese, with our assistance, lately have begun to have some success with high-yield strains in such cultivable land as has escaped what Patrick Owens calls our "craterization" policy in that country. But what this ignores is that South Vietnam was a rice exporting country when we first entered the war in force, but has not been for the greater course of our presence there—for the obvious reasons. It also ignores the price of rice in the local consumer market, then as compared with now, along with all the other inflationary effects that the war has had on the South Vietnamese economy as a whole (not to mention our own.) The day after publication of the Rostow piece in Life the headlines told of the breakdown of orderly marketing procedures even in "safe" rural areas in the country because of the large number of ARVN veterans turned looters and highwaymen in consequence of the combination of low or non-existent pensions and high living costs.

But what all this ignores most of all is that during the period when we supposedly have been effectively "resisting" China, thereby making it more amenable to sane discourse, the Chinese have been strengthening rather than diminishing their influence

along the Indochina periphery, and that during that period—so far from being overthrown internally, which was the wish if not actually the prediction of some of the more glazed-eyed justifiers of our Vietnam intervention—the Communist government of mainland China has survived the Cultural Revolution, with all its wrenching dislocations, to emerge into a period of so much greater stability and confidence as to allow them, once more to confront the Outer Barbarians (us) eyeball to eyeball. It of course was also the period in which they perfected The Bomb, and went to work on a delivery system, if anybody is interested in that.

FILLING A NATIONAL VOID

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has been opened with proper pomp and ceremony and with the grand premiere of a Leonard Bernstein "mass" which was conceived and executed on a scale in proportion to the heroic structure itself. It is a matter of considerable pride and satisfaction to all of us in Arkansas that the Center is the architectural creation of Edward Durell Stone.

In the tradition of nearly all such openings, there is lively if not furious disagreement on the artistic worth of the edifice and of the first performance in it. The old, beloved Metropolitan Opera in New York was the target of caustic criticism when it was opened. In its turn, the Kennedy Center is regarded by some critics as cavernous and grandiose and cold; New Yorkers especially have said sniffily that it lacks compactness and sophistication of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. Edward Durell Stone, in his response, has noted that the setting in Washington is not like New York's and, quoting Frank Lloyd Wright on the virtues of honest arrogance (vs. hypocritical humility), has said that he finds his creation spectacularly beautiful.

As for Bernstein's "mass," the New York Times reviewers found it schmalzy and superficial, while the Washington Post reviewer said it was the greatest thing Bernstein had ever done.

Everyone to his own choice and let history be the judge. All of this lively argument adds to the spirit of the occasion, the opening of an institution fittingly named for a beloved president who was a great and knowledgeable patron of the arts. The Kennedy Center fills a great void at the national capital, which previously had nothing more than ordinary provincial facilities for the performing arts. The Center has been desperately needed. It promises to enrich the quality of American life.

THE COST-OF-LIVING INDEX

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, uppermost in the mind of every person in the United States today are the country's economic problems and how these problems affect each individual. The rise in the cost-of-living index is watched closely. Equally as important and as closely observed by many people is the monthly report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics concerning the rise or fall in wholesale food prices. It is natural for everyone to be concerned with wholesale food prices because changes in these prices generally mean food price changes at retail.

Because of the importance placed on this, and other reports of our many Government agencies, I believe Congress should insist upon the most accurate and factual reports than can possibly be assembled. Inaccuracies in these reports are misleading to the public and damaging to both our Government's image and

the credibility of the department concerned. The reports can also single out and damage important food industries as well.

Such a damaging case resulting from a recent report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been called to my attention, and I wish to inform my fellow Members of Congress of the seriousness of the problem and how it occurred.

According to information supplied to me by United Egg Producers, a nationwide egg marketing cooperative, on September 2, 1971, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released its report which indicated August wholesale food prices rose 2.2 percent over the previous month. In that report, the Bureau said egg prices rose 23.2 percent. After investigating the Bureau's findings, United Egg Producers reported to me egg prices advanced only about 2 cents per dozen, or less than 5 percent, during August and the reason for the Bureau's erroneous report was that their figures were based on one day's price for one size of eggs in four market locations.

It was difficult for me to believe that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has issued such an important statement concerning wholesale food prices on such a shallow sampling of statistical data. Egg prices are so volatile, a month's report cannot be based on what occurred on a given day this month as compared with a similar day last month. Yet, this is exactly how the report was formulated.

When the industry leaders confronted the Bureau of Labor Statistics with the inaccuracy of their report they suggested that if the Bureau were to continue reporting a monthly whole food price index, then such reports should be based on average monthly price figures—not just 1 day's market prices. The Bureau is reported to have advised industry members that it will reconsider sampling and reporting procedures and evaluate possible changes to improve accuracy of the reports.

Mr. President, I say all Federal reports should be accurate and reflect a true picture or they should not be issued at all. Dr. Gene C. Masters, director of statistical analysis for United Egg Producers, said it took him less than 1 hour to evaluate the U.S. Department of Agriculture's daily price reports to determine what the true wholesale price index was for eggs in August as compared to July. These same USDA reports are available to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and their department is adequately staffed to compile accurate reports.

Therefore, I am requesting that the Bureau of Labor Statistics study and correct its procedures and methods to insure accuracy of their reports. Such reports are too important to our Nation as well as to many food industries to be allowed to be misleading or inaccurate. I am pleased that the Bureau has expressed a desire to consider such needed changes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record the text of a letter from Mr. Jerry Faulkner, vice president and general manager of United Egg Producers, and of my letter to the Honorable Geoffrey H. Moore, Commis-

sioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, dated September 13, 1971, asking that he consider changes in methods and procedures.

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

UNITED EGG PRODUCERS,
Atlanta, Ga., September 8, 1971.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to call your attention to misleading public pronouncements and improper statistical procedures by the Bureau of Labor Statistics which have caused the egg industry to be falsely accused as a culprit in the rise in wholesale food prices. This situation needs to be investigated and rectified to prevent future damaging reports to our, and possibly other, agricultural industries.

On Thursday, September 2, the Bureau of Labor Statistics issued its report which was carried by practically every major news media outlet in the United States. Newspapers carried the stories on front pages as those figures said food prices were continuing to rise. The news article noted that the primary culprits in the rise were agricultural items which were not subject to the price freeze announced by President Nixon. It labeled eggs as having advanced in price 23.2 percent over the previous month.

Those of us in the egg business knew this report could not be true, therefore we checked into the matter. We learned from the Bureau that their report was issued on the basis of one day's price for one size of eggs in four market locations. It just happened that the day the Bureau picked for its sample was a day in which market prices were higher than on the sample day of the previous month. We understand the turkey industry was falsely labelled in November 1970 as was the egg industry in July of this year.

Dr. Gene C. Masters, Director of Statistical Research for our organization, called the Bureau's attention to this fallacy in statistical reporting. Comparing egg prices for the entire month of August against July, using the same U.S. Department of Agriculture reports the Bureau used, Dr. Masters found egg prices advanced about 1c per dozen, or approximately 3 percent for the month. Eggs accounted for only about 2 percent of retail food sales, thus could not have been a significant factor in the rising cost of food—even using the Bureau's false report of 23.2 percent rise!

It is hard to believe our government would permit the issuance of such important public releases as the one to which I refer without in-depth, thorough study. To single out any industry on such shallow statistical sampling is certainly without justification, particularly when the figures are readily available. We were told by the Bureau they did not have the time, personnel or funds to study the daily price changes over the full month's range. Yet, Dr. Masters achieved this in less than an hour's time.

I believe you will agree that if the Bureau of Labor Statistics is to continue reporting monthly rises in food prices, then the figures should truly represent what has occurred over the month's duration—not a single day. And, if a single commodity contributed to the rise, then such price rises should be statistically significant. Egg prices are very volatile, so the use of price reports on any one day as an indicator of the monthly average price level is misleading and inaccurate.

United Egg Producers is on record with the Department of Agriculture as having requested a daily or weekly report of retail egg prices to consumers. Such a series is not now available. We believe Market News and the Economic Research Service could develop such a series which would be meaningful to

both the consumer and the egg industry. Those figures would be more significant in signaling a rise or decline in the cost of living.

Until a better measuring system is devised, we would appreciate your investigating the present system to the end that reports issued to the public truly reflect an accurate picture of the nation's economy.

Sincerely,

JERRY FAULKNER,
Vice President and General Manager.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,

Washington, D.C., September 13, 1971.

HON. GEOFFREY H. MOORE,
Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics
U.S. Department of Labor, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER MOORE: Attached is a copy of a letter, which is self-explanatory, dated September 8, 1971, from Mr. Jerry Faulkner, Vice President and General Manager, United Egg Producers, Atlanta, Georgia, concerning the September 2, 1971, report on wholesale prices of eggs by the Bureau.

As you know, consumers are very much aware and rightfully have a deep interest in food prices. However, many consumers equate food prices with farm prices, which are quite two different matters.

I know for a fact that producer egg prices have been disastrously low for a considerable period of time. For example, as reported by the Department of Agriculture prices received by producers as reported on August 15, 1969, amounted to 35.5 cents per dozen, on August 15, 1970, 33.1 cents per dozen, and on August 15, 1971, 31.0 cents per dozen; hardly profitable levels.

Therefore, it seems to me, and I am sure you agree, that the Bureau should do its utmost to assure that prices reported are truly representative and do reflect actual changes.

As I understand it, the United Egg Producers have discussed this matter with you and were informed that you would look into the matter of Bureau procedures and methodology.

In any event I would appreciate very much your cooperation in considering such changes as necessary to fully reflect market for the benefit of consumers and others.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Chairman.

NO PHOSPHATE MINING IN LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, one of the major environmental issues in California today is the proposal for U.S. Gypsum Co. to engage in open pit mining for phosphates in the Los Padres National Forest.

This operation would be an environmental disaster as attested to in the environmental impact statement prepared by the Bureau of Land Management. Not only would the mining result in air and noise pollution and the loss of recreational values of this area, it would also adversely affect the California condor located in sanctuaries on both sides of the proposed mining area.

There has been substantial local opposition to the phosphate mining on environmental grounds, even though the operation might create greatly needed new jobs in the area.

An editorial published recently in the Ventura County Press-Courier during

the congressional recess illustrates the extent of local feelings. Mr. President, 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:

NO NEED FOR U.S. GYPSUM HERE

With the legislators of California and Ventura County in both Washington and Sacramento solidly lined up against open pit mining for phosphates in Los Padres National Forest it is hard to imagine the U.S. Gypsum Company having much of a chance to extract a lease from the Department of the Interior.

The operation of mining in public land in the forest above Ojai, if it were to receive federal approval in a year or so, could last from 40 to 100 years according to estimates. The mind boggles at the mere thought of what this beautiful wilderness area would look like before mining ran down to a stop.

The very idea that such a thing is contemplated and is possible is enough to drive conservationists to distraction, especially those who were "cut off at the pass" during so-called public hearings in Ventura July 27 and 28 when they tried to present arguments they considered should be in the record of testimony the Department of the Interior will review.

U.S. Gypsum wants a lease to mine 2,500 acres of the forest in the vicinity of Pine Mountain Ridge, which is not far removed from the nesting site of the few California giant condors we have left. The company has stated it expects to build a processing plant to handle 2,000 tons of material a day and is seeking two additional prospecting permits which could eventually allow mining of 5,000 additional adjacent acres. A second plant to make 500 tons of sulfuric acid per day for use in the process of producing phosphates would be needed and state highway 33, the Ojai-Maricopa stretch, would see up to 70 25-ton trucks going to and from the processing area.

The magnitude of the operation proposed may be difficult to grasp but it takes little imagination on the part of the average citizen of Ventura County to lend a sympathetic ear to the warnings of save-our-environment groups now active in opposition to the entire project. Forest land now in a virgin state, and all the better for that, would have open pits of about one-half mile in length, 900 feet in width and 400 feet in depth from the surface for at least five miles. Ventura County Environmental Coalition say the result would represent a subterranean Roman coliseum. Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) didn't take long to assure coalition board members in Camarillo Friday that he, too, takes a very dim view of the whole proposal and believes it can be shelved by getting rid of some archaic laws which govern the issuance of permits for strip mining in the United States.

Some of the environmental roadblocks to mining, apart from scarring of the forest, pointed out by conservationists are air, water and noise pollution, adverse impact on both plant and animal life, curtailment of recreation, serious depletion of water table to dry up springs now used by hikers and wildlife, erosion, and increased fire dangers.

It is not at all clear what economic advantages to the county the U.S. Gypsum venture would bring. Is the mineral deposit in Los Padres National Forest needed in the foreseeable future? Environmental coalition doesn't believe so and produces statistics which indicate there is a glut of phosphate on the world market with the U.S. exporting 30 per cent of what is mined in this country.

Sen. Cranston was advised that loaded as it is with information on the subject of open mining, environmental coalition has had difficulty in obtaining data, from either fed-

eral agencies or U.S. Gypsum which would allow citizens to participate in the decision-making process. Cranston, promising his cooperation to break through the ax wall of silence, heard from coalition members they are convinced U.S. Gypsum has not been truthful with them or the U.S. government in some of the statements made at the hearings which, were described as farcical.

An enlightening observation by the senator was that one governmental official frankly stated, when the matter of public hearings on another matter was being discussed, that "We don't want public hearings because we don't want to stir up the natives."

The natives of Ventura County have been stirred up by the threat of damage to one of its natural resources. What environmental coalition needs now more than anything is a citizens' fighting fund (money in the bank) from which to draw in fighting the good fight to preserve the environmental quality of this county.

LEE ANTHONY GIURLANDA—SIGHTLESS ANNOUNCER FOR RADIO STATION KAAA, KINGMAN, ARIZ.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, earlier in the summer, on July 3, 1971, the Arizona Republic published an editorial about a blind radio announcer in Kingman, Ariz. 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:

OUT-TALKING A HANDICAP

Lee Anthony Giurlanda, the sightless announcer for Kingman radio station KAAA, is one of a small but growing number of blind persons winning their way into jobs with the electronic communications media.

They do so by demonstrating that their visual handicap is actually no handicap to the capable performance of their duties amid the clutter of dials, switches, and cables. Their example is heartening to all others who must master physical or mental afflictions.

Giurlanda, who goes by the name "Lee Anthony" over the air, was recently featured in an Associated Press story in The Republic. He had been a broadcasting student at Phoenix College, but was unable to find work with a local station. In Kingman, he appeared for a job interview with the station manager, who didn't realize that Giurlanda was sightless until the aspiring announcer told him so.

"Lee Anthony," who can distinguish only between total darkness and bright sunlight, does not use a cane. Walking down the streets, he has his wife at his side to direct him. He discarded his dark glasses when he decided they looked strange to others in the glareless confines of a control room. Staffers at KAAA who used to complain of personal afflictions say his attitude is a constant encouragement.

The Federal Communications Commission reportedly is considering whether to grant him a first-class broadcaster's license because of his proved ability. The FCC previously limited sightless persons to lesser licenses to restrict the duties they may perform at stations.

A sightless announcer in the Midwest is said to have given the Kingman man the encouragement to hope for a radio job.

Another visually handicapped radio announcer, Paul Caputo of Springfield, Mass., recently joined the news department of WWLP-TV there, becoming, the station believes, the first blind newsman on American television. All these announcers work with the aid of stories punched in Braille.

Their voices and images should remind

the public that handicaps need not become greater than people allow them to be.

PRO-NIXON ILLINOIS PRECINCTS SUPPORT 1971 VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to a poll on Vietnam which was conducted in certain Illinois precincts this summer.

Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, the well-known antiwar lobby, selected precincts which had, by lopsided margins, voted for Mr. Nixon in 1968 and for the victorious congressional candidates in 1970. Neither President Nixon nor the Congressmen advocate setting a deadline for ending the war. But from 62 to 83 percent of their constituents who were polled now believe the war should be ended this year, and say they will not vote for incumbents who do not vote accordingly.

I ask unanimous consent to have a letter containing an explanation of this poll printed in the RECORD.

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

BUSINESS EXECUTIVES MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE, Chicago, Ill., September 10, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to report to you the results of a BEM-sponsored survey just completed in supposedly hawkish precincts in the Chicago metropolitan area on voter attitudes toward a firm 1971 troop withdrawal date in Vietnam. The survey shows that 72.7% of voters in precincts President Nixon carried in 1968 will vote against the President and their congressman unless those officials move to withdraw "all U.S. military personnel . . . out of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia by December 31, 1971."

BEM canvassers worked in districts represented by congressmen who voted against the Nedzi-Whalen Amendment. The canvassing method was to work house to house in precincts selected because they voted for the President and the incumbent congressman at the last elections. All canvassers were volunteers; almost all are residents of the districts they worked. No professional politicians of either party took part.

The canvassing took place during July and August. A total of 3804 voters in six congressional districts marked ballots, with 2765 (72.7%) marking for the Dec. 31st deadline and 1039 (27.3%) voting approval of the President's current policy.

Following are the district results:

District and Congressman	Incumbent's percentage		BEM survey 1971 (per-cent)	Survey percent against Con-gress-man	Size of sample
	District vote 1971	1970 vote in precincts worked for survey			
5th—John Kluczynski (Democrat) . . .	68.8	62.3	17.4	82.6	1,143
10th—Harold Collier (Republican) . . .	62.2	68.0	35.7	64.3	610
12th—Robert McClory (Republican) . . .	61.1	66.8	33.5	66.5	562
13th—Philip Crane (Republican) . . .	58.0	51.8	26.9	73.1	936
14th—John M. Erlenborn (Republican) . . .	65.5	70.5	37.3	62.7	268
15th—Mrs. Charlotte Reid (Republican) . . .	68.9	77.0	28.8	71.2	285

THE FIFTH DISTRICT

Basically a Chicago district, the 5th stretches out the southwest side south of the Sanitary & Ship Canal to bedroom-factory suburbs like Stickney and Justice. The district includes the old Stock Yards, Midway Airport and Mayor Daley's home. Our workers canvassed in eight precincts, one in the 14th Ward (a Democratic stronghold), two in the 15th (Gage Park), four in the 23rd (Garfield Ridge), and one in the town of Burbank. Both President Nixon (in 1968) and Rep. Kluczynski (in 1970) carried all eight precincts; there was also a substantial vote for Gov. Wallace in these precincts. Those sampled in the 25th precinct of the 15th Ward, three blocks from Congressman Kluczynski's home, voted 156-12 for the Nedzi-Whalen date.

THE 10TH DISTRICT

West Cook County suburbs. It ranges geographically from Des Plaines and Park Ridge on the north to LaGrange Park at the southern border. Our workers canvassed in Oak Park (three precincts), River Forest (one), Park Ridge (one), Maywood (two), Brookfield (one), Bellwood (one) and LaGrange Park (one). All 10 precincts were carried both by President Nixon and Rep. Collier. Proviso Township, Pct. 23 (LaGrange Park), closest to Rep. Collier's home, showed a 55-50 majority for Nedzi-Whalen.

THE 12TH DISTRICT

Lake and McHenry counties, and two northwest Cook county townships. It includes suburbs, exurban towns, and farms. Our six precincts are split between Lake County (Lake Forest, Libertyville, and Deerfield) and McHenry County (two in Crystal Lake and one, partly rural, in McHenry). All six precincts were carried both by President Nixon and Rep. McClory. Shields Township, Pct. 9, in Lake Forest, closest to Rep. McClory's home, showed a 140-32 majority for Nedzi-Whalen.

THE 13TH DISTRICT

North Cook County suburbs, from the Lake west to Schaumburg. Our workers canvassed in 15 precincts: Wheeling (one), Northfield (one), Elk Grove Village (one), Glenview (one), Evanston (four), Morton Grove (two), Lincolnwood (one), and Skokie (one), and three in "Evanston P.O." precincts. Twelve of the 15 were carried by Rep. Crane, and all were carried by President Nixon. In Precinct 4 of Elk Grove Village, Congressman Crane's home town, the sampling was 71-34 in favor of Nedzi-Whalen.

THE 14TH DISTRICT

Du Page County (far western suburbs) and the Joliet panhandle of Will County. Our workers canvassed in six precincts, excluding Will County, which was carried in 1970 by Rep. Erlenborn's Democratic opponent. Work was done in Wheaton (one), Elmhurst (one), Villa Park (two, including the new Brandywine subdivision), and Lombard (two). All six precincts were carried both by President Nixon and Rep. Erlenborn. Pct. 85, York Township, in Elmhurst where Congressman Erlenborn lives, turned out 44-25 for Nedzi-Whalen.

THE 15TH DISTRICT

Kane, DeKalb, Kendall, Grundy and LaSalle counties, including exurban cities, downstate towns, a huge state university and farm country. Our workers canvassed in two precincts: Geneva and rural Blackberry Township of Kane County. Both were carried by Rep. Reid and President Nixon. We also included some ballots signed at the Kane County fair last month.

A copy of our ballot is enclosed.

Yours sincerely,

FORBES SHEPARD,
Project Director.

A NEW REFORM ERA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the New York Times of today, September 15, contains a thoughtful and provocative column written by Mr. William V. Shannon entitled "A New Reform Era." I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NEW REFORM ERA

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON, September 14.—"To be a healthy nation, a strong nation, we need also restore the health of our government institutions," President Nixon told Congress the other day.

In support of this contention, Mr. Nixon reiterated his call for reorganization of the executive departments, Federal-state revenue sharing and welfare reform. But the crisis of confidence in the nation's institutions which was discussed in a previous article in this space is far wider and more profound. It encompasses the Presidency itself, Congress, the courts, the military and civil bureaucracies, and state and municipal governments.

No single leader can resolve this crisis by himself. Yet the President is a critical figure because he is the only official chosen by the whole people. A way out of the crisis can begin to be found only if there is a President who can focus the nation's moral energies by a politics of idealism and creative conciliation. That has not occurred during Mr. Nixon's Presidency.

Like President Johnson before him, President Nixon has squandered much of his political credit in Vietnam. As he frequently points out, he is gradually eliminating the war as a political issue. But after nearly three additional years of combat 15,000 American deaths, the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State episode, he has taken so long to do it that he did not benefit from the tolerance that the public extends to every new President. As a result, his base of support is no wider in the fall of 1971 than it was in the fall of 1968.

By the Haynsworth and Carswell nominations, Mr. Nixon damaged the Presidency as well as the Supreme Court. He was seen to be playing regional politics with appointments on which the ordinary citizen had a right to expect him to be highminded and disinterested.

A successful Presidency involves a dialogue between President and people. Candor is the first requirement of a dialogue. Without it, there can be no mutual trust. The dialogue has to be on a regular and frequent basis. Otherwise, there is no resonance. But Mr. Nixon has chosen to emulate the remote, imperial style of General deGaulle. That may be suitable for a country with Bonapartist traditions but it is a curious mode for the United States.

Although the Kennedy Administration tried to "manage the news" and the Johnson Administration found its way to "credibility gap," both of those regimes were as open as town meetings compared to the present Administration with its absence of Presidential news conferences, its overt hostility to much of the press and its passion for secrecy.

Having failed to establish a continuing dialogue with press and public, President Nixon has seriously impaired his ability to win broad support for such institutional initiatives as he has attempted—executive reorganization and Federal-state revenue sharing. He first oversold them to a fantastic degree by packaging them as the "second American Revolution" and then naturally found he could not sustain public interest in them at that level.

He then coupled revenue sharing with welfare reform as postponable items in his new economic program. Trying to repair the damage he reasserted his support for them in his address to Congress last week, but major proposals cannot be used as propaganda make-weights and still retain their credibility. Mr. Nixon does not appear to realize that in manipulating them in this fashion, he undercut not only revenue sharing and welfare reform but also public belief in his own seriousness. Is he trying to reform the Government or is he playing political games?

Yet if Mr. Nixon has failed to restore the Presidency as a center of effective, convincing leadership, other institutions hardly come off any better. Congressmen seem unaware that many citizens see the House and Senate as places where far too many men arrive poor and leave twenty or thirty years later with a lot more than their pensions. Lyndon Johnson with his radio and television franchises set a bad example in this regard, and he is not unique, until Congress clears up flagrant conflicts of interest and drastically reforms the law on campaign spending, a greasy smog of money will linger over the Capitol.

At least half the state governments are not fit to participate in any Federal revenue-sharing plan because they lack adequate budget and accounting systems and have poorly paid, politically intimidated civil services. To pour money into these governments is like pouring water into a sewer—it can never be traced.

At every level of government and in almost every corner of our common life, there is need for a regeneration of public morality and a rededication to social justice such as swept the nation in the progressive era during the first decade and a half of this century. New organizations like John Gardner's Common Cause and Ralph Nader's Public Citizen and the emergence of public interest law firms and citizen environment groups are evidence that such a movement may be forming. When it finds political expression and leadership at different levels, the renewal of the nation's institutions of Government will begin.

DURABLE GOODS TAX CREDIT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, last March 15 the Wall Street Journal published an interesting article by Dr. Francis O. Woodard, professor and chairman of the Department of Economics at Wichita State University, in Kansas.

Dr. Woodard, a man with a very impressive record in teaching, consulting, and research, proposed a durable goods tax credit to help to stimulate the American economy.

In brief, he suggested that American consumers who purchase certain American-made goods be permitted to deduct a certain percentage of the cost from their income tax bill.

The article was accompanied by a Wall Street Journal editorial which called the proposal interesting but unlikely.

Mr. President, as a result of these articles, I asked that Professor Woodard provide a more detailed proposal. Dr. Woodard was most cooperative. He sent a further analysis of the proposed tax credit. I wish to compliment Dr. Woodard for his hard work in this area, and for making a very lucid presentation.

As we all know, many things have transpired since March 15, 1971. All of the work by Dr. Woodard, which I am discussing today, was done well before President Nixon's August 15 announcement of a new economic policy.

In view of the administration's program, and because of the complexity of issues already facing us, I do not believe it is an appropriate time for us to consider adopting the durable goods tax credit concept.

It does seem appropriate, however, for me to offer this material for study as a further step to pep up our economy should it lag at some future time; so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a paper which Dr. Woodard prepared for me regarding the durable goods tax credit.

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

A DURABLE GOODS TAX CREDIT—A FURTHER ANALYSIS

(By F. O. Woodard)

The proposal, briefly, is to give consumers a tax credit for purchases of durable consumer goods; the credit designed to stimulate purchases of such items as automobiles, furniture and appliances so that employment will be restored in one of the most economically depressed areas of our economy. A reduction of unemployment in the durable goods industries, of course, would have salutary effects upon other industries as well, and would go far to restoring an acceptable level of economic prosperity.

Certain changes in the economy in recent months have made the maintenance of full employment very difficult if not impossible. These changes have largely involved the consumer, and were quite well documented in "The Outlook" column of the *Wall Street Journal* on March 15, the same issue that my article on a durable tax credit appeared. Briefly, "The Outlook" pointed out that in the two year period from the 4th quarter, 1968 to the 4th quarter, 1970, disposable personal income, the amount available for consumers to spend, increased 15 per cent. Personal savings, however, increased 30 per cent during the same period. The increase in savings was offset by a decrease in consumer spending, and specifically a reduction in spending for consumer durable goods. During that same two year period expenditures for clothing increased 15 per cent and for food and beverages, 14 per cent. For automobiles and automobile parts, however, purchases declined by 15 per cent and for furniture and household equipment purchases increased by only 8 per cent.

This places the responsibility for the present recession and for the hoped recovery squarely on the consumer. It is not hard to understand why he is spending less now than two years ago. Among other reasons, if he still has a job he is very possibly afraid that he will lose it, as has his neighbor. Also, the rapid increase in prices over the past several months undoubtedly has discouraged many consumers from buying new durable goods. He chooses instead, to repair the old automobile or appliance. * * *

A consumer durable tax credit would be directed squarely at the central problem, and at the same time would result in a minimum reduction in government revenue. It would stimulate activity in that area of the economy which is now experiencing one of the highest rates of unemployment and the highest level of idle capacity. Further, all of the initial reduction in tax revenue would be reflected in consumer durable spending; none would be siphoned off into savings.

There is also the possibility of sufficient controls so that the benefits of the credit can be directed for the most part at those consumers which have reduced their spending the greatest. This is presumed to be the middle and lower-middle income groups, and it is possible to direct most of the benefits to these groups.

The durable tax credit would work by granting a reduction in the consumer's personal income tax liability equivalent to a percentage of the purchase price of a durable good, such as an automobile, a piece of furniture, or a household appliance. The allowed percentage reduction would be subtracted from the taxpayer's personal income tax liability at the time he filed his final income tax return. If his credit, for instance, would be \$100 and his tax liability before the credit would be \$1,200, his total tax liability would be \$1,100. In this respect the durable goods tax credit would work as did the investment tax credit, and the result would be a reduction in the cost of the purchase. The reduction, however, would be in the form of a smaller income tax liability rather than as a lower purchase price.

Further, the credit would be received at the time the income tax return is filed, not at the time of the purchase of the durable good. Thus more than a year might separate the purchase from the receiving of the credit. For instance, the taxpayer might purchase a new automobile in January, earn a tax credit of, say, \$200 then, but would continue to have the same amount of his wages withheld for income tax purposes. The following April, when he files his return for the previous year, it would be found that he had had \$200 too much withheld and would receive a \$200 refund.

This separation between the earning of the credit and receiving it, I believe, is one of the advantages of this proposal. By the time the credit is refunded by the government the stimulated sales of durable goods will have been felt throughout the economy in the form of a higher GNP and the resulting higher income tax collections. Therefore the government at that time will be in a better position to afford the credit payouts.

It should be pointed out that a disadvantage of a cut in tax rates which results in an increase in disposable income (as in 1964) subjects the government to immediate deficits which hopefully will be reduced by a stimulated economy and resulting increased tax collections. With a durable goods tax credit, the stimulation to the economy will come first, the tax revenue reduction last. This should be an attractive feature from the point of view of government.

I have suggested three limits to the size of tax credit which any one taxpayer can earn. First, the credit should be limited to a percentage of the purchase price of the durable good. The taxpayer should still have to put up the greatest part of the cost of the purchase. Also, there should be a limit on the total credit earned by the taxpayer. This should be limited to a percentage of the tax liability of the purchaser, and there should be a maximum dollar limit to the size of the credit which can be received. The purpose of the percentage-of-tax-liability limit would be to prevent a taxpayer from eliminating his entire tax liability through large purchases of durable goods. Such action would be very attractive to many taxpayers in the absence of such a limit. The purpose of the maximum dollar credit limit would be to confine the greatest benefits to the middle and lower income taxpayers which is the group believed to have reduced their purchases of durable goods to the greatest extent. I do not believe that wealthy taxpayers have reduced their purchases of durable goods by any appreciable amount during the past couple of years. * * *

The schedule of credits therefore might be as follows:

1. Ten percent of the purchase price of the durable goods. This figure needs to be high enough to encourage increased purchases of durable goods by the desired amount. The selection of the percentage used should be made only after considerable discussion.

2. Twenty percent of the taxpayer's liability. Again, this figure is dependent upon a

careful determination of the correct figure needed to stimulate the desired added purchases of durable goods.

3. A maximum credit of \$1,000. To earn this credit a taxpayer would need to purchase durable goods valued at \$10,000 and have a personal income tax liability before credits of \$5,000. Certainly a few in the lower or middle income groups would be limited by this provision, and for those who would be restrained, the limit is believed desirable. Again, careful consideration should be given to the selection of the size of this limitation.

Reference is made above to the "desired" increase in durable goods purchases. An examination of national income data gives some clue to the size of the needed increase. In 1969, personal consumption expenditures for durable goods were \$90 billion. The same physical volume of exchange, but allowing for no growth, would require purchases in 1971 of approximately \$100 billion. An increase to \$100 billion in durable goods purchases would earn a credit of \$10 billion if only the first suggested limitation is applied. The second and third limitations recommended would reduce the credit earned to something below this figure. The added \$10 billion in consumer expenditures, expanded by the multiplier effect, should push the 1971 GNP close to the \$1,065 needed for full employment.

Expansion of durable goods purchases beyond the \$100 billion would be desirable if idle capacity still remained in the durable goods industries or if added investment would be stimulated to take care of the added demand. If the needed capacity did not exist or could not be provided, however, increased demand beyond \$100 billion would largely result in increased prices, which would not help the present unemployment picture.

Objections to a durable tax credit will almost certainly be made by Internal Revenue Service officials who will see this as a further complication in the income tax forms. I am in sympathy with the IRS desires to simplify the tax reporting procedures, but I also believe that the present need to increase employment is greater than the present need to simplify tax forms. This proposal is certainly no more complicating than many of the existing deduction and allowance provisions, and is certainly manageable by the IRS.

To earn the credit the taxpayer would need to file a form with the IRS at the time of filing the final income tax report establishing the fact of the durable good purchase and the purchase amount. This would require the name of the seller who would also have to keep a record of the names of his customers. Auditing would then be possible by the IRS. It should be pointed out that similar records must now be kept by savings banks of interest payments, lenders of interest received, and corporations of dividends paid. Durable goods sellers must also keep track of their sales, with the possible exception that the customer's names may not always now be recorded. The addition of that feature would not be burdensome.

Mention should again be made that this proposal is for a credit instead of a deduction. Many taxpayers do not itemize deductions but rather choose to deduct the allowed percentage in calculating adjusted gross income.

These taxpayers would not benefit from a durable goods tax deduction. A tax credit, however, is considered after the tax liability has been calculated, and so would be available to all taxpayers, whether or not they itemize their deductions. Since it is believed that those taxpayers using a percentage deduction (not itemizing) are largely confined to the lower and middle income groups, the use of a credit instead of a deduction is even more attractive.

Two or three other recommendations should be considered in proposing the adoption of a durable goods tax credit. First, the effective date should be no later than the date the proposal is introduced, and the effective date should be well publicized at the outset. This would be necessary to minimize the anticipatory effects which otherwise could be very damaging. For instance, if there would be 90 days between the introduction of the proposal and its adoption, and the effective date would be the date of adoption, those planning to purchase durable goods would tend to postpone their outlays until the credit would be available. This would mean greatly reduced sales of durable goods during the time of debate and further unemployment in those industries.

It is also recommended that the credit be limited to American made durable goods. Conceptually, I must include myself among those favoring free trade, but the current need so obviously is to stimulate domestic employment. An increase in the sale of imported goods might increase domestic employment if there would be a corresponding increase in exports from this country. At the very least, however, such stimulation of exports would trail the increase of imports, and would be too late to help the current employment problem. It should also be pointed out that our low level of exports is not the result of too few imports, but rather of other problems which could not be solved by a tax credit applied to the purchase of foreign made goods. The credit should be limited to American made goods.

Very possibly also the credit should be limited to a particular time period in the adopting legislation. Hopefully the credit would not need to be permanent to maintain employment in the durable goods industries. If this would be so, a serious consideration should be given to the need for resource reallocation. Given the temporary need for the credit, then, the limit of a year, or perhaps only six months, might be sufficient. If there is a continuing but temporary need the credit could be extended. Further, extending would seem to be easier, and more desirable, than discontinuing the credit before it would normally expire should durable goods sales be stimulated to the point where inflation would be a problem.

COALITION FOR RURAL AMERICA: AN IMPORTANT NEW POLITICAL FORCE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week, an impressive and distinguished group of people gathered here in Washington to launch a new political action organization committed to advance the cause of rural development and balanced national growth. Composed of an outstanding group of political, business, farm, labor, and educational leaders, the group which met this week will constitute the initial board of directors of the Coalition of Rural America. This is a widely representative group and every effort will be made to assure that all segments of rural America are fully represented in this new and promising organization.

This is a most welcome, heartening development. At the present no one speaks for the total rural community—farm and small town America—in a way that the Urban Coalition and U.S. Conference of Mayors speaks for the large cities. There is no adequate vehicle through which the American rural community can articulate its needs, its problems, its hopes, its aspirations.

The rural American today is often frustrated and alienated because he believes that he has been bypassed by the political and economic mainstreams in this country. A review of socioeconomic indicators confirms that rural communities lag in such areas as income, housing, health, and education. This lack of economic and social opportunities in rural areas has generated a great migration to the cities. And now there are very disturbing signs that the distribution of our people and industry is tilting too far toward the megalopolis and away from the smaller community.

Too many of our big cities are becoming economically inefficient, socially destructive, and politically unmanageable. In short, the urbanization process seems to have gone awry. As the large cities reel under the weight of too many people and industries, thousands of small towns are stagnating because of lack of people and jobs.

No right thinking person suggests that we relent in our efforts to solve the problems of the big cities. But surely the time has come for a national commitment to the economic and social development of American rural communities in order to achieve a more balanced and equitable growth and, therefore, an enrichment of the quality of life for all Americans.

The existence of a political action group capable of speaking for the broad interest of rural America is absolutely essential if we are ever to realize this national commitment.

Therefore, I am very much encouraged by the establishment of the Coalition for Rural America. I hope that it will be able to achieve its aim of developing a broad based national membership to speak for rural America, and to promote the cause of rural development and balanced national growth in the councils of the National Government.

A great number of people have been involved in developing this new organization. Norbert Tiemann, former Governor of Nebraska, and Edward T. Breathitt, former Governor of Kentucky, deserve special recognition for the leadership they have shown in getting this organization launched.

Mr. Tiemann will serve as president of the coalition. Mr. Breathitt will serve as chairman of the board.

The board of directors of this new organization is bipartisan and it is the goal of the coalition to maintain a bipartisan balance, and, of course, this is absolutely essential.

Mr. President, I was pleased to have the opportunity to join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) in addressing the opening luncheon of this group. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks, the text of the remarks of Senator HUMPHREY, and the text of the statement from President Nixon read to the group by Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin, be placed in the RECORD; also I ask unanimous consent that a list of the board of directors of the Coalition of America and the text of the statement of goals and objective adopted by the board be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON,
ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF COALITION FOR
RURAL AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEP-
TEMBER 7, 1971

THE NEED FOR A RURAL POLITICAL ACTION COALITION

A number of men for a number of years both within and without the Congress have held the persuasion that rural redevelopment, or balanced national growth—whatever identification tag is assumed—was an essential policy or program to undertake at this stage of our national growth.

To the extent that Federal legislation can achieve these goals or rural revitalization, those of us in Congress need your help.

For the interest of rural America, the small towns as well as our farms, is not now being adequately represented in the American process. And, of course, the reasons are obvious. The number of farmers is diminishing. The farm organizations are divided by commodities and political philosophies and are limited to their immediate constituency. And certainly no one speaks for the whole of Small Town U.S.A. in a way that such organizations as the Urban Coalition and the United States Conference of Mayors speak for the large cities.

A Coalition for Rural America, a coalition of people, of ideas, of action, and of advice is needed. For the cry that the Government establishment is too remote, too removed, and unresponsive comes not only from the long haired and bearded youth. It is not difficult to find an older man in bib overalls with a forehead half sunburned over eyes that constantly squint from looking at the sun too long who says that he is frustrated and alienated because he believes he has been bypassed by the political and economic mainstreams of this country.

Perhaps I am belaboring the point. But I argue that there is no adequate vehicle through which the American rural community can now fully articulate its needs, its problems, its hopes and its aspirations.

And perhaps today it has become fashionable for both the students and the farmers to be frustrated and alienated. But there are social and economic indicators which reinforce the countryman's disenchantment. Rural income lags behind urban income.

There is more stark poverty in the countryside and in the small towns than in all of our great cities.

A third of our people live outside the metropolitan areas and that is the same area where two-thirds of our substandard housing is to be found.

The quality of health care is lower in rural communities.

In the cities we argue about which school our children attend while people in the countryside are pleading not only for adequate schools, but for adequate busing.

But the most dramatic evidence of this rural deficit is to be seen in the great migration to the cities. You know, or you read, the statistics.

Seventy percent of our people live on less than 2 percent of the land.

Thirty five percent of our people live in only 25 metropolitan areas.

Nearly a fifth of the American population is to be found in a solid urban area from Boston to Washington, D.C.

If present migration and population trends continue, 75 percent of our people will live in four giant strip cities by the turn of the Century.

Now none of us are here as 18th Century romanticists. To be sure, many people move to the cities as a matter of preference. And we know that the march of modern Western civilization necessarily brought in a great "gathering in" of people and industry. And

we also know that on balance society as a whole has benefited.

But many moved and still move in this rural-urban migration out of necessity borne by the lack of economic and social opportunity in rural areas. And too often there is too much evidence that the concentration of people and industry have defied and, in fact, repealed the law of "economies in scale."

Too many of our big cities are becoming economically inefficient, socially destructive and politically unmanageable.

It is ironic, I think, that it was the crisis of the cities of the 60's that forces us to understand the interrelationship between the problems of rural and urban America and to understand how this great migration suffocated the cities and starved the small towns at the same time.

So the festering slums, the polluted air and monotonous suburbs of the cities and the abandoned farms, stagnating towns and inadequate public services in the countryside is damning testimony of our failure to solve a human and a national problem.

We suffered at both ends of the population scale.

Now it simply doesn't have to be this way.

Surely the time has come for a national commitment to the redevelopment of the nation's rural communities in order to achieve a more balanced, a more productive, and a more rewarding national growth. But we are not going to make much progress toward achieving these goals unless we can develop a broad based political coalition to support them.

I assume that that is what this meeting is all about.

Now before you go about the business of putting these things together, I offer not advice as much as these personal notions. While there is a sense of urgency, there is the necessity of taking the long view. Some will argue that timing is so crucial that if we don't act now and in a big way the moment will have been lost and the rural development movement will fade into history.

I fully agree that there is a desperate need to make a beginning now. But it was not a now or never proposition back in 1966 when Orville Freeman started talking about urban-rural balance and it is now a now or never proposition as Secretary Hardin urges action on this same problem today.

Thus while I hope that we can get something done in 1971 there will be plenty to do in 1981. For if we are really serious about rural development and a balanced national growth, let us think in terms of days and decades.

Nor, I suggest, should we ever let our purposes be interpreted as an attack upon the big cities or that we would relent for a moment to solving the problems of the intercity.

I think we can be aggressive in creating a new rural America without creating a new divisiveness in urban America.

Once again, the problems of rural and urban America are so interrelated that nothing we do should take away from the cities.

Nor I insist are our purposes parochial and they do not represent a turning of our back upon any inevitable wave of the future.

This is not a time to present you with a list of legislative proposals. But I would note that I have introduced a package of bills seeking to provide rural jobs, a national Rural Development Center for Research, Rural Health Services, Rural Credit and Rural Transportation.

So I close as I began. Political action, legislative results, a change in the direction of America's life does not happen overnight. Some movements to make this a better America cannot be carried out by Senators or even Presidents alone. They need the broad, firm base of a people's lobby who care not only about where we are, but where we are going.

In the final analysis, there is no rural

America and there is no urban America. There is no single solution to the rural problem and there is not single solution to the urban problem. This is one country and we can find a single answer.

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE COALITION FOR RURAL AMERICA BOARD MEETING—SEPTEMBER 7, 1971

"Time," said St. Augustine, "is a three-fold present, the present as we experience it; the past as a present memory; and the future as a present expectation."

By that criterion, the world of the year 2000 has already arrived: the future is not a leap into the distance. It begins in the present. It is determined by what we do or fail to do, today.

The enormous difficulties we face in our nation's cities and rural countryside today were created many yesterday's ago when we failed to anticipate and control the changes that were occurring within agriculture and the likely impact that those changes would have on the future of the nation. It took almost 30 years, and the loss of 30 million people from our farms and small communities to our cities, to create a national awareness and concern toward the population imbalances which have been created between our large cities and our nation's rural areas.

We must not repeat these failures in the next thirty years. We must learn to anticipate and plan our future. We must learn to "design," our future, not "resign" ourselves to it.

The pursuit of a "balanced national growth" strategy in this country must be moved from the rhetoric of presidential messages and congressional breast-beating to the "action" stage. We must stop just talking about this merely as a national goal and start defining and implementing "specific" steps toward achieving that goal.

To create, to plan, to think ahead—these are the challenges of our time. For, as John Galsworthy said, "if you do not think about the future, then you cannot have one."

In recognition of this, the Congress took several specific steps last year. It committed itself to the development of a balanced national growth pattern in both the 1970 agricultural act and the 1970 Housing and Urban Development Act. In addition, the Congress instructed the Secretary of Transportation in the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to develop a national transportation policy to coordinate the development and improvement of all modes of transportation with priorities assigned to the development and improvement of each.

To date the Congress has not yet received the Department's report in that regard, despite the fact that it was due on May 21st of this year.

Under title IX of the Agricultural Act of 1970, the Congress directed all departments and agencies of the Executive Branch to develop policies and procedures with respect to the future location of Federal facilities and offices, giving preference to areas of lower population density. The President's report to the Congress citing the progress toward implementing those directives also is past due.

The importance of getting immediate "action" concerning these matters cannot be overstressed.

And, we need to do much more—we must define and develop tomorrow's energy requirements. We must define and develop national policies and programs relating to meeting the needs of tomorrow's populations in education, housing, and health care. We must design today how we can better take advantage of our communication technology and other new technologies that offer us the opportunity to achieve an improvement in the "quality of life" for all our Nation's citizens—and to accomplish these objectives

consistent with our concerns and respect for protecting our natural environment and strengthening of our free democratic processes.

We must also think anew about our Nation's economic policies and goals. We must develop a longer range "national incomes" policy—and before November 12th.

We simply cannot permit inflation to resume beyond that date at the rates that we have been experiencing along with high unemployment and high interest rates.

And, as we address ourselves to these national challenges, we must—and I repeat we must—insert ingredients heretofore missing in our thinking: "Planning" and "location impact".

The implementation of any national growth and settlement policy must include measures to bring about a more dispersed geographic distribution of economic opportunity, jobs and people.

Most Federal and State policies and programs today encourage the depopulation of our rural countryside and center cities.

They are mostly designed to accelerate the growth of our nation's suburbs—a development which is tearing at the very fabric of everyone's quality of life in this country—whether they live in the city, the suburbs, or countryside.

We must not only change these destructive trends in our society but must set about our work in this regard today.

We will need lots of help and the formation of this new coalition will be a welcome addition to the ranks of those of us who already have been laboring in this vineyard.

I'm indeed heartened to see men such as Orville Freeman, former governors Breathitt, Tiemann, Rockefeller and other leaders from industry, labor, agriculture and those representing our country's disadvantaged and minorities all here committing themselves to work and participate together in these efforts—efforts to bring the fight for achievement of these national goals squarely and forthrightly onto the political battlefield.

Those of us who have spent most of our lifetimes working in this city and in the arena of government and politics know all too well you don't get things accomplished in this country unless you are willing to work and fight for what you want in the halls of Congress and at the White House.

Rural America—including all its interests and people—not only need you, but all America needs you. The approach that we have followed in pursuing our objectives in this nation has been traditionally piece-meal. Functional or limited to narrowly defined problem-solving.

The time has clearly come when no major problem in this country can be solved by such piece-meal approaches. Furthermore, no single segment of our society, by itself, stands much of a chance politically today to force its desires or demands on the rest of our society. Farmers have lost most of their political representation both in the Congress and within state legislatures. Center cities and their representatives cannot muster the political muscle necessary to secure a larger share of our national resources to help solve their enormous renewal problems. However, they are well organized and they do work vigorously at it.

I'm afraid the same cannot be said for rural or non-metropolitan America. It still suffers from both a diminished and fractionated representation in the councils of government.

Farmers are often divided among themselves concerning what they consider best for agriculture.

Many small and medium sized towns do not consider themselves rural, yet find themselves unable to compete with larger cities for resources.

And, most of our "urbanists" and urban oriented agencies of government find it dif-

ficult to become concerned about towns or communities under 50,000 in population.

All this points to the need for a coalition of rural or nonmetropolitan interests. Therefore I urge you to open your membership and structure your mission so all those groups, political subdivisions, and organizations representing people residing in these regions can come together for the pursuit of a more common purpose, namely, the revitalization and development of our smaller communities and rural areas.

By doing this, all segments of our society—rural and urban—center city and suburbia—will benefit from our labors.

With the mixture of leaders that I see before me here today from throughout the country I am convinced that you clearly have the potential of not only being the first to move in this direction, but of providing the strong supporting leadership here in Washington, in our state capitols and county and city halls around the country that will be needed in the future to achieve a more balanced national growth and development strategy in this Nation.

As chairman of the newly established rural development subcommittee of the Senate committee on agriculture and forestry, I can assure you that is the direction in which I am headed. I not only welcome you to the Washington and National scene concerning these matters that are so vitally important to our Nation's future, but will be looking forward to seeking your advice and active participation with respect to the legislative work of our committee.

Since our organization in April of this year we have already held a series of hearings both in Washington and in various parts of the Nation.

We have had people from rural America, including those who represent them in local and State government come before us and tell us of the loss of their young, the boarding-up of their store fronts, the lack of adequate transportation, housing, communities, utilities, and the credit to finance them.

We have been told that a young man suffering a serious injury in a rural area stands far less chance of securing needed medical attention than if he had received his injury on a battlefield in Vietnam.

We have also been told of lower prices and incomes for farmers, while farm costs and interest rates have continued to spiral upward.

We have been reminded of the disproportionate percentage of our Nation's poor people who have been left behind to live in our rural area, hidden from view of the TV camera and the rest of the country.

These hearings, which we have now held in Iowa, South Dakota, Georgia and Alabama—and later this week in Oklahoma and Nebraska—are providing us with the insights we need to develop the policies and programs that will be required to provide the citizens of these regions with the level of social, cultural and economic services they must obtain to remain in rural America. It will provide them with a "freedom of residence" which I suggest many Americans today are denied—denied because job opportunities are being limited to too few places in our Nation.

We also have begun our legislative work. I have introduced along with Senator Herman Talmadge and 49 other Senators a bill (2223) to establish a new financial and credit system for rural America. This new system is designed to meet both rural America's public and private credit needs. Hearings on this legislation already have been held, with additional hearings scheduled later this month. Senator Pearson's rural development bank bill also is being covered in these hearings. I urge you to not only lend your support to our bill, but to give us the benefit of your thoughts and recommendations as to how we might improve upon it.

As the President and the Congress begin work on the specifics of our nation's future economic policies, the "location impact" of whatever is agreed upon must be considered. Specifically, the plight of both our nation's rural areas and center cities must receive some special attention in that regard.

For instance, consideration of the President's investment tax credit proposal should contain special incentives for investments in nonmetropolitan regions and within center cities.

If we fail to provide such special incentives, then I would predict that straight investment tax credits to industry will merely result in accelerating the flight of business from our nation's center cities to our suburbs—and, I suggest that such a continued movement will be destructive to both areas. We need your help. Rural America needs your help.

And by providing it, all America will benefit.

The revitalization and development of nonmetropolitan America must be accelerated if we hope to achieve a more balanced growth pattern in this country.

But that won't happen until the political position of rural America is strengthened here in Washington and in the State capitols around the country—strengthened not by increasing the political powers of rural legislators, but by strengthening the influence of those groups and interests that represent the combined interests of rural America. If such a coalition of interests can be formulated for rural America, then hopefully a working alliance between the "urban" and rural coalitions can subsequently be created to further the development and implementation of a "balanced national growth" strategy in the U.S.

The formulation of your organization is a major step toward reaching those objectives.

STATEMENT READ BY SECRETARY
OF AGRICULTURE HARDIN

SEPTEMBER 7, 1971.

Every American, no matter where he lives or what he does, has a vital stake in preserving the beauty and enriching the resources of the nation's countryside. Each of us stands to benefit from a flourishing and healthful rural environment.

This Administration is fully committed to a massive effort in developing and enhancing rural life. Our aim in this decade is to assist in creating greater job opportunities, broadening community services, uplifting the quality of living, and speeding the social, economic and physical progress of the small cities, towns, villages and farm communities in America.

Basic to the success of this effort is a close partnership embracing the Federal Government, rural citizens, local governments and the nation's industries and business community. Any step in this direction is a step forward in the goals we share for our rural areas and for the well-being of the entire nation of which they are such a vital part.

In this spirit, I welcome the new Coalition for Rural America.

[S] RICHARD M. NIXON.

COALITION FOR RURAL AMERICA—
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, Trimble, Soyars and Breathitt Planters Bank & Trust Building, 710 South Main, Hopkinsville, Kentucky 42240.

The Honorable Norbert T. Tiemann, First Mid-America Corporation, 1001 O Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Mr. George Abshier, Director, Community and Industry Programs Cooperative Extension Service, University Extension, P.O. Box 1008, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074.

Mr. Anthony A. Alaimo, Chairman (tentative), Coastal Area Planning & Development Commission, 102 Old City Hall, Brunswick, Georgia 31520.

Mr. James H. Aldredge, 1717 Havilion Drive, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia.

Mr. Robert O. Anderson, Chairman of the Board, Atlantic Richfield Company, P.O. Box 1000, Roswell, New Mexico.

Mr. Orin E. Atkins, President and Chief Executive Officer, Ashland Oil, Inc., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Kentucky 41101.

The Honorable John A. Baker, Director, Community Development Services, 6301 15th Road, Arlington, Virginia 22205.

The Honorable Joseph W. Barr, 2932 North Second Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110.

The Honorable Dewey Bartlett, 406 North Bank of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103.

Dr. Charles E. Bishop, Chancellor, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

The Honorable Jack Campbell, Padre Gallegos House, P.O. Box 877, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.

The Honorable LeRoy Collins, P.O. Box 1170 Tallahassee, Florida 32302.

Mr. Donald C. Cook, Chairman of the Board & President, American Electric Power Company, Inc., 2 Broadway, New York, New York 10004.

Dr. Lawrence Davis, President, Arkansas AM&N, Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71604.

Mr. Tony Dechant, President, National Farmers Union, 12025 East 45th Street, Denver, Colorado 80239.

Dr. Clayton Denman, Small Towns Institute, Box 517, Ellensburg, Washington.

Mr. Edmund H. Fallon (tentative), Chief Administrative Officer, Agway, Inc., P.O. Box 1333, Syracuse, New York 13201.

The Honorable Frank Farrar, P.O. Box 190, Britton, S. Dak. 57430.

The Honorable Orville L. Freeman, President, Business International Corporation, 757 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Mr. Herman Gallegos, President, U.S. Human Resources Corporation, 2940 16th Street, San Francisco, California 94103.

Mr. G. B. Gunlogson, Countryside Development Foundation, Inc., 4746 Highway 31, Racine, Wisconsin 53405.

Mr. Paul Hall, President, Seafarers International Union, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, New York 11232.

Mr. H. L. Hembree, III, President, Arkansas Best Freight Lines Corporation, 301 South 11th Street, Fort Smith, Arkansas 72901.

The Honorable Phillip Hoff, 214 Prospect Parkway, Burlington, Vermont.

Mr. Wilson King, Kinglore Farms, Inc., Route No. 2, Rock Falls, Illinois 61071.

Mr. Aaron Henry, 213 Fourth Street, Clarksdale, Mississippi 38614.

Mr. Don F. Kirchner, Chairman, IBAA Agriculture-Rural America Committee, President, Peoples Trust & Savings Bank, Riverside, Iowa 42327.

The Honorable Harold LeVander, 200 Drivers Bank Building, South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075.

Dr. Winthrop Libbey, President, University of Maine, Orono, Maine 04472.

Mr. Ernest T. Lindsey, President, Farmland Industries, Inc., P.O. Box 7305, Kansas City, Missouri 64116.

Rep. John McClaughry, P.O. Box 94, Lyndonville, Vermont 05951.

The Honorable Robert E. McNair, McNair, Konduros & Corley, Jefferson Square, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

Dr. E. W. Mueller, President, American County Life Association, 2118 South Summit Street, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57105.

Mr. Kermit Overby, Director, Legislation and Communications Department, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Robert B. Pamlin, Chairman of the

Board, Georgia-Pacific Corporation, 900 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204.

Mr. R. B. Patteson, Senior Vice-President, Wachovia Bank & Trust Company, N.A., Winston, North Carolina 28501.

Mr. Charles O. Prejean, Executive Director, Federation of Southern Cooperatives, 52 Fairlie Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

The Honorable Winthrop Rockefeller, 450 Tower Building, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201.

The Honorable Elvis Stahr, President, National Audubon Society, 950 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

Mr. Miles C. Stanley, AFL-CIO Appalachian Council, P. O. Box 646, Charleston, West Virginia 25323.

Mr. Julius J. Stern, Wood County Bank, 5th and Market Streets, Parkersburg, West Virginia.

Mr. James L. Sundquist, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

The Right Reverend Monsignor John George Weber, Executive Secretary, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, 3801 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50312.

Mr. Charles Young, President, E. F. Young, Jr. Manufacturing Company, 500 25th Avenue, Meridian, Mississippi 39301.

Mr. Gordon Zimmerman, Executive Secretary, National Association of Conservation Districts, 1025 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

STATEMENT OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES: COALITION FOR RURAL AMERICA, SEPTEMBER 8, 1971

In support of our broad purpose of advocating legislation of benefit to rural America, we adopt three immediate legislative objectives:

1. In the consideration of President Nixon's proposals for establishment of an investment tax credit, we will support amendments that will provide a differential in favor of enterprises that locate in rural areas and increase employment of residents of the areas where located, including the chronically underemployed and unemployed.

2. We will support measures to improve the availability of credit and financing in rural areas, for non-agricultural enterprises, public facilities, and housing as well as agriculture, as proposed in pending legislation and in the report of the President's Task Force on Rural Development.

3. During consideration of extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, we will support amendments to provide for the establishment of Development Districts throughout rural America and to provide non-categorical funds for the execution of approved development plans prepared by the districts.

In the pursuance of these and other legislative objectives, the Coalition will be guided by these, among other, principles:

We are strongly in support of a structure of agriculture that includes prosperous family farms and an economically viable marketing and processing system based in rural areas.

In building rural America, our aim is to see that development is consistent with the preservation and enhancement of a quality environment.

We are concerned not just with the aggregate development of the rural economy, but with eliminating the causes and ameliorating the effects of rural poverty, through such measures as welfare reform and public service employment.

We are committed to the principle of equal concern for, and equal involvement of, all the people of rural America, without discrimination on any basis.

We recommend that the Executive Committee proceed with plans for a national conference in the Spring of 1972 that will bring the problems of rural America to national attention and provide a forum for national leaders to express their views on rural development and balanced national growth.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE BLACK LUNG DISEASE BENEFIT PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently I introduced S. 2289, a bill designed to liberalize the definition of "total disability" under title IV of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

From what we have learned about the black lung disease benefit program established by title IV, we know that many coal miners with the disease are not receiving the benefits to which they are entitled. In some instances, this injustice is caused by the fact that far too much emphasis is placed on X-rays; in other instances, it is caused by the unavailability of medical testing apparatus and personnel.

A third of the black lung benefit claims which have been turned down to date have been disallowed because the miner was not "totally disabled." In fact, what the Federal Government is saying to these miners is that they do not qualify because they are not yet "totally dead."

After decades of ignorance and misunderstanding, black lung disease is receiving nationwide attention. Recently, the subject was discussed on a national evening news program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of that discussion be printed in the RECORD.

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

CBS EVENING NEWS WITH WALTER CRONKITE, SEPTEMBER 14, 1971

CRONKITE. We hear about accidental death in the coal mines. It makes headlines, it's usually swift, always tragic. But we hear far less about the diseases that strike coal miners, one disease in particular. It's just as tragic, lingering, not swift, the search for economic remedy sometimes disappointing.

HAZEL DICKENS (singing). These blues are so blue, they are the coal black blues. These blues are so blue, they are the coal black blues. My flesh will cave in, my life I will lose.

BILL EVERSOLE. Well, I smother to death every morning, and every night I have to, sometimes, lay on two and three pillows. Smother to death every night. So I can't rest, I can't sleep. I can't sleep on my back at all. Every time I lay down on my back I smother to death, just about.

(Indistinct) Get out, dogs. Go on out, get out of the way.

BENTON. Bill Eversole, father of five, is one of the men around Granny's Branch, Kentucky, who started early in the mine. He was scratching for coal at age 15. Now he's only 33, and his coal mining days are over. Eversole's doctor says he has black lung. The medical term for it is pneumoconiosis. The doctor says he can't work in the mines, but the government has turned Eversole's claim down, a claim filed for compensation under the recently enacted Mine Health and Safety Law. Eversole and his family get along on \$250 a month that his wife earns, plus food stamps.

More than half the miners who've applied for black lung benefits in Eastern Kentucky and West Virginia have been turned down. Two hundred thousand persons, miners, their widows or dependents, have been compensated. But denials to thousands of others have triggered anger among miners in Appalachia, anger that prompted some of them to place the Social Security Agency, which handles such claims, on trial at mock hearings held last November in Horse Creek, Kentucky.

VOICE. What do you think's going to happen with this black lung law?

MAN. Well, if there ain't a change made, I don't—it don't look like anything's going to happen. They just going to start—sweep it under the rug and pull the rug over it.

BENTON. Washup is the typical end to a miner's day, scrubbing out from under an eight-hour accumulation of coal dust. Strong soap and enough scrubbing is effective on the surface, but not in the lungs. Years of work underground cause a variety of respiratory ailments, among them, black lung. What it is is a failure of the lungs to infuse enough oxygen into the blood, the result of deterioration elsewhere in the body, quite frequently, a heart that falls as the result of inefficient lungs. The essential evidence that the Social Security Administration uses in granting black lung benefits is X-ray, but some doctors say that more sophisticated tests are needed, tests such as those at this clinic in Beckley, West Virginia, tests which measure the ability of the lungs to provide proper oxygen for the blood. Dr. Donald Rasmussen, a prominent black lung doctor, conducts such tests. Rasmussen, a consultant to the Social Security Administration, incidentally, says X-rays alone are not much good as a test.

DR. DONALD RASMUSSEN. Now the X-ray, in the way that it's been handled, and X-rays in general, are simply too unreliable—to make a—a decision of the presence or the absence of pneumoconiosis, 'cause actually, pneumoconiosis of coal miners is sometimes very, very difficult to see, and as a matter of fact, it is more difficult to visualize on the X-ray film in those individuals who have the greatest impairment.

BENTON. The Social Security Administration defends X-rays as the best method now available, but it admits the need for more research. The agency also suggests that economic conditions affect the number of miners filing claims from a given area.

BERNARD POPICK. Where there are economic conditions that cause large numbers of people to be out of work, for instance, in a given period of time, that there can—there can tend to be a higher degree of filing for benefits in—under these circumstances than there might be where there are fewer people who are unemployed, and this too could condition not only filing rate, but the rate at which we find these people qualify for benefits or don't qualify for benefits when we review their claims.

BENTON. A rereading of black lung claims that have been denied is under way at Social Security. So far 12,000 X-rays, most of them from Appalachia, have been reread. But only 800 miners whose claims had been turned down are now deemed eligible for benefits.

Tradition and economics have dictated that industry moves into an area, mines the coal, and then moves on, leaving behind its now useless structures to rot in the summer heat and the winter cold. Despite the new law and its noble intent, the same thing happens, somehow, to some of the men.

Nelson Benton, CBS NEWS, in Eastern Kentucky.

HAZEL DICKENS (singing). Black lung, black lung, you're just biding your time. Some old men suffering (indistinct). But I can't help but wonder what God had in mind, to send such a devil to claim this soul of mine.

CRONKITE. And that's the way it is, Wednesday, July 14th, 1971. This is Walter Cronkite, CBS News. Good night.

(Announcement.) ANNOUNCER. This has been the CBS Evening News with Walter Cronkite.

THE ELIMINATION OF STRIKES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, each year thousands of strikes in the United States cause serious hardships for individuals and industries. One of the biggest problems is in the construction industry,

where workers are represented by a number of unions. Even after most of the unions have agreed to new contracts, a few holdout unions—or even one—can stop important projects and prevent thousands of men from working.

In 1970 there were comments from knowledgeable people, including some union leaders, that the strike is an obsolete weapon in bargaining. Yet, late in 1970 and continuing into this year we have seen that the use of strikes is continuing.

I have sponsored legislation which would help to prevent strikes that are especially damaging to the public interest.

The president of Associated General Contractors, John E. Healy, has proposed a system of negotiating in the construction industry that would eliminate strikes. In the interest of further exploring this very serious issue, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article presented by Mr. Healy in *Constructor* magazine.

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

AGC PRESIDENT SAYS: "STRIKES MUST GO!"

In my youth, now more years past than I care to remember, the period of time from April until July was a magic time. I was intrigued by the sight of nature rousing itself from a long winter's sleep and bursting forth in bloom and blossom. The somber days of winter were replaced with a warm sun and the soft greens of spring and early summer. Those last few weeks in the classroom were only bearable because of the thought of care-free summer days ahead. It was a time of vibrant life; things were growing all around you. It was great to be alive and you looked forward to each new day with a sense of wonderful expectation.

As I said, this was in my youth. I grew up and entered the world of construction and since then, the time from April until July each year has had a very different meaning for me. As in my youth, it should still be a wonderful time, for now our projects have deserted winter construction for the warm days of spring and summer. Now our men have shed the gloves and sweaters piled one on the other, and the heavy boots. Now a man can produce in one day what takes two during January and February.

This is the time of bloom and blossom when our projects should grow by leaps and bounds, but the somber days of winter stay with us. For this is the spring bargaining season. This is the annual season of insanity in the construction industry. This is the time when the strike and the picket line reign supreme and turn spring back into winter again. This is the time when angry words, emotional statements, union politics, and management disunity send men walking the streets, losing wages which they will never recover. Projects grind to a halt, thus insuring that there will be no profits on these projects, after all the blood, sweat and tears and money which management has put forth to estimate bids, organize, plan, and manage them. After all the money spent to protect the job, keep the men working during inclement weather, and try to hold schedules, it all goes up in flames because one or more of our building trades unions decide that they must catch up with someone else, or some business agent running for office decides that it is good politics to have the boys hit the streets.

The notion of automatic annual increases, whether they are deserved or not, regardless of business conditions, and with no relationship to productivity, has become a national syndrome which we can well do without. The resort to the strike and the picket

line to enforce such demands by shutting down projects is no longer acceptable to the construction worker, his employer or the public. It's just too damn costly to all concerned.

Let me give you as a typical example, a project being built by my own company. This is a large addition to a senior high school costing over \$6 million. We were awarded this project in March of 1969 and although the competition had been keen, we felt we had a good job. We were looking at 20 months completion date and it seemed perfectly reasonable.

But then on May 1, 1969, the entire industry went down for a 14 weeks strike, the results of which were horrendous settlements. The carpenters, for example, received a \$2.70 an hour increase in a 2-year contract. Since then we have gone through a pipe fitters' strike and an asbestos workers' strike, all at different times and all for very long duration and all at critical stages of the project. As a result, 26 months later we are still working on the project, paying our people an average of 40% more than the day we started. So what we had believed to be a good job is now a bad one. All for reasons really beyond our control as a general contractor.

This industry can no longer tolerate such conditions. Its destiny can no longer be determined by the whims of what is in many cases, a single union local. There is just too much at stake. The building trade unions argue that despite high hourly wages, the annual income of their members is not commensurate with this high rate.

I submit that if this is so, it is largely their own fault. What with strikes for wages or jurisdiction interrupting the continuity of work on a continuous basis, how can a commensurate annual income be generated. Therefore, the strike resulting in a work stoppage has to go. The picket line must be relegated to the Smithsonian Institute. We are in the 20th century and we are smart enough to come up with other means of settling our differences without interrupting production. All labor and management has to do is sit down together and get the job done. In my judgment the following items form an acceptable agenda for such a program:

1. A common expiration date for all construction labor agreements should be established.
2. It should be agreed that the desires of both parties for contract provisions must be submitted 90 days in advance of contract expiration dates with no changes permitted. (This establishes a bargaining base.)
3. Bargaining should take place on a total economic package basis in which the price of all working conditions, plus or minus, is considered.
4. In the event that no agreement has been reached after serious collective bargaining, the situation should then be submitted to a regional council of collective bargaining, for binding arbitration. No work stoppages would be permitted.
5. Such regional councils should be set up with panels representing the labor and management side of all crafts and with the public represented, and should be manned by people thoroughly familiar with the construction industry.
6. The regional council should be administered by an impartial organization such as the American Arbitration Association.

Such a program would revitalize the construction industry and bring responsibility into what is now a totally irresponsible situation. The construction worker, the employer and the public would be getting a fair shake. The largest industry in the nation should not be constrained and circumscribed by the status quo, which has produced nothing but chaos in labor relations. Let's innovate. Let's grow up. Let's get with it.

JOHN E. HEALY II,
President.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC POLICIES: AN EXAMINATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we have now had a month to contemplate the administration's new economic policies—NEP. While some of its elements are ones which I feel are both desirable and long overdue, I am struck by a number of clear deficiencies.

Of particular concern to me is the cavalier manner in which the President has treated our one staunch ally in the Far East, Japan. I am not the first to point out that coming hard on the heels of the announcement of the Presidential visit to Japan's natural enemy, is a plan which includes a number of features which are potentially disruptive not only to Japan's export sector, and financial markets, but to her entire economy. While keenly aware of the formidable—and often unfair—challenge presented by Japan in international trade, I do not believe that the surcharge device correctly meets the challenge. The impact of the NEP on Japan is best seen in the reaction of the Japanese stock market which fell the day after the President's announcement by an amount equivalent to the New York Stock Exchange of 250 points. And Japan received absolutely no prior notification of this step. Certainly this is not a responsible manner in which to conduct international relations.

Turning to the domestic aspects of the program I, along with many others in Government and professional economists, advocated selective controls as part of an incomes policy which would include carefully researched programs with specific goals in mind and would attempt to avoid, or at least minimize, the dislocation and misallocations usually associated with wage and price controls.

What the President does not yet appear to realize is that the institutional structure of the economy has changed. Prices, wages, and other economic variables are no longer determined by the same factors as previously and so are no longer responsive to traditional fiscal and monetary policy. The failure of the economy to respond to what were thought to be foolproof fiscal and monetary remedies indicates that we should look elsewhere for controls.

At the present time, the economy is undergoing a severe strain caused by shifts in demand away from military and aerospace areas toward special services and new technologies such as pollution control. The economy finds it difficult to make this adjustment quickly, and the result is a severe distortion of wage and price phenomena. This adjustment lag as I would call it necessitates that wages and prices be brought under some type of control.

It has been my suggestion that an Incomes Policy Commission be established. The commission would be composed of three distinct divisions: An investigations branch, an advisory branch, and executive branch.

The bulk of the commission's work would be carried out by the investigations branch. It would be its function to identify industries and sectors of the economy in which wages and prices were rising too rapidly.

The advisory branch would contain a

Committee on Incomes Policy which would interpret the findings of the investigations branch and formulate policy goals and courses of action to be supplied the administration and the Congress.

The executive branch would consist of a Wage-Price Board which would have the actual power to regulate wages and prices in the various industries.

Wage and price controls would be instituted in the following fashion. The investigations branch of the commission would conduct a thorough study of any industry being considered for controls. I anticipate that such a study would include an analysis of monopoly tendencies in the industry, demand, and supply elasticity factors, relative degrees of imbalance in the supply of labor and raw materials, and the rates of adjustment of such factors to external factors. The study would also include extensive examination of the impediments to achieving wage-price balance, the magnitude of their effect, and the necessary conditions for dealing with them.

Upon the completion of the study a decision would be made by the Wage-Price Board whether controls should be instituted. The board's decision would be based on the degree to which current and anticipated increases in wages or prices represent real, necessary, and effective responses to change in equilibrium conditions. It would also be based on the anticipated degree to which such controls would tend to introduce distortions in the economic allocation of factors and resources.

The powers of the Wage-Price Board would not be absolute. Rather, they would vary with the extent of inflation and the level of unemployment in the country. For example, if inflation is at a level of less than 3½ percent and unemployment is less than 4 percent then the Wage-Price Board would have no active authority. If inflation is less than 3½ percent and unemployment is more than 4 percent there would be wage authority only. Conversely, if inflation is more than 3½ percent and unemployment is less than 4 percent there would only be price authority. In addition, if inflation is between 3½ and 4½ percent and unemployment is more than 4 percent, the board would have authority to restrict wages to the level in gains in productivity and prices to the rates of inflation.

What the administration has instituted, however, is philosophically and diametrically opposed to this principle. A complete freeze is established which makes no attempt to identify or address itself to those particular areas in the economy in which inflationary problems are centered; nor does it make any allowance for other areas where rises in wages or prices on some sort of scale are necessary to maintain equilibrium or to adjust to changing conditions. Indeed, this distinction has even been stressed in order to support the claim that the previous abhorrence for controls has not been abandoned. Essentially, the administration has completely reversed its position for ignoring the prob-

lem completely to the use of a sledge hammer approach which is likely to do as much harm as good.

Inasmuch as I have been advocating the investment tax credit for some time and, in fact, introduced legislation last March 16—S. 1262—which would have restored it at the 10 percent level, I welcome the President's proposal that it be reinstated. Coming as it does, however, on top of the recent liberalization of depreciation regulations, it represents a not insubstantial degree of overkill.

For this reason, I urge the repeal of the latter measure simultaneously with the passage of the investment tax credit. I am sure that I am joined by many of my colleagues in so doing.

Any bona fide attempts to cut genuine waste in Government spending and thereby free resources for more pressing social needs can only be applauded. Such efforts should be the continuing policy of every administration not merely a part of an emergency plan. However, it remains to be demonstrated that this is the exact intent, or will be the precise effect, of the current announced cuts in Government spending. It does not appear likely that the cause of efficiency will be best served by across-the-board cuts in overall budgets as opposed to shifting of resources within the budget amounting to the implementation of a shift in priorities. Furthermore, recognition of the desirability for speed-up in the recovery from the recent recession in order to cut unemployment and restore the economy to a healthy condition implies a need for greater fiscal stimulus. The positive effects resulting from tax cuts, improved consumer and business confidence and an improvement in the balance of payments can only be countered by a reduction in spending.

The President's proposals regarding tax cuts represent a partial adoption of what I and others have been urging for some time. An increase in personal income tax exemptions is a long overdue reform. Instigation of an investment tax credit even aside from its effects on productivity would provide a needed spur to a sector of the economy which has been exerting a significant drag for some time. Repeal of the 7-percent automobile excise tax is doubly desirable. Almost all excise taxes are regressive and, as such, repugnant to basic notions of equity. Repeal would provide a beneficial stimulus to an industry which, along with its suppliers, contains a significant amount of the economy's unused capacity and which, therefore, has the potential for absorbing a significant amount of unemployment.

However, the President's proposals do not go far enough. Conspicuous for their absence are such needed items as an increase in the minimum standard deduction, a deferment of the scheduled rise in social security taxes, and an increase in the personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000 as I have previously advocated.

A point on which I am very uneasy is the subject of interest rates. Most of us agree that high interest rates are undesirable. The administration contends that the general effect of the NEP

will be to lower interest rates and this hypothesis appears to have been accepted without much question. I am not so sure that this is a valid prognosis. To the extent that the program is successful in stimulating consumer spending the flow of personal savings will diminish. In recent weeks, the Federal Reserve System has been attempting to moderate the excessively high rate of growth of the money supply. To the extent that the Fed feels that the new program will provide a stimulus for the economy, it will be further encouraged to cut this money supply growth. Thus, the aggregate flow of loanable funds can be expected to diminish noticeably from the trend that existed before the announcement of the new program. On the demand side, to the extent that retail sales and business confidence pick up and that the investment credit is successful, business investment and, therefore, business borrowing will rise sharply if only to finance the added inventories that will be required. As noted above, the fiscal effects of the new program on the Federal deficit will be just about neutral. Therefore, the trend in Federal borrowing will be steady. However, we are approaching a period of seasonal deficit in the Government account and the Treasury can be expected to make heavy demands on the capital markets in the fourth quarter. As well, the program will provide a mild encouragement to State and local governments to increase their borrowing. Thus, the net effect of the new program will be to increase demands on all sectors of the capital markets above the trend that existed prior to the announcement of the NEP. This combination of a noticeable curtailment in the supply of and a sharp increase in the demand for loanable funds can only mean one thing—a steady rise in interest rates for the foreseeable future.

Mr. President, I intend shortly to introduce legislation to correct a few of the more serious shortcomings that I have been discussing. In the meantime, I trust that criticism such as this—which is meant to be constructive—will be accepted as necessary to the congressional dialog on this vital question.

EFFECT OF IMPORT SURCHARGE ON FARMERS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I have an extremely high regard for the farmers of America. My father was a farmer; much of my career has put me in close contact with farmers.

Farmers epitomize that independence of spirit that has made America great.

Farmers are as intelligent as they are independent. They realize that when there is a recession or depression in our Nation, the farmers are the very first to feel the consequences. America's farm industry will be strong only so long as our entire economy is strong.

In one newspaper this morning there was a headline saying that "Farm Groups Fear Surcharge Reprisal." Although the lead on this story was in the same vein, there was nothing else in the story to support this "fear" headline.

On the contrary, the quotations from two farm leaders show that they are keenly aware of the importance of and the necessity to maintain the import surcharge until basic corrections are made in the international trade system.

John W. Scott, master of the National Grange, is quoted as saying his organization recognizes that the opportunity to export "is very important not only to the farmers but to the Nation."

William J. Kuhfuss, president of the American Farm Bureau, is quoted as saying:

The President by his announcement (on August 15) commanded the attention of the world and said we are not going to be patsies.

Mr. President, I would say that Mr. Kuhfuss summed it up very well. We certainly have been the "patsies" of international trade.

If we will maintain this surcharge we can rectify many of the inequities in world trade that have shackled not only American industry but the American farmer as well.

Certainly American farmers have some large markets abroad. They can sell in these markets because American farms are not only the most economical source of many products, but because American farms are the only adequate source for the products.

I would point out, however, that if it were not for unfair trade barriers American farmers could have even greater markets abroad.

For example, the European Economic Community has a reference price-levy system that protects inefficient European farmers from American competition.

Not only does the EEC protect its inefficient farmers, it also gives illegal preferential tariff rates to certain farm products from other nations.

One instance we have discussed previously in the Senate—and passed a resolution on—is citrus. The EEC has given huge tariff reductions to citrus from Israel, Morocco, Tunisia, and Spain. Meanwhile, American-produced citrus has had to pay full tariff.

Efforts to obtain a satisfactory settlement of this issue have been ineffective. Obviously, the EEC has continued to look upon America as the "patsy."

Perhaps the EEC is now having some second thoughts.

It is my hope that the 10-percent surcharge will give the United States the bargaining power to roll back trade barriers for all American products all over the world. This includes agriculture.

Even if we were to exclude the direct benefits possible for agriculture, I would expect farmers to support the import surcharge.

The serious erosion of American industrial jobs is as important to the farmer as the erosion of good topsoil. And there has been a very serious erosion of jobs because foreign manufacturers have been flooding our domestic markets while closing their home markets to our products.

If this job drain is not halted, then our economic decline is certain. And this most certainly will bring hard times for the American farmer.

OPENING OF HEARINGS ON THE PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on August 5, the Government Operations Committee opened consideration of S. 1431, a bill to create a new Department of Natural Resources. The bill is, of course, a part of the President's major package of four bills that would reorganize the executive branch along the lines suggested by the President's Council on Executive Organization, by creating new Departments of Community Development, Natural Resources, Human Resources, and Economic Affairs. The hearings on the Department of Natural Resources were presided over by the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), a member of the Government Operations Committee and chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A very distinguished group of administration witnesses testified to the committee, including Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton and Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin; the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. Beal, accompanied by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, General Clarke; Commissioners Larson and Ramey, of the Atomic Energy Commission; Under Secretary of Commerce James Lynn; and the then Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Arnold Weber.

In addition, the committee heard testimony from the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), whose longtime interest in creating a new department for the management of our natural resources and environment is well known, and who made an excellent statement.

Although I was unable to attend the hearings in person because of absence from the country, I have read the statements presented on August 5. These statements very amply explain the proposed new department. With the exception of Atomic Energy Commissioner Ramey, all the witnesses entirely supported the creation of the new department. Commissioner Ramey's objection was that the functions of the Commission intended to be transferred to the new department would not be so effectively performed. On the other hand, AEC Commissioner Larson, speaking for the entire Commission with the exception of Mr. Ramey, supported the transfer of AEC functions to the proposed new Department of Natural Resources, arguing that—

Considering the substantial changes that will be taking place in the energy field, it is logical and important that one Government agency have the total picture and be able to establish policy and to allocate funds for development of the appropriate and necessary energy resources. The responsible formulation of national energy policy must be based on the comprehensive balancing of all factors aimed at serving the total public interest.

As acting ranking Republican member of the Committee on Government Operations and chief Senate sponsor of S. 1431 and the other bills implementing the President's reorganization program, I am very much pleased that Senator JACKSON took the initiative to hold hear-

ings. His excellent opening statement demonstrated his keen interest and knowledge of the entire field. I know that he and the other members of the Government Operations Committee, including its chairman, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the chairman of the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee; the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF); the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS); and the many other sponsors of these reorganization bills, will respond to President Nixon's call in his special message to Congress on September 9 to—

Act in this session on the sweeping reorganization of the Executive Branch which I have proposed, in order to make it more efficient, more manageable, more responsive to the needs and wishes of the people. Every day that goes by increases the urgency of this basic reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that summaries of the statements of Senator JACKSON, Senator MOSS, and mine be printed in the RECORD, along with the complete statements of Secretaries Morton and Hardin, and summaries of the statements of the other administration witnesses of whom I have referred.

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

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON AT HEARING ON LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, AUGUST 5, 1971

We are meeting today to receive testimony on legislation designed to create a new Department of Natural Resources.

The concept of a Department of Natural Resources, incorporating the major Federal programs of resource management and conservation, is not new. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, Senator Ribicoff held hearings on comparable legislation almost four years ago. A task force of the first Hoover Commission urged the creation of such a department in 1949.

If the concept is not new, there are still compelling reasons for taking a fresh look at the proposal to establish this Department. In recent years, there has developed a new awareness of what is at stake in the management of our natural resources. Increasing concern for the state of environment has helped to expose the shortcomings of Federal resource management.

As we have come to understand the ecological consequences of building a dam or dredging a swamp, we have become more aware of the broad impact of Federal resource activities on the environment. Despite significant progress, the Federal government is still falling far short of meeting its minimum responsibilities for the preservation of our environment.

The lack of a coherent national energy policy, for example, is not only affecting the quality of our environment but also threatens to induce a major energy shortage within this decade. The Federal government is deeply involved in energy matters. More than a dozen departments and agencies are involved in such tasks as regulating the level of oil imports, the price of natural gas, the siting of atomic power plants and oil drilling on the outer continental shelf. But there has been no overall management of our energy resources to assure the best possible use of these precious assets. This is one deficiency which could be remedied in a new Department of Natural Resources.

Those of us who have survived various reorganizations in the Executive Branch, including the creation of new Departments, do

not see any magic in shuffling old agencies or establishing new ones. In fact, a major reorganization can sometimes be the substitute for creative thought and positive action. But there is also solid evidence that an intelligent reorganization, properly carried through with full support from the President and Congress, can pave the way for better management.

Many of us believe that an opportunity exists for this kind of reorganization in the creation of a Department of Natural Resources. Of course there is disagreement—even among advocates of such a Department—as to what its components should be. The purpose of this hearing, and others to follow, is to explore the areas of agreement and disagreement to help the Committee decide what form this Department should take.

[Statement of Senator FRANK E. MOSS]

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman, no one could welcome more than I these hearings on the proposal to establish a Department of Natural Resources. As you know, I introduced my first bill to establish such a department in the 89th Congress and have reintroduced a bill, adjusted and improved, but essentially the same in structure, in every Congress since.

FORMER PLANS

The idea of reorganizing the Federal structure which deals with natural resources so that today's great tasks in this field can be performed efficiently and effectively is, of course, not new. It has been pursued for many years, and much has been written about it.

Even in the six years that I have been actively advocating the establishment of such a department, the idea has acquired enormous momentum. Technological changes which have revolutionized our views on environment, has made reorganization of the machinery which manages, conserves, and protects our natural resources not only desirable, but, in my opinion, truly essential.

I, therefore, warmly commended President Nixon when he presented the natural resources reorganization proposal to Congress earlier this year, and I now commend the chairman for calling these hearings.

I asked for time to testify, not only to express my support for these hearings, but because my proposal differs in one or two major particulars from the Administration proposal, and I believe these differences should be considered by the Committee and the Congress.

MOSS BILL

The version to which I wish to speak today is S. 1025, as amended, introduced May 14, 1971, which calls for the establishment of a Department of Natural Resources and Environment.

The most significant difference between my proposal and the Administration proposal is indicated by the difference in name—my Department of Natural Resources and Environment would include the components of the Environmental Protection Agency—the Water Quality Office, Solid Waste Office, Air Pollution Control Office, Pesticides Office, and Radiation Office. The Administration proposal retains EPA as a separate agency.

In other words, the basic thrust of the Moss bill is the placement—within the same Department—of functions governing protection of natural resources as well as those governing development or exploitation of natural resources.

The second major difference is that the Moss proposal places the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Territories in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the Administration proposals place both in Natural Resources.

And there are several other, less important, variations which I will discuss later.

But, to begin, let me discuss briefly the fundamental reasons for the establishment of a Federal resources department.

First, perhaps is the terrible toll American progress has exacted from the natural environment.

A second fundamental reason for the placement of principal resources responsibility in one department is the structure of nature itself.

Robert Frost said that what makes a nation in the beginning is "a good piece of geography." A piece of geography is a unit: Land, water, atmosphere, forests all are part of the same system. For thousands of years, man's activities left nature relatively unscarred. But as we have put more and more pressure on the environment, a "multiplier" effect has come into play.

The numerous and complex responsibilities of the Federal Government in the resources field offer numerous other reasons for the establishment of a DNR. These responsibilities include not only resources management, but also construction of public works; establishment of resources policy, dissemination of a vast range of information; and the conduct of many kinds of research and development.

ADMINISTRATION BILL

Let me now turn to a more detailed examination of my proposal and that of the Administration. What should a Department of Natural Resources do? What functions should be assigned to it? What agencies should it contain?

On these points I differ somewhat with the President.

The most significant difference, as I have pointed out, is that my Department of Natural Resources and Environment would include the components of the Environmental Protection Agency, while the Administration proposal retains EPA as a separate agency.

A year ago, I testified before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations to offer my views on Mr. Nixon's Reorganization Plans Nos. 3 and 4 which established the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

I said at that time it would be helpful to have in one agency all of the programs directed to prevention of damage through air and water pollution, solid waste disposal, radiation, or pesticides, just as it would be helpful to place all of the programs dealing with oceanography under one administrator.

But I also said I would consider it more sensible if all our resources development programs could be coordinated with our resource regulation programs.

Let me use a specific example.

A number of coal-fired electric generating plants are in various stages of development in the Four Corners area of the southwest. These are designed to utilize the plentiful coal of the region and water from the Colorado River system.

Some plants may be built on Federal lands, and power directed to population centers. The transmission lines must cross large stretches of public land. Therefore, easements for land use and contracts for water use would have to be negotiated with the Department of Natural Resources as they now must be with the Department of the Interior.

Numerous environmental problems are arising including: Impact of plant construction on sites; discharge of pollutants into the air; disposal of coal waste; location of powerlines—frequently the least expensive route renders a scenic area unsightly; and the return of water to the river system at a temperature higher than that at which it came out.

Should not these questions be considered and resolved by the same department that grants permission for the use of public property? My answer is "Yes."

I am concerned about the interaction between protection and development because I recognize that both are essential. In this matter, our Nation is cast on the horns of a dilemma. Like a hero of Greek tragedy, we find only two courses of action open, either of which could be fatal. If we put the brakes on production, we face a sinking standard of living; if we press full steam ahead on production, we may—through pollution—destroy the life-giving environment.

Somehow, the technological and political genius of the American people must be harnessed to give us both development and conservation. Otherwise, American society as we have known it must pass into oblivion.

To accomplish this dual task, I believe we need a Department of Natural Resources and Environment exercising comprehensive authority. It must have the responsibility and the capability of keeping the environment clean and of developing sufficient resources to maintain an acceptable standard of living. It must lead the Nation into the new paths that must be found and marked—paths that will permit an advanced industrial society to grow and still survive.

It has been argued that placing protection and development functions in the same department could favor exploitation at the expense of conservation. It has been said that a check on project promotion is needed, and that the Environmental Protection Agency provides such a check.

OVERSIGHT AGENCIES

Yet, though I propose only one executive department for natural resources, I do not intend it to be the sole monitor of environmental condition. I would retain the Council on Environmental Quality; and I advocate passage of Senate Joint Resolution 17, to create in the Congress a Joint Committee on the Environment. In brief, this would result in the following arrangement:

First, the Department of Natural Resources and Environment would exercise the operating responsibilities of the Federal Government relating to natural resources development and protection.

Second, the Council on Environmental Quality would exercise present responsibilities which include evaluating the state of the environment and the operation of the department. The Council would also continue to prepare annually the official Environmental Quality Report of the President.

Third, the congressional joint committee would have the responsibility of holding public hearings on the report and of recommending to the legislative committees of the Congress such action as it deemed necessary.

In short, we would have a manager—the Department—a watchdog—the Council—and a legislative investigator—the joint committee.

Such an arrangement, I believe, would constitute a rational solution to the problem of organizing the Federal resource management effort to provide most effectively both protection and development.

FUNCTIONS REMOVED

The second major difference between the Moss proposal and that of the Administration, as I have pointed out, is that I would place the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Territories in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the Administration places both in Natural Resources.

For some years, the argument has been advanced that the Indian people themselves prefer to work with Interior, and would therefore choose to be in a Department of Natural Resources, which is presumably more like home than HEW or a new Department of Human Resources.

A second argument for placing the Indian

Bureau in DNR is that Indian lands are important resources, and I cannot gainsay that.

But good arguments must give way to better ones. The soil, water, wildlife, and air of the Indian lands must, of course, be conserved, as must all of the physical environment. And such conservation will be a responsibility of the Department of Natural Resources.

But national policy should be encouragement of the Indian to assume a full citizen's role, although, for some period, an additional measure of protection is required. The Administration's own list of the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Territories shows a preponderance of non-resource items. This list includes: Natural resources and economic development, education, public health and safety, job training and placement, and community services and facilities.

The Washington Evening Star left little more to be said when it declared:

"Surely the Indians belong with the rest of us under a Department of Human Resources."

The rationale for placing the Office of Territories in DNR is, apparently, similar to that for placing the Indian Bureau there. But the arguments against such a location prevail as before. The natural resources of the territories must receive the attention of DNR. But these possessions should be regarded primarily as living space for people, and they should be managed by the agency with responsibility for health, welfare and education.

I support the Administration in the positioning of the Corps of Engineers. Mr. Nixon would place the planning, project evaluation, and policy formulation functions of the corps in Natural Resources. He would fund the civil works program of the corps through the DNR. But he would retain construction, operation, and maintenance of projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army. This is a good solution to the thorny problem of maintaining a national defense capability in the corps while providing more highly coordinated water resources planning, and I am pleased to support it.

I agree also that we should include in Natural Resources all of the functions now part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and certain responsibilities now exercised by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Administration proposes transferring from the Department of Agriculture more functions than my bill originally included, but my May 14th amendments adjusted my proposal so that it now coincides with the Nixon proposals in all respects—transferring the Soil Conservation Service, watershed loans in the Farmers Home Administration, natural resource economics in the Economic Research Service, and soil and water conservation in the Agricultural Research Service into the new Department of Natural Resources. I go along completely on these changes.

Mr. Chairman, if ever there were an idea whose time had come, it is a Department of Natural Resources and Environment. It would for the first time make a member of the President's Cabinet responsible for formulating and augmenting a program to care for all of the Nation's natural resources.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CHARLES H. PERCY

I look on the Department of Natural Resources as one of the most needed, and most attainable of the President's four major departmental reorganization bills. Thus I am very pleased indeed that our distinguished Chairman, Senator McClellan, has asked Senator Jackson to chair these hearings. Senator Jackson brings enormous talent and a wealth of experience to bear on these issues of natural resource policy, reflecting his work as Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee.

I look forward to cooperating very closely with him on this important legislation.

The need for such a new Department is truly urgent. A rapidly growing population demands recreation space. At the same time the increased use of existing recreation areas threatens to spoil them. Vastly increased use of energy of all forms puts heavy demands on our energy resource utilization, and further threatens conservation objectives. These difficult and urgent problems cannot be solved by the confused and fragmented departmental organization that exists now.

For example, responsibility for management of onshore Federal lands is divided among at least five agencies. The Bureau of Land Management has jurisdiction over 475 million acres; the Forest Service, over 187 million acres; the National Park Service, over 30 million acres; the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, over 30 million acres; the Bureau of Reclamation, over 9 million acres; the Defense Department and other agencies, over 35 million acres.

The Department of Natural Resources will bring together into one agency most of the numerous natural resource and physical environment programs which currently are scattered throughout the Federal Establishment. It will provide the essential governmental capabilities required to plan, weigh alternatives and priorities, establish policies, and operate programs to meet our needs for recreation, environmental protection, pure water, and abundant energy.

Support for a Department of Natural Resources as proposed in S. 1431, is impressively strong. Many conservation and wildlife organizations have taken positions in favor of the proposed Department. This demonstration of wide public support, and the cosponsorship of the bill by Senators Jackson, Moss and Anderson, along with 19 Republican Senators, has given this bill an appropriately bipartisan background. In my view this bill—and the other proposals for new Departments of Community Development, Human Resources, and Economic Affairs—have to do only with the issue of good government. They are bipartisan, indeed non-partisan. Good government cannot be the objective of a single political party—it is a goal for all Americans.

STATEMENT OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. Chairman, we are most delighted that the Committee has chosen to commence hearings on S. 1413, the proposed Administration legislation which would establish a Department of Natural Resources.

As you know, the idea of establishing a Department of Natural Resources is not a new one. Many Senators and Congressmen over the past several sessions of the Congress have sponsored similar legislation. Nearly every advisory body to each President concerning government reorganization since, and including, the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, has recommended the creation of a Department with overall responsibility for conservation and natural resources.

The Ash Council under President Nixon, after careful examination of the previous studies, also concluded that the creation of a Department of Natural Resources is necessary and timely. The Ash Report formed the basis for what was translated into S. 1431.

You have before you a compilation of the President's reorganization proposals which includes descriptions of how each proposed new Department would operate; how they would be structured; what their constituent elements would be, and other related details.

Rather than attempting to duplicate this information in explicit detail, I would like to limit my remarks this morning to a philosophical overview regarding the need to create a Department of Natural Resources and bring the Committee up-to-date on the planning efforts which have taken place since

the President's proposal to create a Department of Natural Resources was transmitted to the Congress in March.

Representatives present here today from the other agencies affected by the proposed reorganization will also present brief remarks about how the elements from their organizations will contribute to the development of a strong and viable new Department. The representative from the Office of Management and Budget is also with us to discuss the rationale behind the administrative and management provisions of the bill.

Returning to the philosophical realm, Thomas Jefferson, one of the most profound political thinkers our country has ever known, once commented:

"I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions, but . . . laws and constitutions must go hand-in-hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

This same reasoning provided the impetus for proposing a Department of Natural Resources. In advancing institutions to keep pace with the times, we have recognized the need to deal with three basic objectives:

(1) The management by the Executive Branch of our nation's natural resources as a whole rather than by the presently fragmented system.

(2) The system of management for our natural resources should be centered around an organization capable of effective management and which would be responsive and accountable to the President, the Congress and to the people.

(3) The underlying substantive management philosophy of the organization would be based upon the conviction that the development of all natural resources should be harmonized with the most practicable possible means to protect and preserve the environment, consistent with the social and economic needs of the Nation.

I am fully persuaded that if these three objectives are to be realized, the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, as provided for in S. 1431, is absolutely essential. The legislation was carefully designed to make the achievement of these objectives possible.

Under the present Federal structure, the proper achievement of these objectives is nearly impossible.

In response to the many questions raised by Members of Congress and interested members of the public about practical details concerning the functioning of his proposed new Department of Natural Resources, the President asked me to lead an interagency task force to produce such information. We have been hard at work. We are confident that this effort will provide answers to many of the questions you may have about the proposed new Department.

This morning, however, I would like to present to you a preview of some of the highlights of our thinking to date.

On page 164 of the gray Reference Compilation before you, there is included an organization chart of the Department of Natural Resources. Details concerning the top management tier are spelled out in that document and I need not repeat them here. Instead, I would like to focus on the second tier—that is, the Administrator level—because these are the principal units in which the knotty problems regarding policy and program matters will first be addressed before being reviewed by the Department's top management.

As you see on the chart, there will be five major Administrations, one each for Land and Recreation Resources; Water Resources; Energy and Mineral Resources; Oceanic, At-

mospheric and Earth Sciences; and Indian and Territorial Affairs. I will discuss them one by one.

The Land and Recreation Resources Administration would provide a central focus for managing Federal lands, and for development of national land use planning to assure that planning is done *before*—not after—lands are developed. This single administration would ensure that such planning, done in conjunction with regional and State organizations, will provide optimum opportunity for developing multiple uses of our nation's lands.

Land and Recreation Resources would be composed of the following functions: from Interior—the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management; and from Agriculture—the Forest Service, the Natural Resources Economics Division of the Economic Research Service, and the Soil and Water Conservation Research Division of the Agriculture Research Service.

This functional grouping of agencies dealing with land and recreation resources would place bureaus with inter-related missions and programs alongside each other. They would operate under a single Administrator and work cooperatively, rather than competitively, toward achieving a desirable balance in development and preservation of our Nation's land areas.

The Land and Recreation Resources Administration would have enormous responsibilities. It would manage 762 million acres—approximately one-third of the Nation's lands, including 475 million acres of BLM lands, 187 million acres of Forest Service lands, and 30 million acres each administered by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. It would also provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in fields of forestry, outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife and land use planning. This Administration would have a strong research arm to fully support these action programs on both private and public lands.

Its specific objectives would include establishing a Federal structure that enhances comprehensive natural resource planning; developing a national land use policy; assisting with water resource planning; developing better services to the public; and improving the management of our public domain, forests, parks, refuges, wilderness areas and wild and scenic areas.

In the existing Federal structure numerous inconsistencies and conflicts exist among our four principal land managing agencies in such areas as outdoor recreation, streams and watershed management, timber management practices, and those related to grazing and range lands, wildlife and mineral resources, and land use planning—including proper emphasis for preservation.

As you know, most of these conflicts and inconsistencies were identified by the Public Land Law Review Commission with recommendations for corrective action.

The Land and Recreation Resources Administration will be able to provide more adequate expertise to assist urban-oriented agencies in their recreation planning. It will develop recreation plans in a manner more responsive to urban and rural needs.

Finally, the Land and Recreation Resources Administration will be able to administer more efficiently activities which affect all public lands, such as fire prevention and suppression and control of forest and plant diseases and insects.

Turning now to Water Resources, the establishment of a Department of Natural Resources will serve to provide the first opportunity to proceed with unified, comprehensive planning in all major water resource areas under a single Administration.

Transfers to the DNR Water Resources Ad-

ministration would include the following functions: from the Department of the Interior—the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Saline Water, the Office of Water Resources Research, and the hydro power marketing agencies; from the Department of Agriculture—the Soil Conservation Service. The planning, project evaluation, policy formulation and budgeting responsibilities relating to civil functions would be transferred from the Department of the Army's Corps of Engineers. The functions of the Water Resources Council also would be transferred.

Water resource supply can then be considered in the new Department in planning and developing a national land use policy. This objective can best be accomplished through a consolidation of Federal functions relating to planning, evaluation, and the determination of priorities to assure that specific water development and related land uses will serve our regional and national requirements and objectives. Thus, the Administrator for Land and Recreation Resources will work closely with the Administrator for Water Resources.

The Water Resources Administration will work with government and private groups to assure the achievement of such vital objectives as adequate water supplies for municipal, agricultural and industrial uses; flood and drought control; improved navigations; sound agricultural water management; improved water-oriented recreation, including that related to preservation of wetlands for wildlife; and—the development of hydro power. Past duplication and competition between and among agencies involved with water resource development will be eliminated.

Turning now to Energy and Minerals, the new Energy and Minerals Resources Administration in the Department of Natural Resources will be a great boon for those who deal in any form of marketable energy, as well as for consumers across the country.

President Nixon recently stated that the single authority established in DNR would be "better able to clarify, express, and execute Federal energy policy than any unit in our present structure" and that it would provide "a focal point where energy policy in the Executive Branch could be harmonized and rationalized."

The Nation needs a strong, unified agency authority to solve critical and complex problems that relate to energy exploration, development, production, transportation, conversion, and use. It will also have to face up to such troublesome situations as supply and demand, environmental effects in energy and mineral production, and the disposal of solid wastes.

Present dispersion of energy responsibilities within the Executive Branch is so extensive that the President has to rely on a special committee of the Domestic Council to provide him with needed energy information.

Here are the functions which would constitute the new Energy and Mineral Resources Administration: from Interior—the Bureau of Mines, the Office of Minerals and Solid Fuels, the Office of Oil and Gas, the Oil Import Administration, the Office of Coal Research, the Defense Electric Power Administration, and the Underground Electric Power Transmission Research project; from the Atomic Energy Commission—Raw Materials Management, Uranium Enrichment, and planning and budgeting only for the Civilian Nuclear Power Development and parts of the Plowshare program. The functions of the Office of Pipeline Safety of the Department of Transportation also would be transferred.

The new Energy and Mineral Resources Administration will be able to deal effectively with such problems as making adequate energy available; considering the interrelationships of all energy forms for technical and economic planning; and devising lead-

times needed for technological developments related to future needs for clean energy.

This Administration will have responsibility for a broad range of research and development activities, including those that relate to coal, petroleum and natural gas, oil shale, nuclear energy, urban refuse, health and safety, metallurgy, mining and underground power transmission, among others. A consolidated approach to these various energy forms seems absolutely necessary to abate the present crisis, and to provide a planning focus for our future energy needs.

The responsibility for statistics and information—always of vital interest to industry, government and others—will include collection, compilation, analysis, and publication of all kinds of energy and mineral statistics on an integrated basis, heretofore unattainable. An urgent need exists today for an analytical capability to develop available data into useable reports that have options and recommendations which Department managers and other decision-makers can use to make policies and develop programs.

The Administrator's regulatory and enforcement program will be extremely important because it will have to create a healthy and safe environment in the mining and energy industries. At the same time, it will be utilized to ensure a balanced supply and demand pattern for the Nation's mineral and energy resources.

The special proprietary operations of the Energy and Minerals Resources Administration will consist of the uranium enrichment program, the management of our National uranium stockpile, and our helium conservation program. Placing those operations under a single Administrator will offer numerous opportunities to improve and simplify management practices.

Thus, by improved information and statistics collection and evaluation, coordinated program and policy planning, an integrated energy and mineral research and development program, a more systematic regulatory effort, and a more effective series of proprietary operations, the Administrator for Energy and Mineral Resources can do much to improve the outlook for a fuel-and-metal-dependent society.

Turning now to the Oceanic, Atmospheric, and Earth Sciences Administration, we are dealing with the major scientific and technological components of the Department of Natural Resources.

From the earliest historic times, Man has been interested in acquiring new knowledge about his physical environment, not only to learn more about the forces that affect him, but also to alter unfavorable natural conditions in order that he might make his earthly existence safer and happier.

Developing a better understanding of our earth, waters, atmosphere and the physical processes that govern our planet is a long range objective and commitment of the world's scientific community.

This goal can be more easily achieved by transferring the functions of the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior and those of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce to the new administration in the Department of Natural Resources.

In some earthquake, hydrology, and mapping activities, the two agencies conduct similar operations. Bringing the two organizations together will strengthen their efforts.

Many opportunities exist for consolidating related surveying, mapping and charting programs that exist within these organizations.

This Administration will be responsible for such major functions as national weather services, resource and environmental remote sensing studies, operation of environmental satellites, geologic investigations and surveys, water data collection and investigations, environmental data services, earth hazard pro-

grams, prediction of natural hazards and warnings for public health and safety, and topographic and other mapping and charting services, ocean and lake surveys, fishery resources, research and information services, and technical and financial assistance to the States.

The coordinated efforts of this Administration can offer greater protection against those hazards that confront man through such natural causes as the weather, earthquakes, volcanoes, and landslides—and thereby reduce the consequences of such catastrophes.

We can anticipate many other significant improvements under the consolidated strength of the Geological Survey and NOAA. Consider environmental impact analysis. Typically, environmental problems are complicated and no single agency now has sufficient expertise to achieve the desired breadth of perspective and evaluation needed for a comprehensive environmental analysis.

The Geological Survey recently identified 88 specific physical, biological, cultural and ecological factors for consideration in making an environmental impact analysis. Neither the Survey nor NOAA has all the competence needed, but together they would have the expertise required to make a more thorough environmental impact analysis. Also, they would work closely with other entities within the DNR possessing environmental expertise.

Closer working relationships will develop with the other agencies in DNR that now use the information, data and research collected and disseminated by the Geological Survey and NOAA. Under DNR management, service functions of this important scientific component can be better tailored to serve major resource and environmental action agencies thus saving money, time and effort.

Let me turn briefly to the Administration for Indian and Territorial Affairs. The President consulted with many American Indian groups concerning their preference regarding their place within the Federal structure. They indicated, as they had on previous occasions, that they preferred to remain with a land resource agency.

This is understandable inasmuch as the Indians own over 50 million acres of land that is held in trust for them. This is as much land as a number of the New England states combined. Involved is a tremendously important job of managing natural resources of all kinds—timber, forage, minerals, water, agricultural land. The land provides in a large measure their livelihood, a sense of security, and, in some cases, it is even intimately a part of their culture and religion.

The Indian programs concerned with resource development will benefit from close association with the other natural resource programs of the Federal Government within the Department.

The important United States territorial programs will also be a part of the Administration for Indian and Territorial Affairs. This arrangement will assure that territorial policies and programs will receive the high level leadership and attention they deserve.

Each of the five Administrators will be personally accountable to the Secretary for the ultimate success or failure of the programs he administers. Within broad guideline and objectives, each will have considerable freedom in managing his organization including flexibility in organizing his office in the way he believes most effective. Each Administrator will also be a key member of the top Departmental management team. In this role, he must rise above his primary functional responsibilities and develop broad perspectives to give objective advice to the Secretary on Department-wide matters.

These few highlights of the plans for the Department of Natural Resources point up the many practical advantages that can be expected to be realized at the policy and working levels of the new Department.

In closing, let me conclude with a philosophical note. The general welfare of the Nation requires that its limited natural resources, including energy sources, be conserved, managed and utilized so as to help realize a sound balance between preservation and development. The establishment of the Department of Natural Resources will provide the necessary organizational capability for best achieving these objectives.

This reorganization legislation represents the thoughtful product of many minds both within and without the Government. It contains the promise of what is needed to efficiently restructure the Federal natural resource entities within the Executive Branch so that they can work more responsibly and responsively to the American public and its elected representatives in the Congress.

I am hopeful and expectant that the Congress will give this landmark legislation priority attention and support.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
CLIFFORD M. HARDIN

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to meet with the Committee today, to discuss the functions of the Department of Agriculture that are proposed for transfer to the new Department of Natural Resources under the President's Departmental Reorganization Plan.

First, let me say that I strongly support the President's plan to establish four new departments. I encourage you to give favorable consideration to the entire plan, in order to obtain maximum benefits in improved efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness in providing government services.

I believe that it is equally important that you support the principle of providing as much latitude as possible to the Secretaries of the new departments, so that they can make adjustments when necessary in the organizational structures and functions of the agencies under them, and be equipped with the full range of management tools needed to administer the departments effectively.

While the establishment of a new Department of Natural Resources is an important and essential part of the reorganization, the establishment of only one of the four new departments would not achieve the full benefits that would result from substantially streamlining the Federal departments.

From the previous testimony you are aware of the overall organization plans for the Department of Natural Resources. I will therefore confine my remarks to the contributions of the Department of Agriculture to this new department.

Of the five Administrations proposed for the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Agriculture will provide a major input to two of them; the Land and Recreation Resources Administration and the Water Resources Administration.

Transfers from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Natural Resources would include:

The Forest Service, which administers 187 million acres of public lands, conducts forestry research, and provides assistance to State and private forest landowners.

The Soil Conservation Service which provides soil and water conservation technical assistance to communities and individuals, plans and constructs water resource development projects, and carries out soil and snow surveys.

The Soil and Water Conservation Research Division of the Agricultural Research Service, which carries out a nationwide program of soil and water research closely supporting the activities of the Soil Conservation Service.

The Natural Resource Economics Division of the Economic Research Service which conducts land and water economic research and analyses also closely supporting the activities of the Soil Conservation Service.

These are the basic organizations within

the Department of Agriculture directly and primarily engaged in administering natural resource functions that are closely related to the basic mission of the proposed Department of Natural Resources.

As most members of this Committee know, the Department of Agriculture is the most highly decentralized department in the Government. The Forest Service, operating through the 154 National Forests and 19 National Grasslands, and the Soil Conservation Service, operating through over 3,000 Soil and Water Conservation Districts, are among the most decentralized of Federal agencies.

One of the basic principles followed in the proposed reorganization is that existing programs and delivery systems will remain intact under the new departments. There would be no interruption of services at the point of contact with citizens, communities, farmers, and ranchers.

The improvements in management and coordination resulting from establishment of a Department of Natural Resources will be achieved largely through improved organization in Washington and the regional offices, rather than at the local level.

I believe that the reorganization will make it possible to solve long standing problems of government in managing our natural resources. It will put all of the major functions involved in land, water, and natural resource planning and protection into one coordinated operation.

The overlapping and fragmentation that now occur in the Federal administration of laws concerning resource management, ownership, research, technical assistance, and services to local governments and individuals can be worked out more effectively under the unified administration of the agencies concerned.

As you know, the reorganization plans are part of a coordinated package of reforms designed by the President to correct serious weaknesses in the way the Federal Government works, and the failure of government programs to meet the needs of the people. In addition to the President's Departmental Reorganization Program, the package of reforms includes:

Decentralization to get decisions made out where the problems are, by people who know local conditions, rather than in Washington, D.C., by Federal Officials unfamiliar with local needs.

Management assistance to State and local governments to help them improve their administrative ability to plan and manage programs.

Farmers and rural residents, as well as other Americans, will benefit from the reorganization and other governmental reforms proposed by the President.

These reforms will make government at all levels more responsive to local needs, better able to provide coordinated solutions to public problems, and more economical and efficient in serving citizens.

As citizens and taxpayers, farmers and rural residents will benefit from the general improvement in the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of government.

Farmers and rural residents also share with all Americans the desire for better services, a more attractive environment, improved economic opportunities, better schools, and more adequate medical services; these can only exist in healthy, growing communities.

The establishment of the new Departments of Natural Resources, Human Resources, Community Development, and Economic Affairs will meet these needs better by—

Bringing together the fragmented programs and uncoordinated activities now found in seven separate departments, and grouping them together according to major national purposes for more effective management;

Eliminating the overlapping and duplication of services and the complex red tape

citizens now struggle with when dealing with so many organizations;

Merging in one department, under coordinated management, the many different land management agencies and programs of the government;

Assigning to a single department the primary responsibility for developing our natural resources and protecting the quality of our environment;

Making a single department responsible for coordinated management of all programs aimed at improving the health, welfare, and education of our citizens;

Concentrating in one department, under coordinated management, government programs for promoting the economic and social development of rural communities.

Reorganization and decentralization will bring these programs closer to the people who live in rural communities, and will give farmers and rural people more powerful tools to make their local communities better places to live and work.

STATEMENT OF THADDEUS BEAL, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

In recent years increasing public recognition has been given to the importance of accomplishing comprehensive and innovative planning for water and related land resources to meet the full needs of our changing society. As these public demands grow, we are faced with the challenge to meet them in ways that maintain and enhance environmental quality.

To respond to these challenges involving our natural resources, the President proposes to give the Department of Natural Resources overall direction and coordination of Federal natural resources programs either by placing them in that Department or by providing the Department with the necessary comprehensive planning overview, policy formulation, project evaluation and budgeting review. As a result of being assigned this overall responsibility for shaping environmentally sound water resource development programs, the Secretary of Natural Resources can, in coordination with other agencies, particularly the Environmental Protection Agency, most effectively respond to our nation's water resources problems. There is no question that the water planning and related efforts now executed by the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Soil Conservation Service and Water Resources Council will benefit from the central direction and unity of purpose provided by the Department of Natural Resources.

In addition, the President's proposal for a Department of Natural Resources will strengthen regional administration of virtually all Federal natural resource activities. The regional system contemplated by the President's proposal will permit a high degree of responsiveness to regional needs by providing more regional decision-making authority enabling many of the problems now settled in Washington to be settled in the field. The managerial philosophy of utilizing a decentralized organization is quite similar to that presently used by the Corps of Engineers.

The main feature of the proposed legislation relating to the Department of the Army is Section 301(c)(1). That section transfers all Civil Works functions of the Department of the Army to Department of Natural Resources, including all of the Corps' regulatory functions, with the proviso that all Civil Works construction, operation and maintenance, flood and coastal emergencies, and related activities shall be funded by the Secretary of Natural Resources and accomplished through the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. Section 301(c)(2) of the proposed legislation transfers to the Department of Natural Resources all functions of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Coastal Engineering Research Center, Board on Coastal Engineering

Research, Mississippi River Commission and the California Debris Commission; and Section 501 would permit the Secretary of Natural Resources to abolish these Boards and Commissions. Section 506 authorizes the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to make such additional incidental dispositions of functions, personnel and funds as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose of the proposed legislation.

This approach has the advantage of achieving the objective of including in one Department responsibility for comprehensive multi-objective overview of water resource policy and program, while permitting the effective and proven organization of the Corps of Engineers to continue to construct, operate and maintain particular approved projects.

The President's proposal also provides that natural disaster and emergency activities will be performed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

A viable engineering construction organization with planning capabilities is necessary to react effectively in performing this natural disaster function. It is essential to maintain in the Department of Defense an organization in being that is capable of providing an adequate mobilization base for times of national emergency. The Corps of Engineers organization has demonstrated its flexibility and competence to undertake the urgent large-scale engineering and construction programs involved in the SAFEGUARD ABM missile system, NASA space program, Air Force MINUTEMAN System, military buildup during the Korean and Vietnam wars. In addition, retention of such an organization in the Department of Defense means that Corps of Engineers officers will continue to receive the invaluable training provided by Civil Works assignments.

In conclusion, I want to state my belief that the quality of the Corps of Engineers performance in water resources matters is unmatched by any other agency. Nevertheless, the challenges of a new era require that new means be found to fully coordinate planning and policy for all of our natural resources, including water. The President's proposal to put direction of water resources planning in one agency along with other planning for natural resources is a major step in preparing our Federal government to work effectively with State and local governments and with private individuals in meeting the environmental and resource management problems that we face today and in the future. The President's proposal is also advantageous because it would utilize the specialized technical capabilities of the Corps of Engineers and other existing agencies in performing detailed project planning, execution, operation and maintenance under the overall guidance of the Department of Natural Resources. Moreover, it will preserve in the Defense Department the standby engineering and construction mobilization capability that is now more important than ever as we face a period of declining military standing forces. For all of these reasons, the Department of the Army and the Corps of Engineers support the proposed legislation.

STATEMENT BY CLARENCE E. LARSON, COMMISSIONER, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For the last quarter century, the Atomic Energy Commission has been the Government agency responsible for all aspects of the nation's nuclear energy program. We feel that during this crucial period we have succeeded in bringing this new form of energy into a beneficial and controllable form for the American people and that it may now be considered for administration with the established, conventional forms of energy.

The President's reorganization plan comes at a time when the nation is facing a critical energy shortage. The energy needs are so

great that the Government's role has changed from a position of supporting individual energy sources to determining how the nation's needs might best be met from all of the available energy sources. We are projecting a considerable shift in generating capacity among the various energy sources in the next 20 years and a substantial shift in fuel use by electric utilities during this period. These forecasts of the relative energy mix for power generation are based on fuel availability at the requisite quality level of prescribed environmental standards and at economically feasible prices.

Considering the substantial changes that will be taking place in the energy field, it is logical and important that one Government agency have the total picture and be able to establish policy and to allocate funds for development of the appropriate and necessary energy resources. The responsible formulation of national energy policy must be based on the comprehensive balancing of all factors aimed at serving the total public interest.

The President's plan provides that the AEC's uranium raw materials and enrichment programs would be transferred to the new Department of Natural Resources. The new Department would also provide policy direction for the development of civilian nuclear power reactors and the Plowshare program of peaceful nuclear explosives. However, the AEC would continue to conduct the research, development, and demonstration in the latter two programs because of its expertise, its facilities and the need for close integration of the programs with other AEC activities. While the functions of planning, budgeting and funding, coordination, assessment of resources, and establishment of priorities as related to national energy planning would be transferred to the new Department, the reorganization is not intended to preclude AEC continuance of research and development effort in health and safety, reactor and device technology, fuel reprocessing, waste management, and other activities that relate primarily to programs remaining with the Commission.

We feel certain that satisfactory arrangements can be worked out in areas of joint responsibility with the Department of Natural Resources. As participants in a dynamic scientific program, we recognize the inevitability of change. The AEC has maintained in its own organizational philosophy a policy of maximum innovation and flexibility to achieve most effectively the objectives of our program. The President's objective in reorganizing the Executive Branch of the Federal Government is to make it a more effective instrument in serving the needs of the American people. This is a goal we all can and should support.

STATEMENT BY JAMES T. RAMEY, COMMISSIONER, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

On June 7, 1971, by a letter from Chairman Seaborg to Chet Hollifield, Chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Commission provided its comments on H.R. 6959 which is the companion bill to the bill under discussion today.

At my request, the letter included a statement informing the Committee of my belief that the bill was neither desirable nor workable as it affects the programs and organization of the Commission. I would like to take just a few moments this morning to explain why I believe this to be the case.

All of the functions proposed for transfer from the Commission to the Department are—and I believe should remain—integral parts of a complex of interrelated programs carried out through the Commission's unique and highly successful system of organization and management. This system involves utilization of industrial concerns, universities and not-for-profit organizations to operate government-owned plants and labora-

ories under cost-type contracts and a highly skilled management team in the Commission. To alter the existing system, in my view, will increase the cost of essential government programs, reduce the effectiveness of the Federal efforts to resolve critical energy and environmental problems and result in less-than-optimum utilization of expertise and facilities within the Commission complex.

I am particularly concerned regarding the proposed transfer of the uranium enrichment and nuclear power functions.

The overall approach taken in the uranium enrichment program has already created some uncertainty in the nuclear industry and among our free world friends as to our long term dependability as a supplier of enriching services. To transfer this program to a new agency at this critical juncture in the development of nuclear power with all the problems inevitable in such a change can do little but aggravate this situation.

Among such problems, I would point out that supervisory management and overall policy and planning for such an organization would be extremely difficult in an agency with limited prior experience in large scale industrial management. The various interrelationships with AEC research and development programs, particularly at Oak Ridge, could also present difficulties.

What is needed instead is to continue the enrichment program under experienced Commission management but with greater emphasis on consideration of the various elements of the program as parts of an integral enrichment enterprise and within a framework of stable long range planning.

NUCLEAR POWER RESPONSIBILITIES

I also believe transferring to the new Department those AEC civilian nuclear power development functions involving planning, budgeting and funding, coordination, assessment of resources, and establishment of priorities would be very undesirable.

The essential independence of the AEC from other energy oriented agencies was deliberately established by the Congress to assure attention commensurate with its potential as a leading element in the national energy program. The success of the light water reactor development program and the progress on the fast breeder reactor testify to the wisdom of such a decision. I might note in this regard that the President's Energy Message of June 4, 1971, gives top priority to the development of the fast breeder reactor. To now transfer these key reactor development functions to a new "super agency" would run counter to this intent of Congress and inevitably downgrade the vital breeder reactor program on which the energy needs of the nation will depend for the next fifty years.

In this connection, under the proposed reorganization, energy development is only one of a number of functions under one of a number of Administrators in a very large Department. I hardly think the proposed organizational location of the energy function is commensurate with its significance. And again, the traditional background and experience of the Department of Interior which, as reconstituted, would constitute the new Department of Natural Resources, has been in the field of coal and oil development and hydroelectric power. The Department's experience in large scale industrial research and development has been limited.

Coordination between energy development programs—which I certainly believe to be needed—can be more readily achieved without necessarily a complete reorganization of the involved agencies such as has been proposed by the Reorganization Bills.

In conclusion, I would note that the Department as proposed in the legislation does not consolidate in one agency all of the energy related functions of the Federal gov-

ernment. A number of key Federal agencies dealing with energy matters have not been included—notably the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. In addition, under the Administration plan there will not even be a unification of energy related functions within the Department itself. For example, the operation of large hydroelectric facilities and the marketing of electricity will be under the Water Resources Administration rather than the Energy and Mineral Resources Administration.

STATEMENT OF JAMES T. LYNN, UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to be here to speak on behalf of the Department of Commerce on S. 1431. We would like to lend support to the President's reorganization proposal, both as to concept and to the more detailed realignment of programs. In particular, we support it as an alternative to the present structure of the Executive Branch.

Under the President's proposals, elements of the Department of Commerce would be placed into each of the four proposed new departments. Most of the present Department of Commerce would go into the new Department of Economic Affairs, which would also include elements of the Department of Agriculture, Labor, Transportation, the Small Business Administration and other executive establishments.

In the reorganization plan, a substantial portion of the Department of Commerce, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), would move to the Department of Natural Resources. There it would join the Department of Interior and elements of the Department of Agriculture and other executive agencies concerned with the conservation and management of natural resources. Inclusion of NOAA in the Department of Natural Resources will permit the new Department to take a comprehensive approach to problems of environmental management.

President Nixon, in his Reorganization Plan No. 4 of last year, created NOAA as one of the major institutions for dealing with the Nation's environmental problems. NOAA resulted from recommendations of the Congressionally chartered Presidential Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources. NOAA further consolidated environmental activities residing in a number of different agencies. It was placed in the Department of Commerce by the President because the great bulk of the activities of NOAA already resided within our Department.

The proposal to place NOAA within the Department of Natural Resources is viewed by the Department of Commerce as another logical step in fully coordinating and integrating the Nation's environmental activities.

When NOAA is combined with the Geological Survey and related science and service activities we believe that major advantages would accrue to the Nation. For example, the closely related programs of NOAA and the Geological Survey in hydrology, mapping and charting, marine resources and seismology would be better planned and managed.

The new unit of DNR would also place a strong scientifically and technically oriented organization in the DNR which is expected to carry out resource and environmental management responsibilities. Thus, a strong scientific and technical organization would be readily available to support services and management in the same Department. For example, the marine resources programs of NOAA are related to Department of Natural Resources responsibilities

for development and use of off-shore oil, gas, and other mineral resources.

Within the newly proposed mission structure for cabinet agencies, NOAA's most logical place falls within the Department of Natural Resources.

STATEMENT OF ARNOLD R. WEBER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Public concern over the preservation and utilization of our national heritage of water, land, mineral, energy and other natural resources has risen sharply in recent years—a concern that gives an increased urgency to the early establishment of a Natural Resources Department. It is also noteworthy that such a Department has been recommended by most groups which have studied the organization of Federal agencies in recent years, including the Ash Council in 1970 and earlier task forces which submitted reports to President Johnson in 1964 and 1967. It is also practicable to establish a Natural Resources Department without foreclosing the opportunity of the Congress to take such action as it may desire on the other departmental bills. In other words the proposed Department can be established so as to give recognition to the need for the integrated conservation and management of our natural resources without at the same time undermining the surviving departments. The Department of the Interior will, of course, be incorporated in its entirety into the new Department.

The concepts underlying the proposed organization of this Department are the best we can draw from our experience. The departmental management system is based on two principles. First, as noted by Secretary Morton, there will be administrations to assure that substantive operations are vigorously directed by officials with the authority needed to bring about a high quality of management. Second, the Secretary will have the means in his office to assure that matters cutting across the administrations are effectively dealt with at the secretarial level.

The Secretary's direction of the Department will be aided by the important roles which the Deputy Secretary, the two Under Secretaries, an Assistant Secretary, and General Counsel will play as officials charged with assisting in matters of departmental policy formulation, priority setting, evaluation, and management. Important as these cross-cutting officials will be in the overall direction of the Department they are, with the sole exception of the Deputy Secretary, expected to serve in primarily staff capacities. Each administrator will have direct access to the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary on matters in which they have a substantive concern.

I should also like to call to the Committee's attention that the Secretary will have field representatives in the form of departmental regional directors. While it is expected that in most cases the program administrations will have their own field regions responsive to the administrators, it is likewise important that there be a departmental presence in each region. These regional directors will report to the Secretary and will assist in assuring that matters involving more than one administration are effectively handled in the field. The departmental regional directors will also represent the Department in dealings with State and local officials, interpret and communicate the policies of the Secretary and assist the Secretary in the evaluation of the field impact of the Department's program.

The bill supplies the Secretary of Natural Resources with the various authorities and powers which he needs to effectively manage the resources of the Department and to take those actions of an administrative character which are necessary for the efficient

discharge of the program responsibilities vested in him by the Congress. He will, for example, be authorized to adjust the organization of the department, appoint many of its principal officials, delegate his functions, acquire facilities, establish a working capital fund, and conduct research and development.

The Department of Natural Resources is thus designed to draw upon the best experience which we have had in the management of departments and large agencies. We are confident that the Department will make a major contribution to the vitality of our democratic institutions.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF THE DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, the conference report on H.R. 6531, the extension of the Military Selective Service Act, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I expect to seek recognition on the pending measure in just a few minutes. The speech I have prepared is off the typewriters and is on the way over here. I say that for the information of the leader.

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

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

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

PRINTING AUTHORIZATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 167

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand six hundred additional copies of Part 2 of the hearings before its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations during the Ninety-second Congress, first session, entitled "Organized Crime."

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 167) was considered and agreed to.

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF THE DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business is the conference report on H.R. 6531.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I propose to address the Senate on the pending measure.

For the moment, let me make some preliminary observations. We have before us, as the Senate knows, a conference report on the extension of the draft act. It also provides a revised, increased pay schedule for the military, based primarily on the idea that during this 2-year period we will lead into a volunteer force for all of the services.

Superimposed is the Mansfield amendment, which relates to the closing down of the war—the Mansfield amendment, having passed this body by a very good vote, puts a definite time limitation on when the United States would withdraw from Vietnam.

As I understand it, the present plan is that a motion will be made tomorrow to table the conference report. I want to point out, preliminarily, that this report was filed just a very few days before we went into recess. An effort was made to get a time certain to vote on its adoption before we left. Objection was heard from the Senator from Alaska.

Now time has moved on, and the facts and figures on the issues, have at least partly, gotten out of the minds of the Members of the Senate. In some ways, the importance of this bill is overwhelming. We must get back into the minds of the membership the implications of a motion to table and what would happen if it should be adopted. It would mean going back into the same arguments again, the same issues again, which have been thoroughly debated here, after the most painstaking effort by the committee, after 7 weeks of very active, vigorous debate.

I think there were more than two score rollcall votes. Some amendments were

defeated and some were passed. We went to conference with some 28 major differences with the House bill. Without trying to give roses to the conferees at all, there was a real effort, for 5 weeks, to reach some kind of agreement. We came back with a bill that went to the House. The House conferees were able to get the points of order waived by the Rules Committee, which meant one Member could not knock out, on a point of order, one of the provisions agreed on.

The House adopted that conference report, which included a part—and I respectfully submit it was a substantial part, in principle—of the Mansfield amendment, even though it was not germane under the rules of the House. If the rules of germaneness had not been waived by the Rules Committee, one Member could have knocked it out. That compromise provision is now before us as a part of the conference report. I have already paid my respects to Senator MANSFIELD for his consideration and his help to me, during those 5 weeks. We had many communications with each other. I have already thanked him, and I thank him again publicly.

So pending here is a part of the conference report is the Mansfield amendment. I appeal to those who voted for the Mansfield amendment to consider the fact that it is a part of the conference report before us, and consider the fact that other legislative avenues are open. If they possibly can, they should vote for the conference report.

I think it is generally understood over the country that when the time comes to get any bill passed in a necessary field, everyone cannot have everything he wants.

One cannot have everything in it that he wants and one cannot have everything kept out that he does not want. I think people understand that a Senator has to vote yes or no on a conference report. So I ask the membership to consider those facts as far as the Mansfield amendment is concerned.

No one is to blame for it, but the trouble is that since Congress has reconvened, other matters have intervened. One of our fellow members passed away, and the funeral is taking place today. Everyone wants to pay utmost respect to him and his memory. There has been every effort by the conferees to get the merits of the conference report and the conference bill before the membership. As I have said, I am not blaming anyone; I am just stating the facts of life.

Let us see if we cannot give a little and take a little and join hands to pass a bill in a field where almost everyone thinks a bill is necessary this year. There were only 16 votes against this bill on final passage.

Another assault made on the conference report is on another subject on which I have never seen unanimous agreement. There is always a difference of opinion about the level of pay scales for civilian employees and for members of the military. There is always that difference of opinion. We will never find a situation where everyone can completely agree as to where the pay increases should go, or how much. I say that from

experience. We have had pay bills for some time. I was closely connected with my first in 1958. There have been many others. There is always that difference of opinion. Really, this pay bill ought not to be passed as a part of the draft bill, but it was germane, and it was more or less necessary to do it this time because of the effort to transfer to what is hoped will be an all volunteer service.

To show the variety of thought here, we had different pay scales proposed. These involved billions of dollars. We had the Gates Commission Report, which recommended what I think were lavish expenditures for the four lower levels.

The raw recruit under that proposal—and I am referring to that because it is now in the form of the Allott amendment—would have an annual compensation, leaving out the fringe benefits—medical care, and PX and commissary privileges—of \$5,320. That is just the man you pick up on the street. That is the Allott amendment, but I am using it just as an illustration of the variety of opinions. And speaking of differences of opinion, the President of the United States turned that down.

That is my point. We will never reach a point where we will have unanimity, and I think the Senate ought to realize that and go along with what we have here in this conference report. This \$5,300 is the recommendation of the Gates Commission report for the raw recruit. The President of the United States, who originally recommended the volunteer army, would not go that far on the pay scale, so he turned it down and put in a recommendation that, in round numbers, carried about a \$1 billion pay increase, with a great deal of it to those lower groups.

The House of Representatives then passed that part plus another part, which was supposed to be the increment for fiscal 1973, next year's increase. The matter came on over here, and the Senate committee stuck with the budget figures. It came to the floor of the Senate, and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) offered an amendment to put back in the House amount. It was rejected by a fairly close vote. Then the Allott amendment was agreed to which put the sum back at the amount of the Gates Commission report—that \$5,300-plus for the raw recruit—and we went to conference on that basis.

I shall go into details on that in a minute. But in a broad sense, we compromised the categories of differences around that table and in the House bill and the Senate bill. It has been argued here that we ignored this raw recruit. We brought back in a bill that will actually provide for an E-1 recruit an annual compensation of \$4,872, meaning basic pay, subsistence, housing allowances, and Federal tax advantage. This sum, I emphasize, does not include any special payments, or the fringe benefits, including medical care and PX and commissary privileges.

Mr. President, \$4,872, now—for what? For this raw recruit. And, Mr. President, the record will show that many of them—we have the actual figures on this—who are now coming into the Army are

within what they call category 4. Around 35 percent, over one-third, are in category 4, which means they have about the equivalent of a fourth-grade education. That is unfortunate, but it is a fact of life. We are going to be paying such a man, from the beginning, \$4,872, plus commissary and PX privileges and medical care.

Unfortunately, many of those men will not be kept. They will not be able to carry on the training. They will not be eligible for reenlistment, because the services will not be able to use them. I know this is at a time when it is said the dollar does not mean anything, it does not amount to anything. But for a man who is going to be kept and cared for and given medical attention, the privileges of the post exchange, and commissary privileges, \$4,872 a year is not small money, I do not care who he is, and it is more than the average that our high school graduates get. By comparison, the average civilian pay of high school graduates under age 20 is about \$4,289 per year, which is lower than any figure being recommended.

So those are the facts of life. Let us not close our eyes. Let us not say, "Well, it is not enough, the conference bill is not enough," and just send it back. If we do that, what is going to happen? We are going to be faced here with the proposition that the President of the United States has recommended a deferral of the civilian pay increase that would automatically come up in January, and he has recommended the deferral of the military pay increase that automatically comes up in January. There is going to be a so-called veto resolution—I know there will; it is within reason—considered in Congress to veto his proposal to defer those payments.

So we will be confronted with the proposition of voting yes or no on sustaining the President about deferring these payments, after we have come in here and pushed aside this conference report that sets this pay as high as I have said, and then we say that it is not enough, we are going to make it more.

Well, I just tell you, there is going to be confusion compounded, and I do not know what the taxpayers are going to think about it. Understand, we are paying this raw recruit—he is cared for, he is looked after, he has all kinds of protection in every way, and the benefits of training and schooling, and maybe the first discipline he ever had in his life—these sums of money, as I have stated. And we are asked, now, to reject this conference report, not by saying it is not worthy, but by a holding, delaying procedure of tabling it. My goodness, when is the time coming when we will be willing to face up to the issue here, and vote yes or no?

It may be a hard vote. I am not minimizing the problem any Senator has. But that is what we came here for, to try to cast the hard votes. Anybody can cast the easy, popular votes. But let us stand up and face these hard ones.

If this report is rejected, we are going back and go over all these arguments again about this bill—pay, the draft as such, the Mansfield amendment. Already

a Senator has served notice on us that this end-the-war matter and the POW question are going to be offered as amendments on the military procurement bill, which is the next pending business. I am sure there will be other amendments about military aid in Southeast Asia, our expenditures of money there for the South Vietnamese and allied forces. We will be going over the same ground again on the procurement bill, and I do not know but that they could offer the Mansfield amendment. I do not complain about people offering amendments. My point now is that there just has to be a judgment day, when we finally say, "That's enough on this bill, we are going to pass it and move to the next one."

So all these amendments will be coming back in, on top of these real arguments on the draft bill. And that is not all. On top of that are coming the recommendations of the President of the United States about this freeze, tax reductions, and investment credits, and stepping up income tax deductions for the individual taxpayer. All of that is coming in on top of this. I speak with all deference, of course, of the Allott amendment, but I am old fashioned enough to raise the point: Where are we going to get the money? Where are we going to get the money to pay this extra \$300 million for this military pay?

This bill already is \$1.4 billion more than the budget recommendation and the budget recommendation for fiscal 1972. Now we want to make it nearly \$400 million more. So I ask: Where are we going to get the money? I especially ask that question when my best information is that our current budget for 1972, following a \$23 billion deficit last year, is running at the rate of approximately \$30 billion a year. Still, we have the arguments on the floor of the Senate that this conference report, which gives an increase of more than 54 percent to the E-4, the raw recruit, is not enough. We want to put in more. Nobody thinks about, or talks about, offering an amendment to a tax bill to provide the money.

Again, I am old fashioned enough to believe that Judgment Day comes sometime. I do not know when. But I believe that if a family goes on year after year spending more than they take in, somewhere down the highway of life there is going to be a wreck of some kind. If we drive recklessly down the highway of fiscal affairs, with billions and billions and billions of dollars in deficits year after year, this Nation is riding toward a wreck of some kind. In fact, there is plenty of evidence that our fiscal affairs are already in a jam, a national jam.

I am not given to looking at the dark side of life, but it is just commonsense. I know that we are going to have to pay. Someone will have to pay the deficit we have already incurred. Last year it was \$23 billion; this year the estimate is \$30 billion. If we passed every recommendation made on this floor from now on during this fiscal year, there would be a deficit of \$50 or \$60 billion. Somewhere, we are going to have to close ranks.

With reference to the pay schedule in

the conference report, that was a compromise around the table with respect to the different categories of pay—an adjustment of those pay scales. The Senate had to give somewhat. Has anyone here ever been at a major conference in which he did not have to give anything to anyone but just had his own way with respect to everything? Has any Senator here—has any Senator not present, but who may read my remarks—done so? If so, I wish he would come here and identify himself—anyone who never had to yield anything in any way at a conference. Either he has not been to any conferences or it was not a bill related to war, to the draft, to pay scales, to conscientious objectors, and to the subject matter we had in this bill.

Incidentally, many features of this bill are great steps forward, so far as the draft is concerned. This bill contains a tremendous amount of draft reform. I will go over that briefly later. It is not in controversy. This is progress of a very pronounced kind, based on experience and adjustments, some recommended by the President, some recommended by our committee, some recommended by the individual Members of the Senate. It is asked that that all go down the drain.

I make this flat statement. This is not a threat; it is the opposite of a threat. In my opinion—I speak as one who has had a chance to have a firm opinion about this—the pay bill before the Senate is the only military pay bill that has a chance to pass in this calendar year. I think I am familiar with the facts about this matter. I believe it is the only pay bill that has a chance to pass in this year.

I do not see how the President can recommend any other bill, when he has said he is going to defer the other increases in the military and the civilian pay, and he is talking about freezing the salaries and wages of the taxpayers. I do not see how he can come in here now and give his support to any other military pay bill this year.

Many Members of this body and the other body will have to pass on plenty of problems in this field. I do not think they will be happy about jumping in and voting for a military pay bill that is higher than the one now before the Senate.

As I have said, I do not use that as a threat; not at all. It would be out of order. It would be an extremely poor argument if it contained a threat. I am talking about the facts of life.

With respect to the other controversy, with the greatest deference, I do not believe there is any chance for the Mansfield amendment to be made any stronger through the vehicle of this bill. I have great respect for those who voted for the Mansfield amendment. But I appeal to them now—and to the author of that amendment who knows the situation—to consider the primary problem we have before us, the problem of getting a necessary bill passed for our national security; I ask them to let their vote for the Mansfield amendment, which has already been adopted by the Senate, stand as a part of their record; to let their vote for

this conference report stand as a second step on the Mansfield amendment.

The conference report gives a congressional determination—the amendment was just the Senate speaking—the conference report gives a congressional mandate, as far as it goes, about winding down of the war and taking out of the POW's. It ties together the closing of the war and the POW's—those two and no more. It talks about the POW's and the closing down of the war and withdrawing our troops, and Congress is saying that we want that to be it. That is a congressional resolution or declaration of policy. That is what the New York Times said about it as soon as it came out—that it is a step forward. The New York Times does not ordinarily back up positions I have here, and I do not blame them. I point to the Washington Post, too. They agreed, as soon as this conference report came out, that it is a step forward for the Mansfield amendment.

Some of the friends of that amendment are now trying to defeat the conference report, but not on a direct vote up or down. I would feel much better if it were just "yes" or "no." Say what you want, a tabling motion is a deferring action and a putting off of the ultimate decision.

I have tried to emphasize what I think to be the situation with reference to the main points.

I appeal to the membership of this body for an independent judgment on the vital points I have indicated—not to please me, because I am not asking for any favors—but to get the country lined up where it can protect itself; not to fight a war in Vietnam, not to fight a war in Europe. I am not thinking of that primarily. But I am thinking about the protection of this country at home. The step we will be taking, if we turn down this draft bill, will be a step toward unilateral disarmament. If we do not realize that, then I think we are the only parliamentary body in the world, the only informed government in the world, that does not realize it. Because other countries will say very quickly, "Well, if they are not going to supply themselves with the necessary manpower, we have nothing to fear from their military power."

Mr. President, I expect to repeat these preliminary remarks tomorrow because of attendance in the Chamber today I do not say that critically, as many Senators have gone to the funeral of our late friend Winston Prouty. I wish I could have gone but I am glad they did. My point is that we have not had the opportunity to get the hard facts before the Senators. We do get them, theoretically, before all Senators, by means of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but not before the Senators themselves.

Now, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) wishes me to yield to him and I am glad to do so briefly, if I may say briefly.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, first of all, generally speaking, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the stand he has taken and the arguments he has advanced.

The Senator from Mississippi is considered to be one of the eminent authorities not only on strategic military matters but also on tactical matters, our defense posture, the subject of armaments and all other related subjects pertaining thereto.

I should like to suggest a couple of points and then ask a question or two with reference to those points.

The Senator from Mississippi has pointed out that the impact of further delay in getting an extension of the draft at an early date will bring the defense posture of this country to a perilous point—and very, very soon.

Already, some of the adverse effects of the delay have been listed, and they are notable. So we already have in this phase one potential bad effect which will flow from a rejection of the conference report.

Another potential bad effect in rejecting the conference report will be the inadequacy of military pay, as alleged by some, provided for some ranks in the military service. Assuming that this opposition is of substance and merit, that argument would bring about a second potential bad effect.

I should like to pose this question to the Senator from Mississippi: Is it not true that we are at a point where we must make an assignment of priorities? In that search for the most desirable priority, would there not be considerable logic to try to avoid that potential bad effect, which is irrecoverable and which cannot be corrected or restored and, maybe, could not be cured at all except at the expense of a great threat to the defense posture of this Nation, as opposed to trying to avoid a second potential bad effect which, even granting the merit of the cause, is something that would not be permanent but could be corrected in a short interval of time, and at a time when recovery could be effected with the least possible detrimental effect upon the national defense posture.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has expressed it so well. If it should prove that it takes an increase in the military pay bill, we could remedy that, but the tragedy is the time that would be lost in letting the trained submarine crews, the ICBM crews and all the other crews that go to make up the necessary weapons—letting them move on out and leave without having any replacements trained to take their place. That would be unilateral disarmament. The Senator has put it well.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is a scar that would be most difficult to erase, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. It could not be erased except by having to wait it out or sweat it out in the time that we would have.

Mr. HRUSKA. The same argument could be made to the points of difference that we had in the conference that were resolved one way or the other. The Senator has pointed out the situation in regard to the Mansfield amendment. That can be taken up at a later time in another bill and with great promptness, in the event of the persistence being attached to it that some of its advocates have already indicated. But it need not be done now in this conference report.

If it is not done now, it does not result in any great prejudice to its later consideration, does it?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Yes, sir. There are many other avenues that the Senator from Montana has open to him. I am not trying to suggest what he should do.

Mr. HRUSKA. And promptly?

Mr. STENNIS. Oh, yes. Within a matter of days. Certainly within the next 2 or 3 weeks. Those avenues are open and he is capable of pursuing them vigorously, too. Of course he knows that. I imagine he has considered it.

Mr. HRUSKA. At any rate?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. He has pointed it out very clearly.

Mr. HRUSKA. I want to assure the Senator from Mississippi that this Senator proposes to support his position and to do so by a proper vote at the proper time. I am very grateful to the Senator for the fashion in which he has analyzed this bill and presented it to the Senate. So there is a clear and full understanding of the real and fundamental issues involved.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution to the debate and for his support. I hope that his thoughts and facts will come through to his colleagues. I thank him again.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRAVEL. I am grateful to the Senator from Mississippi. I should like to ask a question.

It has been repeatedly stated that the nonexistence of the draft today poses a threat to our military and to our defense posture. Other than the fact that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has stated that, and now the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) has stated it, and the Secretary of Defense has stated it, I placed in the RECORD yesterday figures that adequately demonstrate that no threat is involved. So perhaps we could get down to some specifics as to where the threat might be, so that we could evaluate this contention.

I am not persuaded by the general statement that we are losing men from the Poseidons or the submarines, because I happen to know the figure. Many Senators do not. The figure for the personnel in the whole strategic force of this country is 134,000.

We have 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces today. So I think there is a little slack between 134,000 men and 2.7 million men.

I think that that slack could very easily be taken up over a period of 10 years without the draft. So rather than merely take the loosely made statements of the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that we are about to be visited by more cataclysmic occurrence, I should like to have more specifics. Perhaps I could be persuaded that there is a danger, but I should like to have the specific figures.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall respond briefly to the Senator. I have additional material on that question. I have data and material on that in another speech.

The Senator and I have argued these

things many times on the floor. And the Senator is a very fine speaker and presents his facts well and very forcefully. I am going to make a speech based upon the conference that was held on yesterday at my request with these men that know more about the matter than I know or than the Senator from Alaska knows.

The Senator from Alaska is very firmly convinced that we do not need any draft. He has said repeatedly that he would filibuster this bill, if possible, to its death. I will ask the Senator to wait until he hears my other speech. I am under the gun, time-wise, in trying to get this matter back in the minds of the Senators.

This shot from the side has been threatened to be fired tomorrow—it is not from the back, but from the side—contained in a motion to table.

So I am determined that everyone will have a chance to get the facts as I see them. It is a very grave situation with reference to a manpower shortage that we are threatened with.

I thank the Senator for waiting until we get back to this matter at another time.

Mr. President, in an effort to get the facts to the Members of the Senate, I am mailing this morning a letter dated today to each of my colleagues in the Senate regarding the pay raise matter set forth in the conference report. In order to further spread these facts, and so that they will be available to any staff member who wants to read them, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Senate is being urged to reject the Selective Service Conference Report on the basis that the pay increases being recommended are insufficient. This charge will not stand any reasonable test.

The \$2.4 billion proposed increase is the most costly military pay bill ever recommended—nearly two and a half times the amount originally requested by the President for this year.

Let me point out the increases being recommended for the lower enlisted grades since this question is the primary issue. For the E-1 raw recruit, annual compensation would be increased to \$4872, from \$3165, a 54% increase. This sum, I emphasize, does not include any special pays and the fringe benefits including medical care, PX and commissary privileges. For the E-2, the amount goes to \$5311, from \$3345, a 59% increase; the E-3 to \$5663, from \$3931, a 44% increase; the E-4 to \$6189, from \$5253, an 18% increase. The average recruit reaches E-3 in 9 or 10 months. By comparison the average civilian pay of high school graduates under age 20 is about \$4289 per year, which is lower than any figure being recommended.

This bill provides ample money for the volunteer force. A 2-year draft extension, however, is essential to give the volunteer force a chance. It should be crystal clear that enlisted personnel with under 2 years' service are not being shortchanged. With this bill, the under 2 basic pay rates will have been increased by 189% since 1952, as compared to 151% for all the over 2 rates. Over 71% of the increases in the bill would go to those with under 2 years' service (compared

to 64% in the House bill and 74% in the Senate bill). At the same time the Conference Report recognizes the career force, without which the Services cannot survive, in the form of the increased housing allowances urged by the House.

The Report reverses this division since under present rates these cumulative increases since 1952 have been only 79.5% for the under 2 and 144% for the over 2.

You are being urged to send the pay increase back to Conference and adopt another proposal adding \$381 million in annual cost to the bill. There can be endless preferences on any Conference Report and on this premise every conference agreement could be rejected, not only in the Senate, but in the House. The Senate should not attempt to override President Nixon's wage stabilization policy by adding another \$381 million in annual military pay costs. To reject the Conference Report and thereby reopen all conference issues will jeopardize any pay raise at all and serves to create the manpower crisis due to the absence of the draft.

The Conference Report needs no apology, is a fair legislative compromise, and I urge you to vote to support it.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. STENNIS.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, returning to my more formal remarks, the cornerstone of the legislative process is the acceptance of a reasonable compromise of differences between the membership, in the beginning, of each branch of Congress and then the acceptance of a reasonable compromise of differences between the House and Senate as expressed in a conference bill.

On a major matter, and this goes from the smallest item regarding military pay of personnel to the settlement of the war in Vietnam, anyone would know that there has got to be some compromise in a settlement of a bill that touches on that subject matter.

If either body refuses to operate on this premise, the Congress will cease to effectively function as a legislative body. It can continue to function as a talking body, but it will not continue as a legislative body to pass bills unless there is some compromise.

Mr. President, I submit that this conference bill is a reasonable compromise of these various differences. As I indicated in my remarks on yesterday, the Senate prevailed on a number of issues, including a numerical induction ceiling, revised authorized strength ceiling, registrant procedural rights, and others. Many of those provisions were written in here in the Senate at the insistence of very sincere and able Members of this body who, I understand, now plan to turn around and vote against the conference report just because it did not have something else in it that they wanted.

Members of this body can use any number of reasons for voting against the conference report—they think the pay provisions are either too large or too small, that the Mansfield amendment is not strong enough in its present form, that the various selective service adjustments did not include a sufficient number of the changes voted on by the Senate, or for other reasons. However, Mr. President, there is one overriding reason why Senators should vote for this conference report. And that is the defense of

the United States, the necessity to provide a draft law for 2 years. Without it, we will face a most serious crisis. I appeal now, as I shall appeal again tomorrow, to the Senate to support the President of the United States. I am not talking about Richard Nixon. I am talking about the President of the United States, our supreme constitutionally elected executive authority. We should support him to provide the needed manpower with which to defend this country, to man our Polaris crews at sea, our B-52 crews in the air and on the ground, the forces with which to defend this country from obliteration from a nuclear attack. We hope to have a volunteer force in the future. But we do not have it and we cannot have it as of this date. There has got to be a law.

The idea of going into a volunteer army now, all of a sudden, just by putting in a little extra money, is like a man who says that he wants an education and he wants to get it by 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. It just will not happen in that way.

If we ever have an effective, worthy all-volunteer military service, it is going to have to be built from the ground up, and gradually.

Mr. President, aside from the merits of the pay matter, let me point out a serious parliamentary situation confronting another conference on this bill, especially as it relates to the House Members.

As this bill was amended and passed by the Senate, it was determined that seven of the Senate-passed provisions, not contained in the House version, were subject to a point of order on the floor of the House under the new House germaneness rule, pursuant to the new reorganization act of last year.

I emphasize that, because the new House rule is not ordinarily understood over here because it is new. The matter is not as it was when the Senator from West Virginia was a Member of the House. It is not as it was last year. This is a new rule, and I want to emphasize that.

Mr. President, in order to carry out the spirit of the adjustments that we made at the conference table, in order to carry out their promise of what they would try to do to get the bill passed in the House, and in order to have the widest possible latitude in considering the differences at the conference table, Chairman HÉBERT said he would go before the House Rules Committee in an effort to get the rule of germaneness waived so that the Mansfield amendment could be passed upon in the House. Otherwise, one Member of the House could have knocked it out on the floor of the House and end the matter. One Member of the House could make a point of order, and if the point of order was sustained by the Chair, that would have ended the Mansfield amendment.

After some difficulty, the House Rules Committee late last July agreed that points of order will be waived. That meant that a Member of the House could not make that point of order.

As the Senate well knows, the House is reluctant to waive points of order, and it was only after some persuasion that they were waived in the case of this bill.

Mr. President, the Senate should understand that, if a point of order is raised by a House Member and is sustained by the House Parliamentarian, the item at issue is automatically ruled out of order from being considered. Further, the record should show that one of the provisions which would have been subject to a point of order in the House, had it not been waived, was the so-called Mansfield resolution, dealing with the termination of hostilities in Indochina.

It is an open question, Mr. President, as to whether the House committee would be successful once again in waiving all such points of order, or even whether the House conferees would be willing to attempt to repeat the process in view of the obvious difficulty of trying it the second time.

By way of emphasis, as I have already indicated, every Senate-House difference except those which might be ruled out on a point of order would again be at issue in a new conference—not just the pay matter discussed by Senator ALLOTT.

The primary attack on this conference report has been that it leaves out too much of the Mansfield amendment.

No one who voted for the Mansfield amendment has been willing to discuss what is left of the Mansfield amendment, and there is very definitely something left.

In each House each Member has to follow his own judgment. But, Mr. President, do not let anyone sell you on the idea that we can object to this conference report on the grounds of the Allott amendment and the Mansfield amendment and send it back to conference and that those matters would be the only things in issue. Everything that was in issue before will be in issue again. The House will even have to appoint conferees again because they have already passed the conference report and discharged their conferees. I think the Senate would again have to go through the process of appointing conferees. Anyway, it would be a new start with respect to everything in conference; it would be everything all over again with no holds barred.

Mr. President, I repeat the challenge I made a few minutes ago. If any Senator knows how he can make a House Member do something or force a House Member to sign a conference report I wish that Senator would get up and tell us how to do it. I do not think that anyone who has ever been to a conference on a bill that is controversial can tell us how to make a person do something he does not want to do. The same is true on the floor of the Senate. This is not that kind of body and neither is the House. Members cannot be made to do anything. I emphasize that we went over every single part and parcel of this bill; we went over and over the bill for 5 weeks.

Mr. President, I turn now to the speech of the senior Senator from Colorado. As I interpret his remarks, he makes three points with respect to the conference report.

First. He feels that the report should have provided for an annual pay expenditure of about \$300 million more than the \$2.4 billion being recommended in the report.

Second. In what he referred to as traditional injustices, he criticizes the conference report's reduction in the pay for the lowest enlisted grades, as compared to the Gates rates passed by the Senate.

Third. The Senator from Colorado also takes issue with housing allowance increases but acknowledges that these are subject to compromise.

NEW PAY PROPOSALS BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Mr. President, Senator ALLOTT has urged the Senate to reject the conference report because of its pay provisions and consider a new pay proposal. In effect, he urges that all of the increases recommended in the conference report be adopted including the housing allowance for the career forces. In addition, he proposes a slight increase in the quarters allowances of \$5 and \$9 a month for certain lower enlisted grades with a total cost of \$18 million. Moreover, he proposes that the basic pay rates for the lower enlisted grades be increased, at an annual cost of \$360 million, over the recommendation by the conferees. The total annual cost of his proposal is \$381 million over the annual cost of the conference report.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado proposes that the basic pay rates for the lower enlisted grades be increased by an annual cost of \$360 million over a recommendation by the conferees. The total annual cost of this proposal is \$381 million over the annual cost in the conference report.

I will not repeat at length what I said a minute ago about these bills running up. I point out that \$381 million is a good deal of money. We have just closed a year where we were \$23 billion in the hole, and we are now running a deficit, I understand, of \$30 billion, and we are talking about decreasing taxes, if the President's recommendation is passed.

We already have in the conference report more than \$1.5 billion above the budget. The Allott amendment would add \$381 million on top of that, beyond the budget. No provision is made anywhere to pay for it. There is no talk about increasing taxes; the talk is about decreasing taxes.

I will not go over my concern about pay day coming some day. I covered that a few moments ago to these virtually empty chairs. But it is a fact of life, and I think it has a place in the consideration of this matter.

DISCUSSION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT

GENERAL COMMENTS

Mr. President, the pay raises in this conference report need no apology. This pay bill, of \$2.4 billion, is the largest military pay proposal in the history of this country.

President Nixon is seeking the cooperation of all the country including the Congress in trying to stabilize pay rates. Yet, the Senate is being urged to reject the conference report's rates as insufficient and adopt a new proposal of adding \$381 million in annual costs to military pay.

Mr. President, the charge has been made that the conferees should have increased pay costs by another \$300 million above the \$2.4 billion recommended,

in view of the levels approved by the two bodies.

Let me emphasize that the conferees were not attempting to come up with a particular annual dollar cost total. Each of the seven pay elements was considered separately and judged on its own merits.

In addition, I would like to answer in some detail the criticism of the conference report.

LOWER ENLISTED PAY RATES

The basic pay issue is the sufficiency of the pay increases for the lower enlisted grades. Mr. President, we are faced with the old question of how much is enough. I would like to make the following points in this regard: There was a time when the charge could be accurately made that pay rates for those with under 2 years of service were not sufficient. These rates were not increased between 1952 and 1965. At present, under existing rates since 1952, the under 2 enlisted pay rates have been increased 79.5 percent as compared to 144 percent in basic pay for enlisted people with over 2 years of service.

With the adoption of the conference report, however, the cumulative increase since 1952 for enlisted men and women with under 2 years of service would be 189 percent compared to 151 percent with those of over 2 years of service. In other words, the under 2 go ahead after this bill is adopted.

Under the Gates rates passed by the Senate the under 2 would have been increased by 216 percent as compared to 161 percent for the over 2.

I repeat, Mr. President, for the period since 1952, this conference report recognizes the under 2 enlisted pay grades with a proposed cumulative increase of 189 percent as compared to the 151 percent for those with under 2.

DISCUSSION OF COMPENSATION LEVELS BETWEEN THE PRESENT AND THE CONFERENCE PROPOSAL

The next question, Mr. President, is whether overall compensation levels for these lower grades, established by the conference report, are sufficient.

Mr. President, I would like to compare the present and the proposed compensation levels as provided for these lower grades in the report. I refer now, as Senator ALLOTT did, to regular military compensation, which includes basic pay, quarters allowance, subsistence, and tax advantage. For the E-1 grade, the annual figure will be \$4,872, a 54-percent increase from the present annual total of \$3,165; for the E-2, an annual level of \$5,311 is proposed, a 59-percent increase over the present \$3,345 total; for the E-3, \$5,663 would be provided, a 44-percent increase over the present \$3,931; for the E-4, \$6,189, 18-percent over the present \$5,253. In terms of basic pay only, Mr. President, under the conference report the E-1 recruit is increased 99.8 percent—from \$134.40 to \$268.50, plus \$134.10; the E-1 over 4 months is increased 86.8 percent—\$143.70 to \$268.50, plus \$124.80; the E-2, 100.6 percent—from \$149.10 to \$299.10, plus \$150; the E-3, 72 percent—from \$180.90 to \$311.10, plus \$140.20; the E-4, 29.4 percent—from \$249.90 to \$323.40, plus \$73.50. All of these figures reflect the under 2 rates for these

grades. None of these compensation totals, Mr. President, include any of the special pays or fringe benefits, such as medical care, commissary, and PX privileges.

These figures as I have already pointed out, run considerably above the average high school graduate compensation for the first year that a young man is employed in the civilian forces.

I point out again for emphasis that some of the raw recruits that we take in have only a fourth grade level education, and they will receive \$4,872 per year. This does not include any special pays and fringe benefits, including medical care, PX, and commissary privileges.

By comparison, the average civilian high school graduate under age 21 receives pay of \$4,289 per year, which is lower than any figure being recommended.

I think that is a very liberal sum, frankly, for an untried man who may have an education level of as low as fourth grade or not a very high grade of intelligence. Before he is trained one day, he starts receiving pay at this rate and has all this medical care and dental care, and PX and commissary privileges, drawing \$4,872 a year.

Some of them will not prove to be worthy and will not be capable of taking the training, and some of them will be, and they will become very valuable men and will go on up the ladder and will be worth that money, some of them many times over. But I tell you right now, Mr. President, we are going a long, long way in taxing people who do not make that much money after they have been on a job for years and having a part of their pay taken away by a tax bill to pay salaries this high for men who are beginners.

I think it is a very liberal and very fair compensation. I do not know anywhere in government or out of government where a man has a better chance to go forward, and rapidly for a while, than he does in the military service, and the other benefits they will get, if they will take them, over and beyond money value, because the money value cannot be arrived at.

COMPARISON OF LEVELS WITH COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

Mr. President, how do these compensation levels proposed in the report compare to comparable earnings in the civilian economy? I think an accurate comparison would match the average pay of high school graduates under 20 years of age. Census Bureau data, adjusted October 1, 1971, indicate that the average annual pay for such a graduate in the civilian economy is \$4,289 per year. This sum I should emphasize, Mr. President, is less than the lowest level being recommended by the conference report, which is \$4,872 for the E-1 as I have already indicated.

Mr. President, comparisons are seldom in order, but I just do not know of any place where the pay is as liberal to a person with as little training and as little experience and with as low a level of intelligence—and I say that with all respect—and with as low a level of educational training.

RAPID ENLISTED PROMOTION

Mr. President, I would like to remove any impression that enlisted men languish for any long period of time in these lower enlisted grades. Within 4 months after induction, the average recruit will become an E-2 and, under this report will be entitled to annual compensation of \$5,311—an increase of almost \$2,000 over the existing level. Practically all military personnel entering the military service attain the grade of E-3 within 9 or 10 months and thereby become entitled to annual compensation of \$5,603.

With the other benefits that go with that pay, it is not just small change to receive an attainment of pay like that within 9 or 10 months after they come into the service. That is the pay scale under the proposed bill, the conference report bill.

Mr. President, during the long debate on the pay question, much has been said about the number of military families below the poverty line. Some of the conclusions were speculative. At my request, the military services made a survey to determine the number of military families that would actually be in this situation if the conference report is agreed to.

In order to come within the so-called presidential poverty guidelines under the terms of the conference report, a man must be an E-1—that is, just entering the service—and have at least five dependents. I think it is very obvious that he should not be taken in anyway if he already has five dependents. There is something else he can do to help the country along, and that is to take care of his five dependents.

Our survey determined that there were only 14 men, out of a total of 133,000 men in the grade of E-1, recruit, who would be eligible for assistance under the President's family assistance plan, which calls for an annual compensation of \$5,190 for this category. But, of these 14 men, five were in the E-1 grade because of a reduction in rank, meaning due to misconduct. We cannot underwrite everybody, everywhere, all of the time, especially a man who loses a part of his pay and rank because of loose conduct.

The remaining nine would not be under the poverty level on an annual basis, since they would normally be promoted in 4 months.

Even for this minor group, if any value is placed on the fringe benefits, all would be clearly above the poverty line.

I hope that these facts, determined by an analysis, will lay to rest, once and for all, the so-called poverty question as it applies to this report. During the debate on this report, charges of the existence of poverty have bounded around the Chamber like a basketball bouncing up and down a basketball court. But lo and behold, when we get down to the facts of life and analyze the real situation about the so-called poverty families in the military, we find the situation I have just related. It was found that out of all this group, only 14 men out of a total of 133,000 in the E-1 class would be eligible for assistance under the President's family plan.

But of those 14, Mr. President, five were in the E-1 grade because of reduc-

tion in rank, meaning misconduct. I repeat that for the benefit of those who might have come in.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude this part of the formal portion of my remarks. I wish to summarize and repeat some points for the benefit of Senators who have come in.

As Senators know, this matter is now back before us on the bill as recommended by the conferees of the two Houses. It is attacked on two principal grounds, even though, if the conference report is rejected, it will then be open for further conference on all grounds. But the attack made on it, and the threatened attack of making a motion to table sometime tomorrow, are based on two principal grounds. One of them relates to the Mansfield amendment. I have covered that in considerable detail, always in a deferential way. I have great respect for those who voted for the Mansfield amendment. But I ask them again to consider the point that that matter about ending the war at a certain time, with a certain timetable on it, advanced a great step forward when the Mansfield amendment passed this body by a handsome vote. This is step 1, which all those who are interested in it have taken; and it was a long stride.

But after all, that was just a Senate-passed amendment. Now, though, this conference report, which some propose to just scuttle, certainly has within it a part of the Mansfield amendment, not just a Senate expression this time, but as an expression of Congress, which has already been adopted by the House of Representatives, where the opposition to it was severe. That was done over there by getting the Rules Committee, under their new rules, to waive points of order. Otherwise, as I understand their new rules, one Member, by merely objecting to the Mansfield amendment part of the conference report, could have had it knocked out if the Parliamentarian agreed that it was not germane, and my information is that it would have been ruled that way. I have not talked to the Parliamentarian, but that is my information.

Anyway, they waived the rules of order to get a bill passed, and it did pass over there.

The New York Times has said that the conference report bill is a step forward, in that it is the first legislative declaration about winding down this war and coming on out of there with our men, and tied onto it is the POW release, not tied to all these points we went in there with, about making accommodations with South Vietnam or anyone else. It is a legislative determination to get out. It does not set a date; we could not get that. We are not going to get that in this way on this bill, I do not think. But it says the policy is to come on out, and it is tied to the POW question.

With great deference, and in behalf of all the membership of this committee who are interested in the Mansfield amendment, I counsel the Senate, do not scuttle that step forward—and it is a step forward. Do not kill that with this bill. Keep it alive, and let us let it pass. Then there are other avenues open. We

have a bill right here following this one, military procurement. I am not suggesting that it be offered as an amendment to that, but I am talking about open avenues, now. We are going to have debate on many of these kindred matters, which is another reason for adopting this conference report now, and at least getting it behind us. We have been served with notice that someone is going to offer an amendment about POW's on the military procurement bill. There are other methods, such as a resolution which would not go to either of the military committees. That avenue is open. I am not advocating that, but I am suggesting it as a reason and a ground to go on and pass this legislation, which almost all of us think is necessary. Everyone here except 16 voted for the bill when it passed. That is an extraordinary situation. All Senators except 16, and the Senator from Montana, was one of those 16, voted for this bill, and it comes back, not with all the provisions, but most of the provisions, as to pay that the Senate had in it. It has many other provisions, leaving out, now, for the moment, the Mansfield amendment, that the Senate passed, and we vigorously urged them in conference. I have been over them once; I shall go over them again before the debate is over. Many so-called reforms, over and beyond the House bill, are in this conference report, and as I say, a sizable remnant of the Mansfield amendment is in this bill.

That is what the New York Times and the Washington Post said. They do not ordinarily stand with me, and I do not ordinarily quote them, perhaps, but that is their version of it. And they are informed; their men know.

So I appeal to all Senators who are holding back here—and there are some very fine ones, including the author of the Mansfield amendment—to come on and close ranks, now, and pass this bill, and get rid of that much, and then other avenues are open for the others who wish to try again.

Otherwise, I do not believe we will get a military pay bill this year, and I want to repeat that in the presence of the Senators who are now present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was interested in what the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee had to say about the Senate amendment having to do with termination of hostilities in Indochina.

May I say that I, of course—as I have stated many times—will not vote for a draft bill under any circumstances, nor will I vote for a draft conference report. My reason primarily is that the draft law is inadequate and unfair. I would be not at all averse to considering universal military service, which would affect everyone, but not a system which is so inequitable, unfair, and has so many loopholes. So much for that.

So far as the Senate amendment on the termination of hostilities in Indochina is concerned, what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said is cor-

rect. He has worked long and hard to keep as much of the Senate amendment as possible. I would also agree with him that the amendment as agreed to in conference goes a long way in the direction which I am sure all of us seek—that is, to become a full partner with the President in trying to bring this tragic and wasteful war to an ultimate conclusion.

But I still do not think—speaking personally—that it goes far enough. It is not that I am in love with the language which the Senate has agreed to. But I cannot reconcile myself to the disposition of the word "policy" of the United States and the replacement with "sense of Congress." To me, "policy" has more strength than "sense," and is more determinative, and should be more effective.

Nevertheless, I agree with the chairman of the committee that the fact that the House and the Senate did get together on this in conference is a long step forward—and for the first time. The two Houses of Congress, at least, are acting together in urging the President to take the initiative to achieve a ceasefire, a practicable date for the withdrawal—and note this—of all, repeat, all, military forces of the United States, contingent only upon the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam, and so forth. The word "all" is very important; because if this is carried through, it will mean that no residual force will be there, so to speak, and I want to see this country withdraw—lock, stock, and barrel.

(Applause in the Visitors' Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be no more demonstrations in the galleries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

That is along the order that Gen. Matthew Ridgway, for example, one of the real soldier-statesmen this Republic has produced in modern times, advocated, if I recall correctly, in Foreign Affairs Quarterly—he called for a 9-month termination date and then a withdrawal of all our armed personnel, leaving only the Marine guards at the Embassy to take care of the security situation there.

As to the third factor, which the distinguished Senator and I have discussed, frankly, I would be more than willing if an agreement could be reached to have an up and down vote on the conference report. But if what I hear is correct, if we attempt to operate on that basis, we will be confronted with a talkathon. For my part, I do not want to see the consideration of this conference report delayed any longer than necessary.

Because of my desire—and the desire of others, I assume—it is quite possible that a tabling motion will be made tomorrow. That at least, if it is made, will give the Senate an indication of the difference in feeling and view in this body. If it is agreed to—I do not know whether or not it will; I have not taken a poll and do not intend to—then, of course, we get to the question of going back to conference with instructions.

It would be my intention in that case to try to get the Senate to agree to instructions relative to the Senate amendment as it was adopted by the Senate 2½

months ago, with the proviso that the 9-month period be shortened by the 2½ months which have elapsed. If the tabling motion is not agreed to, then, of course, we are open to continued debate, and the only procedure to be followed then would be to invoke cloture. I do not know whether that could be achieved, but my guess is that it would not be achieved immediately.

I do not intend to filibuster, any more than, as stated, I do not intend to vote for the conference report. But, so far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, the situation in Vietnam is not going to be placed on the back burner as long as that conflict exists and as long as I am a Member of this body.

I cannot reconcile myself to the fact that as of September 9, 1971—these are figures released by the Department of Defense—301,504 Americans have been wounded, 45,487 Americans have been killed in combat, 9,757 Americans have died from noncombat injuries. The total casualties as of September 9, less than a week ago, were 356,784 Americans. Too many, too much, too long.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Montana, but I ask the Senator this question: Is it not true, talking about finding out the sentiment of the Senate, that if the motion to table should prevail, that would mean that the conference report is dead? Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the time being.

Mr. STENNIS. The conference report, as such, is dead.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. It is a new start.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. It is further true that then we would be back to the point where we passed the bill on the rollcall vote on June 29 or 27, whatever the date was. We would be back to that point, would we not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. As to instructions the Senate might give, none of that, of course, would be binding on the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator would propose to instruct only in the limited field that he mentioned. So the Senate conferees would go back and confront a group that had no instructions on their part, and the Senate conferees would be morally bound only to the degree of the instructions on those two subjects. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senate conferees would have no control over what would be brought up at the conference table, because the House conferees would be footloose and fancy free, unless the House limited its conferees.

It is true, as the Senator knows, that the House already has discharged its conferees and it would be a new start for them, too. I appreciate, though, the Senator's remarks.

I understand the Senator now wishes to take a recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the Senator has laid out the steps, because I must repeat, regardless of the outcome, I want action. I do not want this matter dragged out, because we have other business to attend to. Every Senator will vote as he sees fit, because what any Senator does is that Senator's responsibility.

I hope that I have made my position clear. I do not wish to repeat it. I do not intend to make a speech tomorrow, because the facts are there for all to see.

I would, though, express this hope, that if the motion to table is made tomorrow, we lay aside at least 4 hours for that motion, to be equally divided.

I would hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee would agree with me in that contention.

Mr. STENNIS. I indicated in my opening remarks that I was very much concerned that a bill which has taken 7 months, with so much work on it by the membership, and so many decisions having been made, and then having it go to conference, and now to have it shot down, not in the back, but from the side, with a motion to table that does not decide anything, merely compounds the confusion.

I want a decision like the Senator from Montana, except I want a different decision.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say that we are basically not in disagreement. One way is to get quick action, and the other may be weeks away from action. The best thing to do is to try to determine what the sentiment is in the Senate at this time.

Now, Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and when the Senator from Alabama has completed his remarks, I would suggest that he ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 p.m. today as a further mark of respect to our late departed colleague, Senator Winston L. Prouty of Vermont.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield, at the termination of that recess, then we will go back on the draft conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY A DELEGATION FROM THE SENATE OF THE REPUBLIC OF FRANCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we are honored today by the presence of three distinguished Senators from the friendly country of France.

They are in this country studying primarily civil aviation and problems related thereto.

We have just been favored with the presence of these distinguished gentlemen at a luncheon given in their honor by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It has been good to have them here. I should like at this time to present the three Senators who are here:

Marcel Fortier, Senator of Indre-et-Loire, Union of Democrats for the Republic, Chairman of the Delegation.

Henry Henneguelle, Senator of Pas-de-Calais (Socialist).

Yves Durand, Senator Vendée (unaffiliated).

We are delighted to have these distinguished Senators with us, and very glad they could be here—even for this brief time—on the floor of the Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair welcomes the three distinguished Senators from the Republic of France.

RECESS AS A MARK OF RESPECT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in keeping with the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 p.m. today, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our departed colleague, Winston L. Prouty, of Vermont; and that when the Senate reconvenes at 2:30 p.m. today, it resume consideration of the conference report on the extension and revision of the draft act and related laws.

The motion was agreed to; and—at 2:03 p.m.—the Senate took a recess until 2:30 p.m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEALL).

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF THE DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 6531, which emasculates the substance of the Mansfield amendment. I voted for the original McGovern-Hatfield provision calling for a date certain to end the war as of December 31, 1971. When this measure failed, I then voted for the Mansfield amendment calling for a 9-month deadline for withdrawal of all American forces from Indochina subject to the release of all American prisoners of war.

I believe this war will not be terminated unless Congress sets a policy for a specific deadline as articulated in the Mansfield amendment. The conference revision expresses the provision as "the sense of Congress" rather than "the policy of the United States," thereby destroying the binding effect of the Mansfield amendment. Moreover, the conferees have eliminated the 9-month deadline and substituted a "date certain to be negotiated" rather than the Mansfield requirement that the President establish a final date for withdrawal "not later than 9 months after enactment."

In light of President Nixon's recent statements, his policy of Vietnamization,

and his failure to respond to the NLF peace proposal of July 1, it is clear to me that he is unwilling to set a date certain to end the war.

The Congress, therefore, must insist that the President not conduct this outrageous war any longer without providing a firm war policy calling for specific plans to end it.

Congress has the power to declare war and the power to undeclare war. The repeal of the Tonkin Gulf resolution terminated any congressional authority ever granted the Executive Office to wage war in Indochina. The President's constitutional authority is thus limited to expediting the withdrawal of American forces with all deliberate speed.

Firm congressional action to end the war becomes even more imperative as the administration's failure to intervene to assure the people of South Vietnam an opportunity for a political choice undermines the moral basis for claims by four American Presidents to justify intervention in Vietnam. Rather than demonstrating responsible competitive democracy, the South Vietnamese election travesty has shredded hopes that 45,000 Americans have died to win for the people of South Vietnam an opportunity to choose their own government.

This denial of a meaningful political contest is all the more reason for an immediate withdrawal of troops and termination of further economic or military aid to Saigon.

Frequently in recent weeks, I have urged the President also to test the July 1 National Liberation Front peace initiative and actively to explore the possibility of a settlement based on this new concession. The President, however, apparently is using his proposed visit to China as an excuse for failure to respond.

I am convinced that Hanoi's seven point peace proposal holds the key to peace and talks with Communist China. There can be no substitute for direct negotiations with Hanoi by a constructive response to the unanswered seven-point proposal that lies on the table in Paris. It is difficult for me to believe that Peking can force Hanoi to yield in light of recent disclosures that the Soviet Union supplies North Vietnam with some \$500 million in military aid per year or 65 percent of North Vietnam's total foreign military aid.

Because the administration has resisted a specific withdrawal timetable and cease-fire arrangement; because the administration has failed to assure the people of South Vietnam an opportunity to choose their own government; and because the administration has failed to respond positively and creatively to the NLF peace initiative, it is imperative that the Congress set a clear date for termination of this shameful chapter in our history by adoption of the original Mansfield amendment.

This bloody war in Indochina has taken its toll in American lives and American dollars. Even on a reduced scale, the war has a planned expenditure of \$14 billion in fiscal 1972. This severely shortchanges our ability to fund domestic human needs. The Congress must set a date certain for the termina-

tion of this tragic war. The President is unlikely to defy the clear mandate of the Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the business before the Senate, the extension of the draft act, selective service legislation, has, as my colleagues well know, precipitated a very serious controversy.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee is now extremely disturbed about the strength of our armed services. All of us are very disturbed about the stories which have been appearing in a local newspaper, and in some other papers, about the demoralization of our Armed Forces, especially those now stationed in Germany.

It is not news that our armed services are scattered about in stations in some 30-odd countries, ranging all the way from a couple of hundred thousand in Vietnam and Germany down to small bases.

The circumstances in which we find ourselves, it seems to me, are such that it justifies reviewing some of the incidents, some of the history, that have led up to the situation which has necessitated continuation of the draft act throughout these many years, and with which we are now confronted in the bill before the Senate.

Just a little over a week ago, Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, former Chairman of the Council of Ministers and First Secretary of the Communist Party, passed away. In 1959 he came to this country and there was a meeting. I think what he had to say is not only interesting historically, but it is relevant to some of the problems that confront us here today. I believe it will be appropriate to recall to the Members of this body and to the press the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and some invited guests. It was not a formal meeting of the committee as such, but it was sponsored by the Foreign Relations Committee. It was held on September 16, 1959, and I think would be of interest to recall now.

Chairman Khrushchev was invited to meet informally for a cup of tea at 5 p.m. in room F-53 in the Capitol. The reason for this meeting was that the responsible authorities had declined to invite Chairman Khrushchev to a joint session of the Congress, a practice theretofore customary in the case of visiting Heads of State of important nations. Several Members of the Senate outside of the committee were invited to the meeting, along with other guests. According to my best memory and the informal notes made after the meeting, the following were present: Senator Aiken, Senator Long, Senator Sparkman, Senator Kuchel, the late Senator Green, the late Senator Dirksen, Sen-

ator Hayden, the then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, the late Senator Wiley, Senator Mansfield, the late Senator Russell, Senator Morse, the late former Senator John F. Kennedy, Senator Gore, Senator Ellender, Senator Church, Senator Bush, Senator Hartke, Senator Carroll, Senator J. Clark, the late Senator Dworshak, Senator Eugene McCarthy, Senator McGee, and Senator Jackson.

I am not sure that is a complete list, but I believe they were all present.

Chairman Khrushchev had appeared at a luncheon with the National Press Club for approximately 2½ hours just prior to the meeting in the Capitol. I recall that the Chairman arrived 5 minutes early, much to my surprise as he had a most vigorous and lively discussion with the members of the press at the luncheon meeting. This was further evidence of his enormous physical and psychological stamina.

For the following synopsis of the discussion, I have omitted the comments and questions of the individual Senators inasmuch as it is impracticable and in some cases impossible to obtain their approval within a reasonable time. Also, some remarks by Mr. Khrushchev's colleagues have been omitted.

As chairman of the committee, I made a few introductory remarks, approximately as follows:

On behalf of the Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and other Members of the Senate of the United States, I welcome you to this informal meeting in this historic Committee room.

Under our Constitutional system, the Committee on Foreign Relations has a particular responsibility regarding our relations with the Soviet Union and all other foreign countries.

I have long believed that meetings between people who have different views about important matters is an appropriate way to proceed. We are glad to have you here today, and I am glad you and our President are to have conversations about our relations.

Your country and our country are powerful communities with vast natural resources and with energetic and talented people. It would be difficult to put a limit upon what either of our countries individually can accomplish, given the desire to do it.

By working together, the principal afflictions of the people of the world might well be eliminated.

Even competitive coexistence, with significant mutual reduction of armaments, will give the world an opportunity to make vast strides in raising the living standards of people everywhere.

A nuclear war between our countries can bring only universal devastation and abject misery to all mankind.

I believe you, Mr. Chairman, when you say you do not wish to settle our differences by nuclear warfare. I can assure you this country doesn't wish to, either.

The problem, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, is—do you and do we have enough wisdom and patience to find the means to avoid war; to engage in peaceful competition in such a manner as to avoid bringing about a war, even inadvertently or by adventurous third parties?

Mr. Chairman, many of us observed you on television as you addressed the Press Club and answered questions a couple of hours ago. We are glad that, in a sense, we are now to continue that conversation, and now we await with much interest whatever you care to say to us.

Mr. Khrushchev opened his remarks as follows:

It is difficult to drink and talk at the same time. As a matter of fact, we have seen speakers who managed to drink and speak at the same time. But, in general, I am in favor of tea.

I replied that we might find some vodka, or some bourbon, if he preferred, to which Mr. Khrushchev replied:

It is a misconception to think that the Russians have such a proclivity for vodka, because if they only drink vodka, they would not have time to launch rockets to the moon. Drunkards can't do that—but that is a joke.

After this opening aside, Chairman Khrushchev continued on a more serious note as follows:

I would like to express my sincere appreciation for this honor which has been rendered me of meeting you. You are the people on whom, in a large measure, depends the direction of the policies of this great country of the United States. Therefore, it is a pleasure for me to meet you and to try to answer your questions, as far as my strength and wisdom permits me, the more so since I feel that I have known practically all of you a long time but up to now you have been sort of ethereal beings to me; now, you have appeared in flesh.

There is hardly a Senator present here whose statements and speeches I have not read. You will not be surprised if I say that I do not agree with much of what you say in the Senate, but even though I do not share your beliefs here, I should speak the truth in that. It is no good recollecting what Senator said something bad or something good in the past. That is a matter of the past. We must face the future more and have wisdom enough to secure peace for our countries and for the whole world. We have always had great respect for the American people. We have also been somewhat envious of your achievements in the economic field, and for that reason, we are doing our best to try to catch up with you in that field, to compete with you, and when we do catch up, to move further ahead. I should say that future generations would be grateful to us if we managed to switch our efforts from stockpiling and perfecting weapons and concentrate those efforts fully on competition in the economic field. We are prepared for such competition. I should say that that is possible only under one condition.

I don't consider myself to be a young person, and being elderly, I can say that elderly people like old things. When a man buys a new pair of shoes, he does not feel comfortable in them, often, and throws them off sometimes and takes back the old pair of worn out shoes, to feel more comfortable. Things like that happen in a wider field, too. When something new is born, it takes time for people to get used to it.

Or, to take another example, who of us has not been disappointed sometimes in life when a daughter was born instead of a son, or a granddaughter instead of a grandson, but sometimes nature provides a different result from what a man would want—a result which is not dependent upon the wishes of the person concerned. People have always fought for progress. In the past when there was a change-over from feudalism to capitalism, for instance, there have been revolutions in many countries.

When you fought your war of independence against the British, I am sure the King of England sent no messages of greeting to you, but irrespective of that, you struggled on until you achieved your aims. Your Civil War also was a progressive event, a struggle for the dignity of man, and the name of Lincoln as the leader of that struggle will live forever in the minds of men. He was a most

human person who gave his life up for the dignity of man.

Now a new kind of society—a socialist society—has given birth, first in one country, and now in others—12 or 13. You do not accept that new form of society, but the appearance of a new society in some particular country cannot be controlled from outside by other countries—no more than can the birth of a granddaughter instead of a grandson. And, therefore, if we recognize that fact—that is to say, to recognize the right of any people to choose the kind of society that they want—if that fact alone is recognized, we should be able to secure peace on this earth. We want nothing from any other country. We have everything we need for the development of our economy. We have demonstrated this by the progress made in our country. The developments in other socialist countries we think have always confirmed that. We think that the practice in our country has confirmed our communist theories. We think that the social system we have is best fitted for our country. You must accept that. We do not ask approval from you. But this fact—the fact of the existence of a new society in some countries—must be accepted like, for example, I have come to accept this thing that I have on my face. It has bothered me and I can do without it, so must the fact that a new society exists be recognized. That in fact is the main thing. There is no other problem, and if that is recognized, we should be able to secure firm and lasting peace. If, however, that fact is not recognized, we would hardly be able to avoid a conflict. That would mean that you would be trying to bring about a change in the social systems of the countries which have chosen a socialist way of life, and the peoples concerned would certainly defend themselves, which would bring about a conflict.

If I may be allowed to say a few critical remarks, gentlemen, I would say this. For instance, appropriation by the Congress of funds for subversive activities in other countries is an act which can hardly be conducive to peace and peaceful coexistence. I look upon that as an unreasonable act, and speaking in terms of a businessman, that is an enterprise which yields no profit. The capital appropriated yields no profit, and therefore the appropriations are unreasonable. I do not want to preach to you. You are responsible for your own political actions. I do not know what the custom is here—how you look upon guests who make statements that do not coincide with the views of the hosts—but in our country when guests come we welcome such statements.

My remarks have been rather lengthy, but I want to once again express my appreciation for having been invited here and to repeat that the only purpose we have in mind is to bring about peace and friendship with other countries—yours included. We bear heavy responsibility before the people and we must do our best to meet the aspirations of the people and the main thing to which the people aspire today is peace. No doubt you prefer your own social system. We have nothing to say against that. Live under that system as long as you like, but recognize the fact that we prefer a different one and want to live under that. There was a time when people were burned for saying that the earth rotates. But there is no simpleton today who does not believe in that. Can you not recognize the possibility that opinions about social systems may not be entirely correct? But that is your business.

What is needed is to recognize the status quo, meaning that there exist two different social systems on this earth today, and that we must learn to live bearing that fact in mind; namely, the existence of two different systems in a world divided thus.

Since I have permitted myself to make some critical remarks in my statement, I have created the conditions for you to act

similarly. I am prepared to listen to them and to reply. Thank you.

That statement of the then Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, I think, warrants very serious consideration today. At that time, the mood of this country and of the world generally, was such that the statements made by Mr. Khrushchev were not taken as seriously as they should have been taken. No one knows the alternatives of history, of course, but it is remarkable to me how similar some of the statements made at that time by the head of the Government of Russia were to some statements that are often made in this and other countries with regard to their own systems, their own aspirations, and their own views about their own countries.

In other words, there is a certain universality about some of the statements that he made in this opening informal and spontaneous statement. His statement was not prepared. It was not written, certainly; whether it had been rehearsed or not is another matter. But I think it has some very interesting points, and I do not think this whole exchange is unrelated to the problem which we face in Congress today, one aspect of which is the bill now under consideration.

Following this exchange, Chairman Khrushchev was asked if he would be in favor of expanding the scope of international educational exchanges, to which he answered:

Yes, we are in favor of widening these contacts, but I have been told by our Mr. Zhukov, Chairman of our Committee on Cultural Relations with other countries, that the American side has now provided us with their draft of a new agreement for 1960 for cultural relations, and the draft provides for some curtailment of our contacts as compared to this year.

He was then asked about his attitude regarding a joint exploration of outer space and if he were willing to exchange scientists to engage in joint projects, to which he replied in the affirmative. When asked why he had not participated in the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee, his reply was as follows:

I believe you know the reply to that. Because an attempt was made to place us in the position of a poor relation in that Committee and we wanted to have parity with you. Since you would not do so, we said we would not take part. For the time being, in practice only you and we can do anything about outer space. If that fact is recognized, we could find the organizational forms. We would not want to take part in a Committee to listen to the preaching of others while we would be in a position of poor relations there. You must not try to do harm to our self-esteem. We won't do it either. We can cooperate if that is understood.

When asked about censorship in the Soviet Union as compared to the United States, he commented as follows:

You see, each of our countries has its own traditions and constitutions. For instance, a person can print practically anything he wants in your press. In our country, if someone were to suggest an article for a newspaper containing appeals to war, that article would be turned down and the person would be put under trial because we have a law prohibiting any war-like appeals. But everything that is conducive to better relations

between countries and to the consolidation of people can be free to be sent out.

I must say that I read rather closely the dispatches sent by many American correspondents from our country and I find many of them very reasonable. As a matter of fact, there have been many occasions when I have thought them so good that I have asked our people to republish them in our newspapers. As for Tass, I might say that if a Tass correspondent were to send dispatches from this country which are mendacious in character, he would be recalled by the agency—recalled back home by the agency. But, for instance, if some correspondent were to send from Moscow a dispatch of the nature something like the first question which was offered to me at the Press Conference today, I am afraid our telegraph girls who send them over—our cablegrams—would refuse to them over themselves. Therefore, as I can, we have certain rules at the present time in our country in that respect and we have no intention of changing them.

In reply to a question about restriction of travel in the Soviet Union and involving similar restrictions in this country, Chairman Khrushchev's comment was:

You want to travel anywhere you want in our country. If we abolish military bases on foreign territory, withdraw foreign troops to within their national frontier—if that is done, you would get permission to go anywhere you like in our country. But when our country is surrounded and circled by your military bases, and you want to have your correspondents or people under the guise of correspondents go to places where we do not want them to go, we would regard that as military intelligence. And for that reason, we have closed up to foreign travel certain parts of our country which are particularly important for the country's defense.

When asked about what measures he had in mind as a possible contribution to peace, such as free elections in Germany or in Eastern countries, the Chairman replied rather forcefully:

This question has been formulated in a somewhat different manner than it was previously, and because you and we were powers which fought together against Germany, I consider it appropriate to reply to this question. I know about our position in this respect. We have expounded it—repeated it—several times. Our position is that two independent German states have been set up in Western and Eastern Germany. And we think that the Germans themselves should decide themselves on the question of reunification; otherwise, we would be prepared to accept their position. But I cannot speak to reply in full to that question. I would have to speak not only for Grotewohl but for Adenauer, too, and it would be best for those two to come together and decide that for themselves.

Further pursuing this, he was asked about universal suffrage in Russia and whether or not election is limited to one party and one candidate. He replied:

That is not quite exact, because in our parliament there are 40% of the members who are non-party—do not belong to any party. It is a fact, however, that they vote for only one candidate in a particular instance. I am not sure that you will understand my explanation of this, and I am sure that you do not agree with me on this matter.

Our explanation of this is that after the revolution in our country—after the great changes took place—there are no classes in our country, and since parties represent different classes, we have only one party, representing the working people of the country as

a whole. But several candidates are usually put up at a preliminary stage in our country. And under our constitution, an unlimited number of candidates can be put up in any one constituency; and at the preliminary stage in some constituencies as many as five or six candidates are first put up, and a campaign is conducted for those candidates. But then before the elections, the representatives of the groups—the factories, plants which had put up these candidates—come together to decide and discuss and decide which one of these candidates is most appropriate, and they usually come to an agreement among themselves on some one candidacy, and he is put up to be voted upon. We think that system is a democratic one. You have a different one—okay. But each people have their own system—their own customs.

Finally, when asked about the real purpose in his coming to this country and what he thought about the arms race, the Chairman replied as follows:

I might address the question in a large measure to you, too, as members of this Committee, because the results of any discussion we have in a large measure depend upon your side, on the President and on this Committee. We, for our part, are prepared to go very far in the field of disarmament. Our positions on these matters have been explained rather clearly.

For instance, we are prepared to come to terms on the liquidation of foreign military bases and on the withdrawal of foreign troops to their national territories. The question is whether you would be willing to come to terms on that problem. If you are, that's fine. There has been thought by some people in this country that systems existing in Poland, and in Hungary, and in other countries where there would be Soviet troops, are kept on because of the presence of Soviet troops in these countries. Or that the matter should be tested by withdrawing all foreign troops from foreign territories and having the peoples of those countries prove the fact that the people of these countries have themselves chosen the form of government which they now have. There has been talk that the regime in Eastern Germany is kept only by Soviet bayonets. Well, our reply to that is that foreign troops should be withdrawn both from Eastern and Western Germany to see how things would work out. Would you agree to that? If so, we would come to terms. You hesitate to reply. Well, I hesitate also to reply as to what results our discussions might yield, because the results depend not only upon our desires and wishes but on the plans of the United States. You might say that I am skillful of polemics, but this is not a matter of polemics but a matter of fact. It would be well if we could come to terms on the withdrawal of foreign troops and have all the soldiers return home. The mothers and the fiancés would be very glad when their dear ones come home.

When one of the Senators suggested that we should compliment Mr. Khrushchev's interpreter, Mr. Troyanovsky, for the excellent job he had done, and that we would all agree that he should be given a raise, Mr. Khrushchev quickly replied,

Since Mr. Troyanovsky has lived here quite a few years and is practically half-American, you must pay part of the raise.

On this light note, the meeting ended. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of September 12 appeared an article by Mr. Edward Crankshaw, one of the leading authorities on the Soviet Union, entitled "An Appraisal: Marked by a Streak of Reckless Courage." In the

same issue of the Post, was an article by Chalmers M. Roberts, entitled "The Rages, Charms of Khrushchev." I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In reviewing the events during and since the period of Mr. Khrushchev's dominant influence in the Soviet Union, it is my own view that the Western countries were mistaken in not being more responsive to his efforts to begin negotiations in the field of arms control and what he called peaceful co-existence. His manners were unorthodox and startling, and many people did not take him as seriously as they should have. In any case, he made a contribution to the relaxation of the extreme tyranny of the Stalinist period, and in many respects was a man of unusual ability and vigor. He was the product of a harsh period in his country and reflected the characteristics of his time, but beyond the usual qualities of the leaders of his era he possessed a ready wit and a colorful and exuberant personality. As his son said at his funeral a few days ago, some hated him, some loved him, but everyone was aware of him.

Mr. President, this account of an exchange and discussion engaged in by the then leader of the Russian nation and Members of this body is quite relevant, I think, to the discussion here today. It is quite true that he, like all other leaders, could be guilty, I suppose, of overstating his country's good intentions. We are all subject to a degree of chauvinism, more or less. But the issues he raised in 1959 are involved in the matter before the Senate today, especially on two counts.

The Mansfield amendment, with regard to withdrawal of troops from Germany, while it has not yet been offered on this bill, is closely related to ending the war in Vietnam. The amendment and the bill itself are all part and parcel of a foreign policy which has enabled us to intervene in many countries and to place troops all around the world. During the late 1940's and 1950's, we believed and honestly believed—I certainly shared in that belief at that time—there was necessity for the actions which we were then taking. Today, I am not disposed to say that there was no justification for it. What I do think is that it would be helpful for us to review the statements and actions over the past 20 years, especially such statements and actions as were made by Mr. Khrushchev, and test them against the events which subsequently occurred. In that way we might see whether our judgment was valid on those occasions and whether, today, it is not proper and appropriate that we reassess and examine most carefully our present judgments about the necessity for the continuation of policies which have resulted in such grave difficulty to our country.

I am not prepared, as I am sure none of my colleagues are, to say that all our policies should be changed, that everything we did was wrong. I do not mean that at all.

I do mean to suggest that the necessity for the extension of the draft and especially with the emasculation of the Mansfield amendment relating to Vietnam and, I hope, also, with the opportunity possibly to inject into the matter the Mansfield amendment on troops in Europe, can all be reconsidered, reassessed, and reevaluated in the light of what we are beginning to know about our past and also about what is developing today.

We hear reports in various quarters that progress is being made in the SALT talks. Whether there is any validity to those reports at all, I do not know; but there are signs, and hopeful signs, about our relations with China.

I feel, on the one hand, that we have these reports, but, on the other hand, we are confronted with demands for the extension of the draft with demands for very large appropriations for military procurement, which will be the bill immediately to follow this conference report and, overall, for an extremely large military budget as a whole—almost in the neighborhood of \$80 billion.

I have found a review of the remarks of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Soviet Russia extremely interesting. I am always intrigued by the possibility that at some time we might take some initiative such as taking a man like this at his word—or making a move to withdraw troops from Europe, or some initiative with regard to disarmament beyond what we have thus far done. Such initiative at that time might have produced results—though it is vain to look upon it in that light now. But it is not vain to apply the same lessons to the facts which face us today on the international scene.

I am inclined to think that the opportunities to deal with Mr. Khrushchev were probably greater than we realized at the time. This does not mean that he did not engage—as I have said and others have said—in overstating his case. It might have been that he would not have been disposed to make any concessions whatever with regard to troops or disarmament. However, the facts, such as they were, and are, would seem to me to lead possibly to the other conclusion, because in the light of history it obviously was in the interests not only of the United States but also of the Soviet Union to have done that 12 years ago instead of now—although we have done it very little up to now. In other words, the self-interest of the two countries clearly indicated that it be done at that time. Whether either country was as forthcoming as it should have been, is a matter for the historians to assess; but I personally feel that we were not so forthcoming as we should have been.

I also feel about the present situation and the present conference report that in view of the actions which have been taken by the conference with regard especially to the Mansfield amendment, it will be extremely difficult for me to support it.

Mr. President, I thought it was worthwhile to recall this little bit of history because it is, in effect, relevant to the kind of question that the Senate will be

called upon and is being called upon, to decide nearly every day.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

AN APPRAISAL: MARKED BY A STREAK OF RECKLESS COURAGE

(By Edward Crankshaw)

If Khrushchev had died when he was 60, in 1954, he would have passed into deserved and unlamented oblivion. He would have been no more than one of Stalin's bully boys whose total obedience and lack of scruples made possible the destruction of the old Leninist party and the subjection of a cowed and broken people to a tyranny of the bloodiest kind.

During the active years of his life, from his joining of the Bolshevik Party in 1918 at the age of 24, through his rapid ascent of the party ladder until the final scramble that brought him into Stalin's immediate entourage over the dead bodies of his comrades, right up to his master's death, he had held his own through the exercise of that unpleasant combination of sycophancy and violence that he shared with all his colleagues: the only visible distinguishing mark was a streak of reckless courage that drove him to expose himself in difficult assignments and to win through by boldness of attack while his rivals were counting on his fall.

Two or three times under Stalin he nearly came to grief. He was lucky again to survive in high office when his chief rival, Malenkov, backed at first by Beria and others, took over when Stalin died. But within four years, with the exercise of consummate political skill, based in peasant cunning, he had more or less painlessly destroyed the entrenched and formidable opposition.

He emerged, for all practical purposes, as master of a refurbished Soviet Union—having, in the course of the struggle, risked shattering the whole fabric of the Communist world by his exposure of some of Stalin's crimes.

From then on, for the next seven years, he grew and expanded at a dizzy rate to establish himself as an international statesman able to lead the Soviet Union out of the Stalinist wilderness and into some sort of communion with the world outside.

If he could have brought to bear on internal Soviet problems the relative freshness and openness of mind with which he faced the complex challenge of a global society of which he had known next to nothing for the first 60 years of his life, he would have been a very great statesman.

If he could have combined his dynamism and courage with steadiness and a methodical approach he would have kept his power until he died.

This was too much to ask. The very qualities that enabled him to break out of the Stalinist paralysis called for a recklessness, a refusal or inability to think a problem through that did not go with steadiness. He was able to approach the outer world with a fresh eye precisely because, when he first encountered it (at Belgrade in 1954) he quickly realized he knew nothing about it and had everything to learn.

He was unable to bring an equivalent curiosity to his contemplation of the Soviet Union because he had inhabited that closed system all his life and thought he had nothing to learn.

His achievement, great as it was, was also, of course, severely limited by the evil nature of his climb to power. Born the poorest of the poor, and having escaped from his peasant home to better himself as a mechanic in the mines of the Donbas, he had next to no formal education. After the Revolution the simple certitudes of elementary Leninism or anticapitalism were enough for him. Here was a gospel. This was the way the world went.

And it was a gospel that was to suffice him until the end of his life. He was never to seek to expand it or deepen it, much less question it. His later development, when he amended the Leninist canon to exclude war as a necessary stage in the progress towards world revolution and to allow the possibility that revolutions might be achieved elsewhere by peaceful means, was a pragmatic response to certain new facts of life—above all the atom bomb.

It is very much to be doubted if he ever realized the radical importance of these amendments, or that he fully appreciated the inevitably explosive consequences of his denunciation of Stalin. He was concerned above all not with any theory, but with clearing away certain physical obstacles to the security and physical development of the Soviet Union—with himself very firmly at the helm.

It is hard to see how such a man could have been otherwise. Impatient of intellectuals, including revolutionary intellectuals, he was a born man of action, priding himself on his grasp of the practical, a sort of human bulldozer with a delicate eye for the main chance. He did not begin to find himself until the civil war when, sent back to the Donbas to help get the mines working again, he emerged as a man with a will and great driving force. He was precisely the sort of unquestioning man with an iron fist that Stalin and those close to him were looking for in their drive to capture the party from the emigre intellectuals.

It was to Kaganovich, whom he was much later to vilify and ruin, that Khrushchev owed his swift promotion from the lowest level of the party apparatus—first to Kiev, then to Moscow in 1929, and very soon to the summit of the Moscow party apparatus.

Now it was his task not only to put a decrepit capital into some sort of shape (including the rushed building of the Moscow Subway) but also to make the whole Moscow region safe for Stalin during the great purges of the 1930s. It was now that he came to work closely with Bulganin, at the head of the Moscow Soviet, with Malenkov and with the villainous Yezhov, who was to become head of the secret police when the purges began to run wild.

In a word, Khrushchev was in the thick of things throughout this terrible epoch. He survived and had his reward. His reward turned out to be the making of him, perhaps also his salvation.

In 1938, he was made a candidate member of the Politburo and was sent off to be Stalin's viceroy in the Ukraine. Such an exalted position would never have come his way at that time but for the fact that virtually the whole of the Ukrainian party apparatus, led by men very senior to Khrushchev, had been shot. He grasped his opportunity with both hands.

Now he was on his own, away from the demoralizing atmosphere that surrounded his Moscow colleagues strutting about in Stalin's shadow. His essentially self-reliant spirit had a chance to develop. He became a boss in his own right—boss of 40 million souls.

Further, because the Ukraine bore the brunt of the German assault in 1941, he was caught up with the Army machine as none of his Moscow colleagues were. He was at the terrible encirclement at Kharkov, at Stalin-grad, at the great battle of the Kursk Salient that tore the heart out of the German armies. He got on well with the marshals and took their part against interference from Moscow, and this was to stand him later in good stead. He saw with his own eyes the sufferings of ordinary people and learned more about their lives than any of his Moscow colleagues ever knew.

By the time he was called back to Moscow in the winter of 1949 he had been on his

own for 11 years; he had a more independent view and a greater confidence in his own powers than any of the men who had stayed close to Stalin and been overshadowed by him. He started throwing his weight about and speaking off the cuff as nobody under Stalin had ever spoken. Sooner or later he would have gone too far and ruined himself; but Stalin had only three more years to live and died in time.

This was the background, essentially parochial though on a vast scale, of the man who was to emerge in late middle life in all his ignorance onto the world stage and use every weapon of cajolery, threat, deception, flattery, reason and blackmail to advance the cause of the Soviet Union; to talk to Eisenhower as an equal, patronize MacMillan, enchant Nehru, anathematize Mao Tse-tung. This was the man, also, who more than any other achieved some sort of constructive working relationships between two hostile worlds.

He never, of course, broke away from his past. He never saw that in condemning Stalin for his crimes against the party he was really condemning the party for its crimes against the people. Even while he was genuinely seeking coexistence he thought until it was too late (until after the Cuban fiasco, that is) that he could have things both ways: that he could achieve a military detente while pursuing bitter ideological warfare.

He still lapsed into bullying when crossed. Nevertheless, this little man, who had no feel for personal dignity, achieved dignity on occasion by his very passion to uphold the dignity of his country—and once, over Cuba, by his readiness to suffer humiliation in the cause of peace.

He pushed the quarrel with China (inevitable as it was to some degree) too hard and too fast, with ruinous consequences to the Communist cause. He brought new ideas to Soviet domestic problems, seeing the need to break the Soviet Union out of Stalin's repressive bonds and release initiative. But he was incapable of working out a considered, articulated plan—thus rushing from one badly-thought out panacea to another and unsettling the economy, in some aspects quite disastrously.

Yet, when all is said, with all his plunging he did no more harm to the economy than his successors have done with all their caution—and he did much more good for the spirit of his people. He opened windows (or broke them) to let in more light than in fact he knew how to bear.

He was, that is to say, an anti-Stalinist who nevertheless accepted the premises on which the Stalinist regime had been based. He was part of that regime. He wanted Stalinism without tears. Russia needed the sort of explosion he alone dared invite.

It was easy enough to see why, in the end, his inferior colleagues ganged up against him. One hoped that after a pause for breath they would set to work to bring order into a house with open windows. Instead they started closing windows, and instead of order they contrived stagnation. Khrushchev's achievement may be measured in part by the failure of his successors to bring forward new ideas. Another measure is that coexistence, no longer a favorite word, is still a firm reality.

THE RAGES, CHARMS OF KHRUSHCHEV (By Chalmers M. Roberts)

(NOTE:—Roberts retired earlier this year as a diplomatic reporter for The Washington Post.)

On the evening of Sept. 19, 1959, I went up to the head table to ask Nikita Khrushchev for his autograph. It was the Los Angeles World Affairs Council dinner for the Soviet premier, and his ambassador, "Smiling Mike" Menshikov, did the interpreting.

Nikita Sergeevich turned over the dinner ticket I had proffered for his signature. "It's

not a blank check," I said, "you don't have to worry." Quick as ever he replied: "I'm not worrying; I have nothing: I'm a poor man." He scrawled his signature on the back of the late ticket.

A few minutes later Khrushchev's memorial nature produced a quite different result. Los Angeles mayor Norris Poulson stood up to publicly chide Khrushchev for his earlier statement that "we will bury you."

Khrushchev reacted with rage. He already had explained that remark, he said, and it referred to economic competition, not to a military strike, "I am deeply concerned over these conscious distortions of my thoughts," he shouted at the stunned audience. "I've never mentioned any rockets."

"Let's not try to bury one another," Khrushchev declared. We are the two most powerful nations and "the consequences of a play on words can be too sad for our peoples. Our rockets are on the assembly line" but "I have come with serious intentions and you try to reduce the matter to simply a joke." And: "If you want to compete in a cold war, go ahead but think what it means with modern weapons."

Khrushchev worked himself into a fury. It had taken him 12 hours to fly to America, he said, but it would take "even less" to return. He turned on Poulson, shouting again: "I trust that even the mayor reads the press. In my country the chairman of the City Council reads the press or he isn't elected the next time he runs. If you want to insist on this cold war line, then there can be no thought of disarmament."

The dinner ended in a shambles. Ambassador Llewellyn E. Thompson, back from Moscow for Khrushchev's American tour, thought he might very well head for home the next day. Khrushchev already was out of sorts over the refusal of the Americans to let him visit Disneyland.

Next morning Khrushchev was glowering as we boarded the special train for San Francisco. But the friendly crowd at Santa Barbara warmed him up. During an incredible roving press conference he held as he walked through the jammed press cars, Khrushchev was back to his old self.

"The people are wonderful," he told us. "The people want peace. There must be peace in the whole world." After the crowd at the San Luis Obispo stop he was on top again but still needing about Disneyland: "I'm especially glad that the house arrest I was placed under has been lifted and they allowed me to approach the people and to look them in the eye."

"I'm a political leader," he said. "My strength is my tie with the people. To lose the tie is to lose all influence."

A most extraordinary political leader, he was, indeed, one of the most amazing and unusual of this turbulent century. He had been invited to America by President Eisenhower as a way out of an impasse over Berlin and he was all eyes and ears to see and know about this epitome of capitalism and imperialism. Nikita Khrushchev was a Communist by faith, as ardent as any religionist has ever been.

But it was Khrushchev who was the first Soviet leader to sense that nuclear weapons had changed the ways of international politics and to act upon it. He found a similar sense in Eisenhower and together, despite the almost immeasurable gulf that separated them, they began to take the first steps until Francis Gary Power's U-2 was shot down over the Soviet Union.

In 1960 at Paris, after the U-2 he raged and he did so again that fall with his shoe pounding at the United Nations. It was a rage induced no doubt by the fact that the U-2 incident had gravely impaired his power as he subsequently was to tell an American visitor.

No one who was there will ever forget the grim looks on the faces of Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy as they came

out of their last meeting in Vienna in 1961. Khrushchev had judged Kennedy a patsy for his debacle at the Bay of Pigs, a judgment that I am sure had much to do with his emplacement of missiles in Cuba in 1962. Yet the two leaders managed to step back from the brink of disaster in time to save us all.

Khrushchev was, as we all wrote, beady-eyed. He was a master of theatrics, turning rage or laughter or charm on or off at will and always to a purpose. He was a Russian peasant, a Communist apparatchik, a totalitarian. He never forgot his past or Russia's past.

In Los Angeles that day before the dinner he indulged in an amazing verbal match with another poor-boy-made-good, film magnate Spyros Skouras. They kept interrupting each other, shouting out fragments of their life histories to prove that a man could make it better under one system than the other.

Skouras, an immigrant from Greece, told how he had gone to work at 12. Khrushchev shouted back that "until the age of 12 I worked as a shepherd for a capitalist."

Then he "worked at a factory for a German," "in a French-owned mine" and "at a Belgian-owned chemical factory." Then he topped Skouras for good: "And I am the Prime Minister for the Great Soviet State!"

The American visit of Nikita Khrushchev was one of the most profoundly important trips ever taken by a leading statesman. Khrushchev would never admit it but the sight of America altered his view of this country and its power and potential.

Still, he could never believe that Americans also had will and so he took us to the brink over Cuba, not to mention his Berlin ultimatum, to test it.

The sad fact today is that Khrushchev's successor in power, Leonid Brezhnev, has never been to the United States nor have many of his compatriots at the top of power with the major exception of Premier Alexei Kosygin.

Khrushchev once said that "the continuing unprecedented arms race" presents "serious danger that even a small blunder on the part of the statesmen of this or that country might trigger off a new war." So great a truth; so hard for statesmen to act upon.

Perhaps the gray men who followed him to power in the Kremlin have done better in acting upon the truth. Part of Khrushchev's row with Mao Tse-tung was over the meaning of that truth.

Somehow, looking back, one must give this peasant from the Ukraine an immense amount of credit, both for his own success despite the bodies he crawled over on the way to the top and for bringing the Soviet Union to a realization that in the nuclear age weapons of total destruction are ideologically blind.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTING POSITION OF SENATOR MAGNUSON ON S. 2007 ON SEPTEMBER 9, 1971

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on September 9, 1971, there was a rollcall vote on the question of agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) to recommit the bill S. 2007, to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes.

The distinguished senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) had wanted to be announced with respect to the voting on that bill, but inadvertently his position was not announced. The Sena-

tor from Washington wanted to be announced as being in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), had he been present, would have voted "nay" on legislative rollcall No. 218, on the question of agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) to recommit the bill, S. 2007.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BAYH TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, on tomorrow, immediately following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUGHES ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, immediately following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the able Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF THE DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in conclusion, with reference to this subject matter, I reminded the Senate yesterday that the conferees had already approved the \$2.4 billion conference report on August 15 when President Nixon ordered his wage-price freeze. In those remarks, I suggested that for Congress to reconvene its conferees now and increase that sum would appear to be driving a \$300 million bulldozer through Mr. Nixon's fence of economic restraints.

Having now analyzed the proposal offered by the Senator from Colorado, I find that I had not correctly stated the amount involved. Actually, the Senator from Colorado is attempting to drive a \$381 million bulldozer through Mr. Nixon's fence.

My point is the same; however, Mr. President, the Senator should not be the first to block or the first to disrupt the President's new economic plan.

It means, I again emphasize, that failure to approve the conference report would create a manpower crisis which could seriously impair our national defense. And that is exactly what we will have, a manpower crisis, as I shall explain in detail and cite some illustrations in subsequent remarks.

Mr. President, in attempting to get before the membership of this body the full meaning of this conference report, which was filed just before we left for the August recess, I have written two letters to each of my colleagues. The letters are to be mailed this afternoon.

I wish to have one of these letters appear in the RECORD at this point. However, I will read it into the RECORD, if I may. It explains the high points of what is involved in the supposed motion to table, which I hope after all will not be made. It is so much more acceptable to have a direct vote up or down on a conference report rather than a motion to table prevailing which decides nothing and postpones everything. It is just a rehash and a rerun of what we have been discussing here, in the committee, and on the floor for 7 months.

The letter reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have written to you separately regarding the pay provisions of the Conference Report on Selective Service and Military Pay.

I want to point out as well that tabling or rejecting this Conference Report will, at best, mean significant delays before the draft can be renewed and pay provisions approved; at worst such a vote would mean that there will be no draft bill or military pay increases during this session of Congress.

I have good reason to believe that we will not be able to obtain as favorable a compromise on many aspects of this bill if we must begin anew with a House/Senate conference. As part of the understanding on this Conference Report the House conferees agreed to seek, and obtained, from the House Rules Committee a waiver on the points of order which could be raised against this bill in the House of Representatives. This problem arose because at least seven items in the Conference Report were not germane under House rules.

These non-germane items included the Mansfield amendment itself, which was tabled by the House 219-176. During a new Conference all matters would be again open for resolution.

Although the version of the Mansfield amendment approved by the Conference Committee does not include the 9-month deadline for withdrawal from Vietnam, the principle of a withdrawal tied only to the release of US prisoners-of-war is clearly the focus and meaning of the modified amendment.

In my opinion the most important reason why the Conference Report must be approved is that we will begin soon to face serious manpower gaps in the military services if the draft is not renewed. I am not speaking about the war in Vietnam but rather about the crews for our aircraft carriers and submarines and for our strategic bombers and anti-submarine warfare forces. Failure to provide these crews would amount to unilateral disarmament of these forces.

The men who enlist in these forces which protect our own shores are largely motivated to do so by the draft—42% of the Navy and 47% of the Air Force enlistees are so motivated. I urge all Senators very strongly not to let their legitimate dissatisfaction with the war in Vietnam lead them to throw away the important two years of transition, rely-

ing partly on the draft, which are needed to give us the opportunity to develop a voluntary system for our military forces.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. STENNIS.

Mr. President, that is the entire text of the letter. Since it has been written, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) has very candidly stated here, as is characteristic of him, that this conference report has a part of the Mansfield amendment left in it which is a step forward, and a meaningful step forward, in that the Mansfield amendment subject matter converts a Senate resolution into a congressional declaration that the war should be wound down and the troops withdrawn. And that is tied only to the proposition involving the release of our prisoners of war.

I think that is a very strong point that the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) has made with reference to the Mansfield amendment. I was not surprised at all because the Senator is always frank and fair in his evaluations. However, I do think that since the author of the amendment and the news media, and most everyone else, think that this is a step forward for the Mansfield amendment idea, it ought not to be scuttled and shot down from the side by a motion to table which, as I have said, does not decide anything. It just puts everything off and says we will have a rerun.

Mr. President, in support of the selective service conference report bill, I have on a couple of occasions used the word "crisis" to describe the manpower situation which is being created by the absence of any draft. By contrast, some opponents have suggested that the absence of a draft has done no harm and that no harm would be done by further delay.

On Tuesday, September 14, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) in her capacity as ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, and I as chairman, met with the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff or their deputies from each of the armed services.

We asked them about the impact caused by being without a draft for 60 days. We also asked them about the impact caused by further delay.

It gives me no pleasure to report, Mr. President, that the spokesmen agreed without exception that they have already been harmed by the absence of a draft law not only with respect to the loss of available manpower, but also, and very importantly, with respect to the quality of men now entering the service.

With regard to the original concept of an all-volunteer force, all representatives were agreed that the draft is still vital for preparedness.

In that context, the Air Force, Navy, and Marine spokesmen said that they will need draft-induced enlistments for some time to come to man and maintain their advanced weapon systems. They were also agreed that the Reserve force—the National Guard and Reserve components—have also suffered a decline in availability of quality Reserve enlistments, as a result of this unintended 2-month experiment with a zero draft.

The Senator from Maine and I asked

spokesmen to go back to the Pentagon and supply further details, in addition to the information they quoted to us. Here are some of the high points made in our meeting and in the supplemental material which was submitted to us.

Mr. President, I emphasize that this meeting was at the request of the Senator from Maine and me. When I say these gentlemen agreed to certain things, I meant that their testimony was not in conflict. We asked these pointed questions, and we gave them some idea about the nature of the questions before they came and told them to be prepared to answer those questions. Then, when we asked them we told them to please send us over written memoranda giving the substance of what they said and including some of those figures. I have here, as I have said, some of this supplemental material, as well as some of the points of our discussion.

I continue now with the general statement on the Department of Defense data.

In the face of larger monthly requirements in Army and lessening recruiting potential, the Department of Defense does not expect to be able to meet the requirements for October-December and thereafter unless the draft authority is renewed early enough in October to permit delivery of inductees to start by November 1, 1971.

That is in the face of the fact that the Army is being drawn down to a smaller number by general orders; and still the quota cannot be met.

Further delays in enactment of the extension of induction authority would result in a fall off of draft-motivated enlistments in all Services.

Incidentally, they do have true and accurate records as to the history of these enlistments and whether or not they are draft motivated.

The number of true volunteers available, if the draft-motivated supply ends, would not be sufficient to meet fiscal year 1972 requirements for about 465,000 new men. Shortages would not be confined to the Army but would also exist in the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and would occur most heavily among personnel of higher mental abilities and aptitudes. There is no question that such shortages would adversely affect the readiness and capabilities of all Services.

These are statements made by responsible people, both civilian and military, in response to direct inquiries by the committee that has jurisdiction over their activities.

Of course, these men were attempting to give us their best thoughts on the subject, and these are figures they found.

Now, with respect to the question of quality of new recruits. I know there have been statements made on the floor quoting figures during this 60-day period about the number of so-called enlistments; but when we get down to the very nub of things those figures were partly misleading. These men are going to the source of those enlistees and making judgments down the line for the next 6 months.

With respect to the question of the quality of new recruits:

Although the Military Services recruited the total number of men needed in August, the proportion of high school graduates entering Service was below the August 1970

level. In the Army only 50.9% of August enlistees were high school graduates compared to a 62.5% figure in August 1970. Each of the other Services had a lower proportion of high school graduates this year compared with last year's entries.

I wish to emphasize the key word is "quality." We found in all four services that in this 60-day period, which is a very short period, the quality had consistently gone down and that is one of the things that many of us close to this problem felt all the time.

Mr. President, you cannot measure strength in the military services by the number of men; you have to measure the strength of military services by the quality. We felt enough quality would not be voluntary. We felt we knew a great part of the talented men that are trusted with the more complicated as well as the most critical functions in the Air Force, Navy, Army, and Marine Corps were men of a type that was beyond the average that would be gotten from men who are volunteers.

To carry on complicated avionics and technology with which all the services operate, more men will be needed than they can get under a voluntary system. This is already showing up.

In connection with the Air Force, they need 113,000 recruits and they expect to get about one-half of that number from true volunteers. This is in response to a direct question. If the bill is delayed another 6 to 8 weeks the Air Force would be short 5,000 recruits and the quality decline would continue.

The Air Force high school graduate rate, which was 93 percent in 1970, was 83 percent for enlistments in July and August. There is a falling off of 10 percent in the very brief period of 60 days in the Air Force.

The Air Force, because of the color and many other things that go with it, is considered to have a high attractiveness for the average person who may want to volunteer or a person who is volunteering under the pressure of the draft. But even in the highest category we had that certain and immediate decline. In my opinion if there were no draft bill passed there would be rapid continuation of that decline.

Mr. President, continuing along the same line, the Navy reported that they need about 90,000 recruits for the fiscal year 1972, and they expect now to get 56,000 through volunteers not draft-motivated. Again, with all the varieties the Navy has to offer, they have a very attractive program and it is a popular service.

They have been under the influence of the draft and they have been getting their recruits, but there is what has already happened. They are running now, and the indications are that this is what the number will be, at a rate of 56,000 true volunteers rather than the 90,000 recruits they will need for the fiscal year. Furthermore, they predict that the enlistments will decline as the economy improves.

These gentlemen do not overlook things. They and their staff are very alert and very complete in their consideration of facts, especially including their own business, and they do not overlook any-

thing. I am not surprised by what they say. They say the decline in these enlistments will continue to go on even faster as the economy improves.

Here is an important point. The Polaris and nuclear power ratings are about 50 percent draft motivated. Absence of the draft would also produce only about one-half of the men required for engineering ratings, aircraft maintenance, and so forth.

There is a strong feeling about the necessity of having these quality men of talent in all the services for aircraft maintenance. It is a highly essential matter. If they do not have those maintenance crews, it just means those aircraft will not operate. If that happens our Air Force will be decimated and, to that extent, it will be unilateral disarmament.

No one wants that to happen. We may wish ourselves into believing this will not happen, but here are the figures that show that even in the short period of 60 days it is already beginning to happen.

The Army will need 212,000 to 240,000 new recruits to meet overseas replacements and at the same time maintain trained strength level in this fiscal year.

Under the present situation, with no draft in effect, they expect to get only 85,000 to 100,000 true volunteers—I believe they are rather optimistic in their figures—that is volunteers, who are not influenced by the draft. Selective Service, directly and indirectly, supplies balance.

The impact of no draft through November is that a peak shortage of about 13,000 trained men—about one division—is already projected this winter. Delaying the draft will extend that shortage.

Continuing draft physical examinations, and the draft lottery, have continued to exert draft pressure on young men.

In other words, they are continuing these physical examinations and running these lotteries, and, of course, they continue to exert draft pressure on the men. I am not happy to even talk about these things, but it is necessary in connection with our national security at this time.

I know that while I was at home, many young men, some of whom I personally know, came to me in my office in Mississippi to talk about the situation with reference to the draft. Of course, they are motivated by the prospects of the draft bill continuing. That is their thought, because their actions are based upon that motivation.

As far as the Marine Corps is concerned, they need 55,200 men and women to meet current force levels. They expect no more than 55 percent will be true volunteers. If draft is deferred another 6 weeks—through November—recruiting will fall short by 4,500 to 6,000 marines.

As to these special men with this special talent that I have already described, the crews that man our missiles, maintain our planes, man and maintain our submarines undersea, man our carriers on the seas, and perform a whole host of duties related thereto, they are talented men. So very many of them come in through the inducement of the draft.

Many of them are drafted directly, but so many more of them come in through the inducement of the draft. That is no reflection on them. That is the Government's way of letting a man know that his services are needed and are expected.

But here, after all the talk about the volunteers, and so forth, this is what the record shows and here is the opinion testing these facts further by men who are qualified and in these services.

Mr. President, that is the sort of material we have been receiving, and I repeat: Failure to act on this conference report will push us to the edge of a military manpower crisis.

In fact, Mr. President, failure to act will involve the United States in a kind of creeping disarmament—a unilateral disarmament and decline in military preparedness.

I ask unanimous consent that a fact sheet prepared by the Department of Defense be inserted in the RECORD at this point. I may want to supply additional material later.

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

FACT SHEET: NEED FOR RENEWAL OF THE INDUCTION AUTHORITY

It would be erroneous to assume that the draft is no longer needed because of the favorable recruiting results during July and August. During July and August all Services, except the Marine Corps, met their recruiting objectives. These months are historically among the best recruiting months of the year; many young men completing their schooling in June decide to enlist during the summer months.

A substantial number of July and August enlistments were draft motivated. Many men with low draft sequence numbers assumed that the absence of the draft authority was only temporary; therefore, to discharge their anticipated military obligation they enlisted. Analysis of the July enlistments shows that 12,500 draft motivated men entered active duty—about the same proportion as in July of last year. If the draft authority is not extended promptly, draft motivated enlistments will soon "dry up".

In the face of larger monthly requirements in Army and lessening recruiting potential, the Department of Defense does not expect to be able to meet the requirements for October-December and thereafter unless the draft authority is renewed early enough in October to permit the delivery of inductees to start by November 1, 1971.

Army's total accession requirements for new enlisted personnel for the October-December 1971 quarter are estimated to be 52,000 compared to 42,000 in the July-September period. Normally, enlistments during the October-December quarter are 20% below those during the seasonally good recruiting months of July-September.

While entries into immediate active service held up during July and August, the number of young men committing themselves to future entry through Delay Enlistment Pools declined 13% from the same period in 1970. In the Navy the decline was nearly 50%. This decline indicates a potentially serious reduction in late fall enlistments in the absence of the draft.

Further delay in enactment of the extension of induction authority would result in a fall-off of draft motivated enlistments in all Services. The number of true volunteers available, if the draft motivated supply ends, would not be sufficient to meet FY 1972 requirements for about 465,000 new men. Shortages would not be confined to the Army

but would also exist in the Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps and would occur most heavily among personnel of higher mental abilities and aptitudes. There is no question that such shortages would adversely affect the readiness and capabilities of all Services.

Because of the training period required for new recruits, failure to meet requirements for new enlisted personnel in the immediate future will have an adverse effect on the Services' ability to meet requirements in the spring and summer of 1972. The Army would experience shortages of trained personnel which would become critical after the first of the year. The effect would be very severe in the capability to fill units in all Services which require higher mental groups for operation and maintenance of highly technical equipment. Although the Military Services recruited the total number of men needed in August, the proportion of high school graduates entering Service was below the August 1970 level. In the Army only 50.9% of August enlistees were high school graduates compared to a 62.5% figure in August 1970. Each of the other Services had a lower proportion of high school graduates this year compared with last year's entries.

The ability to meet Reserve and National Guard requirements for new enlisted manpower will be seriously jeopardized if the draft authority does not become available soon. Experience has shown that three quarters of all non-prior service enlistments are draft motivated. The long waiting lists of persons wanting to enlist, which have been in existence for years, have disappeared in many states. Further, the Air National Guard is below its mandated strength and the Marine Corps Reserve is not meeting the recruit quotas required to maintain their strength. Unless the draft authority and pay increases are restored, Guard and Reserve strengths can be expected to deteriorate further. This deterioration would be hazardous at a time when we are increasing reliance on and readiness of the National Guard and Reserves as part of the Total Force Concept.

Immediate reinstatement of the induction authority is needed despite the Army's early release of a number of inductees during the winter months. The early releases are necessary to accommodate the 50,000 man-year reduction in Army strength contained in the pending draft extension bill. The early releases will go to men who cannot be deployed overseas because their remaining time in service is too short. Draftees entering the Army in the November-January period will complete their training during April-June 1972. The requirement for these trained personnel is determined by the number of inductees being released early because of the Army strength reduction in the pending legislation.

It is estimated that draft calls for the balance of FY 1972, if the draft authority is promptly renewed, would not exceed 80,000-100,000. Total calls of this magnitude would continue the decline which started in FY 1969. By fiscal years the total draft calls were:

Fiscal year 1968, 343,300.

Fiscal year 1969, 266,900.

Fiscal year 1970, 209,300.

Fiscal year 1971, 152,000.

Fiscal year 1972 (est.), 80,000 to 100,000.

If enlistments increase significantly as a result of enactment of the pay provisions of H.R. 6531, the total draft call for FY 1972 may be even lower.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I judge that the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) wants the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, for a few minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. I will want to come back.

Mr. JAVITS. I will take 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may yield to me.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I can get the floor back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MOMENT OF TRUTH ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the negotiators for the United States are entering into the first step of what one of our major newspapers calls an economic poker game in negotiating for a new international policy. This very day the U.S. representatives are meeting with the 10 principal industrial nations of the world, whose decisions will pretty much make or break the new economic policy in its international phases and the new international monetary policy for the world. The U.S. representation will be by Secretary of the Treasury Connally and Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns.

I thought it might be useful, as I have been very close to the development of the whole situation, to put on record, for the interest of my colleagues and the country, some observations upon this situation.

In addition, Mr. President, I have just spent some time in Europe only as recently as last week and have a fairly good concept of the reaction of Europe to our proposals.

There is no question about the fact that we acted as we thought we had to act without necessary relation to the situation of other countries, in order to compel what we considered to be essential to avoid severe economic difficulties for the United States. I am in agreement that we had to act and that on the whole—I may differ with some things in the package—we did what had to be done.

But, Mr. President, it is obvious, and the President himself has made it clear, that just as he is going to end the freeze in 90 days, and succeed it with a new and, we hope, effective wage-price policy and machinery to implement it, so we will have to, within a very measurable period of time, move similarly in the international field. Simply slapping on the 10 percent surcharge and cutting the link between the dollar and gold are strictly temporary Phase I operations. The President himself, when he presented the matter to the country on August 15, stated that he called for and looked toward the establishment of a new international monetary system.

Mr. President, I would like to discuss the key problem which we face in Europe in this regard—and that is the home of the principal financial nations of the world, other than Japan and Canada, and Japan and Canada are very much a part of the group that begins to meet today, the so-called Group of Ten. The principal thing that bothers them is that they took the United States action to be strictly unilateral, with the United States sort of turning to Europe, Japan, and Canada and saying to them, "You are on your own, whatever you do to counter this is

your responsibility, and if you have any propositions, make them and we will listen."

I think, Mr. President, the time has come to change that, by taking the position, first, that we will ourselves make a proposal for a new international monetary system; and, second, that we are ready to negotiate our proposal. I believe that these two declarations will represent such a healthy development in making the other nations feel that these measures are temporary, and that we are ready to negotiate on a multilateral basis in order to replace them with a more permanent system, that we ought immediately to take this particular step.

A satisfactory realignment of currencies is the major short-term objective of the United States. I accept the arguments that retention of the surcharge makes a satisfactory realignment of currencies difficult and feel that disposition of the import surcharge will have to be part of a package settlement which would see a substantial realignment of major currencies against the dollar.

Over the short-run, I also feel that a widening of the permitted bands of currency fluctuations, say from 1 to 3 percent against the other should be implemented.

An emerging major issue is the European request, which the Common Market countries just made, and in which it is reported that Britain and Japan have joined is for a devaluation of the dollar. This is totally unrealistic over the short run for, even from the purely mechanical point of view, Congress could not act on it in time to tie it to early disposition of the import surcharge. This cannot however, be ruled out in terms of the long run and may become a key part of the phase II negotiations.

Therefore, I believe, Mr. President, that the twin propositions which I have recommended, first that the United States make its own proposal of what it would like to see as a new international monetary system, and second, that it offer to negotiate with the other members of the Group of Ten on the basis of that proposal, represent the soundest course.

The short-run problems can best be handled that way, as I have described; and it is impractical and unrealistic for Europe to believe that the United States will devalue absolutely or devalue by changing the price of gold in terms of dollars in the immediate future.

The long-term problems are more difficult even if one can assume that the short-term goal of a satisfactory realignment of currencies will be achieved—meaning by the end of this year, which I believe is thoroughly possible in the way I have suggested. The long-term problems, in my view, include the future role of gold in the international monetary system; the future role of the dollar as a reserve currency; the parity relationship between the dollar and gold; and the need to create an international reserve standard independent of any national currency.

That is generally associated with the idea of an international reserve system under the auspices of the International

Monetary Fund, in which large parts of the world's existing gold and currency reserves will be deposited and a new amplitude will be developed in the issuance of the so-called special drawing rights—paper gold.

So we need, first, to prepare an agenda for negotiating all these questions on a longer range basis in international forums. In the trade area, negotiations leading to a definition of the future relationship between an expanded Common Market, which will include the United Kingdom and certain other European countries, and the United States, likewise are essential, as are continuing trade negotiations with Japan. In turn, the granting of generalized tariff preferences to the less developed countries of the world remains an unfinished item on the U.S. trade agenda.

That a more equitable sharing of our overseas defense costs will be an increasingly important area of negotiations now has been signaled by both the executive and legislative branches. Senator MANSFIELD stated only yesterday his intention to push for the gradual reduction of U.S. troops in Europe—which is a form of burden sharing—and I note that Senator FULBRIGHT addressed himself to this issue during his outstanding interview with Elizabeth Drew of WETA last night.

In conclusion, Mr. President, with the President's announcement of August 14, the United States entered a new era in its international relations. We now have the potential to build a new and equitable world economic order that would contribute to the peace and security of our Nation for the rest of this century. Likewise, the potential also exists—if negotiations fail and if any country or group of countries overplays its hand—to move the world backward into rampant nationalism, trade war between regional competing blocs, and economic stagnation.

Mr. President, there is no doubt about the fact that the United States can hold its own in any of this, but we are not interested, either economically, politically, or militarily, in a "Fortress U.S.A." This is hardly the way in which our people expect to develop and carry out the destiny of the United States in respect to world improvement and world peace. So, Mr. President, there is no question about the fact that the next stage is the negotiation stage in the international field with respect to a new international monetary system, and I believe that the proper first step toward that end should and can be taken now by our representatives meeting with the Group of Ten which opens today. That should consist of the United States putting forward its program by which currencies can be realigned as a condition of removing the surcharge, assuming that an agreement can be reached. The next step would be a more permanent realignment of the international monetary system. But all of this requires, first, a proposal by us, and, second, an expression clearly, distinctly, and most authoritatively of our willingness to negotiate.

That does not seem to have gotten across as yet to our principal trading partners in the world. I urge it very

strongly upon the President and upon our delegation which has now gone to these meetings.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent interpretive article entitled "Economic Poker Game," written by Leonard Silk and published in today's New York Times.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1971]
ECONOMIC POKER GAME—AMERICANS PLAYING FOR MAJOR STAKES AS GROUP OF 10 COUNTRIES IN LONDON

(By Leonard Silk)

Secretary of the Treasury John B. Connally, the take-charge guy of President Nixon's New Economic Policy, has his work cut out for him in facing angry foreign critics at the monetary and trade conference of the Group of Ten nations that starts in London today. The United States intends to keep the heat on the other rich capitalist countries—Britain, Japan, Canada, West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland as an observer—to take steps that will enable this country to swing from a huge balance-of-payments deficit to a surplus position.

STEPS ARE UNCERTAIN

Undersecretary of the Treasury Paul V. Volcker has told Congress that the United States basic payments deficit ran at a \$9-billion annual rate in the first half of 1971; on an official settlements basis, the United States deficit ran at an annual rate of \$22-billion in this year's first quarter.

At least for public and Congressional consumption, Messrs. Connally, Volcker and their associates are refusing to make clear exactly what steps they want other nations to take to help the United States wipe out its deficits. Nor will they say when or under what conditions the United States will drop the import surcharge or discrimination against foreign capital goods.

The Administration recognizes that it is asking for "a lot," including a realignment of exchange rates by other countries to make their money more expensive in terms of the dollar, a major reduction of trade barriers against American goods, and an increase in military burden-sharing by others.

FORCE OF WILL

The European Common Market countries have insisted that the United States must be prepared to devalue the dollar in terms of gold if it expects to get a realignment of exchange rates, but the United States is against changing the gold price of the dollar for several reasons. One is simply prestige; the Administration thinks that for this country overtly to devalue the dollar in terms of gold would be a sign of weakness.

While some economists regard this as nationalistic nonsense, Administration officials appear determined to demonstrate the force of their will by refusing to devalue the dollar—though a major goal of the N.E.P. is in fact a dollar devaluation.

However, the Administration thinks that the issue of who devalues and who upvalues is more than a matter of mere semantics or empty prestige. If the dollar looks weak, because the United States yields, it is feared that other nations will be less willing to hold dollars or use them as international money.

Some foreign representatives talk as though they are in fact determined to dethrone the dollar and make it subject to the same rules and limits as other currencies. But the United States position is based on the assumption that most nations will recognize that it is in their own interest to make the dollar strong so that the world does not lack a readily usable international

currency and relatively stable exchange rates.

There are real economic gains and losses depending on who devalues and who upvalues. If, say, Japan or France upvalues, their goods would be more expensive in all world markets; if the United States devalues, then Japan and France would give up some trading advantages in relation to American goods but not to those of other countries.

The Nixon Administration does not believe, however, that even a major revaluation of currencies in favor of the dollar would in itself produce the big swing it seeks from payments deficit to surplus. It wants major trade concessions as well.

The Administration contends that the United States has held the dirty end of the stick despite reciprocal trade agreements over the years and that the United States started bargaining from a more liberal position than foreign countries.

This is a view that many economists—and some political officers in the State Department—would deny. But the Administration's economic policy-makers think the State Department has been a haven of soft-bargainers where United States business interests have been concerned.

GATT VIOLATION FOUND

It is worth noting that the basic United States trade legislation is still the highly protectionist Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, which made it possible for Mr. Nixon to impose the 10 per cent import surtax without going to Congress.

In imposing the surtax on imports not already subject to quota—of which there are more than 50 items, headed by oil, without counting some important items that are on informal "voluntary" quotas, such as steel—Mr. Nixon stunned foreigners by wiping out all tariff cuts reciprocally negotiated by the United States since the end of World War II.

The United States has now been declared to be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; other GATT members have the right to retaliate.

Nevertheless, the Administration is in no hurry to surrender the bargaining weapon of the 10 per cent import surtax. Nor is it in a hurry to give up the discriminatory clause of the proposed 10 per cent investment tax credit, which limits the tax break to American-made capital goods while the import surtax is in force.

Even if the 10 per cent import surtax were to be dropped immediately, the Administration still would grant an investment tax credit of only 5 per cent to foreign-made capital goods rather than the 10 per cent credit American goods would get in the first year.

The combination of the import surcharge and investment tax credit create a 22 per cent price barrier for other nations seeking to sell capital goods to American companies to surmount. In addition, prices of foreign-made capital goods have been further increased in some cases by the upward valuation of national currencies.

Foreigners accuse the United States of adopting beggar-my-neighbor policies; they say the United States now proposes, in effect, to export its unemployment to them.

They insist that the United States drop the import surcharge as a condition for a realignment of exchange rates.

President Nixon suggests that the United States is now in a poker game and must play the best it can to win.

He told Congress that after World War II, the United States had all the poker chips and "we had to spread them around so that others could play."

That was true in the 1940s, he said, and partially true in the 50's and even the early 60's, but "it is no longer true today." Now, said the President, "the time is past for the United States to compete with one hand tied behind her back."

Whether a hand tied behind your back in a poker game matters much is moot. But the game of poker, which the British historian D. W. Brogan regards as the true clue to the American character, is fundamentally based on bluffing—or, to put it more accurately, on skill in leveling threats that are difficult to distinguish from bluffs.

Mr. Nixon and Mr. Connally are advertising their belief that they have the cards to beat their opponents in the poker game. They hear the threats of retaliation—in the political as well as the economic area—and think it is the foreigners who are bluffing.

Some officials within the Administration are appalled at having the whole money and trade problem cast in terms of the poker analogy, with its implications of threats, bluffs, big winners and big losers.

Nevertheless, the Administration's leaders warn that if foreign governments do not do for the United States what they earlier were prepared to do for Britain, Canada, Italy and others when they were in serious balance-of-payments deficit, the United States is ready to limit their access to the big American market and pursue its own economic and foreign-policy aims as it sees fit.

Critics fear that the new Nixon policy marks a decisive turn away from the foreign economic and political line backed since the end of World War II by the so-called American Establishment, which included the Eisenhower Administration as well as the Democratic Administrations that preceded and followed it.

NIXON'S MOVES SCORED

Mr. Nixon's critics contend that the President's foreign economic moves will undermine his domestic moves to stop inflation.

In the celebrated Pepperdine College address, Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, called for trade liberalization as a means of helping to check inflationary pressures at home.

The Nixon Administration now is presently heading in the opposite direction; protection of American producers from foreign competition could ultimately intensify inflation.

However, the Nixon foreign economic policy is still ambiguous. The President and Secretary Connally are prepared to stay with the aggressive, nationalistic line until foreigners adjust but to moderate it if and when other countries move to help the United States regain international balance.

Worries are spreading throughout the world that heightened nationalism in the United States—a reaction to the long and bitter Vietnam war—and growing support for economic protectionism—a reaction to intense foreign competition, domestic inflation and unemployment—will ultimately force the Nixon Administration to resolve its ambiguities on the side of an aggressive jingoism.

This could breed similar reactions abroad and split the non-Communist world into largely isolated blocs.

This is the hazard that confronts the Group of Ten nations now meeting in London and will face the annual conference of the International Monetary Fund in Washington later this month.

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF THE DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I want to join in urging the Senate to approve the pending conference report. I think it is a good conference report, and its subject matter has been given long—and perhaps over-long—consideration. I urge the Senate to reject the proposed tabling maneuver and any other attempts to sidetrack the bill.

I believe that the long and somewhat stormy conference on this measure produced a reasonable compromise in all respects, and I do include the controversy over the so-called Mansfield amendment. I do not think House conferees would—or will, if the conference is reconvened—go beyond their present commitments.

Two major issues are involved, other than the Mansfield amendment. There is a 2-year extension of the draft. I think it is needed. There are pay provisions to benefit the military. I think they are needed, also.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that the hopes of some people, in and out of the Senate, for an all-volunteer force have tended to obscure the need for a continuing draft. No competent authority believes that an all-volunteer force can be brought into being now, so a draft extension is needed in any case. Indeed, the military services say they have already been hurt by the 2-month draft holiday.

As to the question of military pay, the increase provided in the conference report will provide the necessary incentives to give the volunteer force concept a fair test.

It has been charged that the conference report gives unfair treatment to men in the low enlisted pay grades. On the contrary, I believe that it is clear that the conference report will redress inequities which have existed in the military pay structure since 1952.

Over 71 per cent of the pay and allowance increases in the conference report go to individuals with under 2 years service. The figure for the House bill was 64 per cent. For the Senate, it was 74 per cent.

Once the conference report's pay scales are in effect, basic pay rates for individuals with less than 2 years' service will have been increased 189 per cent since 1952, as compared with 151 per cent for all the over 2-year rates.

Mr. President, I find it hard to understand newspaper accounts which indicate that a "coalition" has formed to reject this conference report by one parliamentary device or another. It would seem to me that a strong coalition should be pushing to speed passage.

The conference bill provides a draft extension which is necessary even if it is viewed as a transitional step toward an all-volunteer force. The bill includes pay increases which are deserved by the military and can provide incentives if the volunteer force is to be formed. It would seem to me that the justification for the conference report is overwhelming.

I urge the Senate to reject the tabling motion and, then, to approve the conference report, so that this 7-month cliffhanger can be ended and the military can be assured of manpower necessary for the Nation's defense.

Mr. President, in light of the present

action on the wage-price freeze and what is likely to occur afterward, it is probable that this is the only military bill that will come before the Senate in this session. The military are long overdue in their need for a pay raise, to make their pay comparable to that of others throughout the country. I think they are hurt as badly as anyone by reason of the freeze that is in effect at this time.

So I urge Senators to vote for the conference report and to give the military a pay raise, when it can be granted. That, of course, will be after the freeze has been lifted. It is a pay raise for which they are long overdue.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. No one is better qualified than he to pass on a set of complicated facts such as presented here.

I know that the Senator from Nevada has been concerned all year about this bill and about the draft. He knows the necessity for it. He knows the need for an equitable pay raise. Although the Senator from Nevada was not a member of the conference, he was of great assistance in helping solve some of the problems there. He had a very urgent and demanding assignment in another committee at that time, in connection with hearings, but we had the benefit of his constant counsel and advice. I thank him for that. I know of his continued interest in the subject matter as well as in this bill.

Mr. President, I do not have any other remarks at this time. I might want to make some remarks later, before the Senate adjourns. For the time being, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the most damaging legislative blow to our national security in years could come tomorrow if the Senate votes in favor of tabling the conference report on the draft extension bill.

If this report is tabled, the chances of extending the draft another 2 years will be placed in serious jeopardy. Without the draft a military manpower crisis of serious proportions will result and those who favor an all-volunteer force may see their hopes vanish.

An orderly, phased transition to an all-volunteer armed force is necessary if this goal is to be achieved. At present few of the inducements and changes needed to attract volunteers to either the regular forces or the reserves have been enacted.

While I remained unconvinced that an all-volunteer force of the necessary quantity and quality can be obtained to assure our national security, I do see how delay or elimination of the draft would wreck the chances of this concept succeeding.

The Members of this body should also weigh carefully the warning of Chairman JOHN STENNIS that if this report is tabled he doubts a new compromise can be reached. If the draft is killed in this manner, then the military pay raise and other important provisions of this act will die also.

Some in the Senate say they favor extension of the draft but dislike the decisions of the conference. They want the bill returned to conference so that their ideas can be written into a new bill. If the draft is killed by this action, and our military forces disintegrate, those who voted to table must bear the responsibility.

Mr. President, the Senate must realize we have been working on this bill since hearings began in February. Debate on the Senate floor began May 5 and lasted until June 24 after over 50 amendments had been considered.

The conference between the House and Senate deliberated well over a month trying to write a compromise bill suitable to both Houses. The House promptly passed the compromise version. The Senate should now pass it.

It is serious business to reject a conference report on any bill. Enactment of legislation involves compromise. We cannot each have our own way. The conference members on the draft extension worked long and hard to come up with the best bill possible. The conferees were the senior men from both committees.

The Senate must realize that if tomorrow's effort to table the report is successful it will nullify the agreement on the 28 differences in the Senate and House bills. Old issues, once settled, will be reopened.

Two issues in the draft extension bill seem to be on the minds of the members of this body—the Mansfield amendment and the pay proposals.

First, on the Mansfield amendment it can be said without fear of contradiction that the reason for the long conference between the House and Senate was due to the Senate's effort to get the best possible compromise on this amendment. If we are forced back to conference I see little hope of obtaining any wording which would come closer to the original amendment.

Second, the pay proposals. There are some who are leading the fight to return the bill to the conference on the ground that the pay compromise falls short of properly rewarding the first-term soldier.

The Senate must bear in mind that while the first term is important and should be fully compensated it is the career soldier who holds the services together. If we are to encourage men to make a career of the service then the higher grades must also be made more attractive.

The annual cost of this pay bill is \$2.4 billion. It exceeds by over \$1 billion the next highest pay raise which was enacted in 1963. It would be unwise to pass a pay bill of this size and not recognize in some way the needs of our career military personnel.

Mr. President, as I stated on the floor Tuesday we are racing head on into a

military personnel crisis if we continue delay of the draft. I cited many statistics to support that position.

Yesterday, the service Secretaries and the Joint Chiefs of Staff appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee and expressed their grave concern if the draft bill is tabled in the Senate.

I would like to cite for the Senate some of the points made in this highly unusual committee session.

First, the Army represented by Secretary Robert Froehike and Gen. Bruce Palmer made these points:

1. Army enlisted personnel strength will fall below needed levels if the draft is delayed past September.
2. The all-volunteer force concept will be imperiled if the draft is not continued during the next 2 years.
3. The quality type Army soldier able to perform duty on complex Army systems is not being obtained through enlistments and can be obtained only through the draft at this time.
4. In July 36% of the men enlisted were in the lowest acceptable qualification category and 47% of those enlisting were not high school graduates.

Navy representatives at the meeting included Secretary John Chafee and Adm. Elmo Zumwalt. They said:

1. Without the draft the Navy will be able to obtain only 62% of the high-quality-type enlistees and only 85% of the needed officer force.
2. Naval Reserve forces will be able to meet only two-thirds of personnel requirements as many reservists are draft-induced.
3. The Navy manpower pool of likely enlistees has dropped 35% in the past 2 months.
4. The Marines estimate they can get only one-half to two-thirds of the numbers they need if the draft expires.
5. Marine Reserve strength will drop to 50% of requirement without the draft.

The Air Force, represented by Secretary Robert Seamans, Jr., and Gen. John Ryan made these points:

1. The Air Force was 1,800 short in the 4th Quarter of FY 1971 and estimated a shortage of 7,000 airmen for the 1st Quarter of FY 1972 since the draft has been shut down.
2. In the past some 94% of enlistees were high school graduates while in August this figure fell to 84%.
3. ROTC enrollments in August and September are down and reports from the field indicate the draft shutdown is the main cause.
4. In filling reserve slots last year only 3 interviews were necessary to get 1 man, but this summer it required 7 interviews to get 1 man. Men on waiting lists told the Reserve recruiters they were no longer interested.

Mr. President, Admiral Zumwalt also made an interesting point that would have an impact on all services. He noted that, if the economy picked up, as we all hope it will, then service enlistments would decrease.

In summary, it should be noted that the personnel shortfall in our Regular Forces and the marked downtrend in Reserves will accelerate if word goes out Thursday that the draft bill has been tabled by the Senate.

Our Army is already short of trained personnel in certain positions and fighting serious morale and discipline problems due to the drug culture, racial problems, and the mismanagement of the Vietnam war.

The Senate must refuse this bid to deal the Army and the other services another blow by placing in jeopardy the draft extension. I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to table the draft extension conference report. We must get on with the business of meeting this issue head on, an up or down vote on the draft

report, so other important problems of the Nation may be considered.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, at this point the sole surviving "argument" against tabling the draft bill conference report is the implausible motion that any delay—any delay at all—in approving the report will cause a calamitous erosion of our national security.

Rather than allow this assertion to collapse from under its own burden of incredibility, I want to share some facts with the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table printed in the RECORD.

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

1970-71 DRAFT CALLS AND ACCESSIONS COMPARED

	1970 draft calls	1970 DOD total volunteers	1970 Army volunteers	1971 draft calls	1971 DOD total volunteers	1971 Army volunteers
April.....	19,000	25,200	10,100	17,000	26,800	10,200
May.....	15,000	22,900	17,600	15,000	22,500	8,500
June.....	15,000	33,500	14,000	10,000	38,400	16,000
July.....	15,000	32,300	11,500	35,400	13,600
August.....	10,000	32,500	11,800	38,800	14,400
September.....	12,000	31,800	13,700

Mr. CRANSTON. These figures demolish the argument that instant adoption of this conference report is all that stands between the Republic and catastrophe. Specifically, these figures clearly establish three things:

First, that monthly accessions are even higher than last year, although the army is now dropping its force levels;

Second, that even without the draft, July and August, that total accessions are higher than those figures for the same months last year; and

Third, that the training establishment cannot be lying fallow, as total accessions are up to comparable months last year.

Note that Army figures for April year's figures, as distinguished from total DOD—military.

Mr. President, the Pentagon has issued a formal statement predicting needed draft calls of 80,000 to 100,000 for the remainder of fiscal year 1972.

Taking the most conservative figure—100,000—and placing that number needed from December through next June, the monthly draft call will be only 14,300—a figure very comparable to the monthly calls of last year. That level can in no way be a burden on the Defense Establishment, including the training establishment.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to share with the Senate this table concerning the various services' own quotas, and their commendable success in meeting them, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

	Quota		Actual enlistments	
	July	August	July	August
Army.....	9,500	13,500	14,800	14,900
Air Force.....	8,628	9,439	8,677	9,444
Marines.....	5,500	5,690	5,256	5,280
Navy.....	8,300	10,300	8,177	10,373

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, these facts should lay to rest the notion that the Nation cannot afford to have the Senate work its true will on the draft bill.

CXVII—2010—Part 24

ORDER FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, immediately following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR CONFERENCE REPORT ON EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the close of the routine morning business on tomorrow, the Senate turn to the consideration of the conference report on the extension of the draft, which is a privileged matter.

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

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON FRIDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, immediately following the remarks of the able Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I assume and hope that this will be the final quorum call today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Presi-

dent, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow, as nearly as it can now be seen, is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Immediately following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes. At the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of the routine morning business on tomorrow, the Senate will return to the consideration of the conference report on the extension and revision of the Draft Act.

There are indications that there may be a motion to table the conference report on tomorrow. If such a motion is offered, that motion will not be debatable unless a unanimous-consent order is entered, and agreed to, allowing time for debate on such tabling motion.

Senators are therefore on notice that there may be a rollcall vote or rollcall votes on tomorrow and that there may be a rollcall vote or rollcall votes on Friday. In accordance with the statement made by the distinguished majority leader some time ago, moreover, the Senate may hold Saturday meetings at any time during the remainder of the session if it appears to be necessary.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

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 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 16, 1971, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 15, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Richard J. Grunewald, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, vice Jerome M. Rosow, resigned.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The following-named persons to be Members of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for the terms indicated:

For the remainder of the term expiring August 3, 1974:

J. Stanley Marshall, of Florida, vice James Chipman Fletcher, resigned.

For a term of 4 years from August 3, 1971: Susan N. Crawford, of Illinois, vice Frederick Herbert Wagman, term expired.

Bernice M. Hetzner, of Nebraska, vice Robert Higgins Ebert, term expired.

Angelo M. May, of California, vice Bruno W. Augenstein, term expired.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John E. Reinhardt, of Maryland, a Foreign Service Information officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Herbert J. Stern, of New Jersey, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years, vice Frederick B. Lacey, resigned.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Louis R. Abraham
John B. Acey
John A. Adams
Richard J. Adams
Thomas G. Adams
Mars M. Adkins
Francis R. Allen
Jesse L. Altman, Jr.
Dennis N. Anderson
Ira C. Anderson
Thomas C. Andrew, Jr.
Harold L. Angle
Phillip T. Arman
B. L. Avera, Jr.
Robert L. Baggett
George L. Bailey
George N. Bailey, Jr.
Richard A. Bailey
Harry H. Bair
George A. Baker III
Terrance P. Baker
William R. Ball
William H. Barnard
John A. Barry
Karlton L. Batt
Andrew F. Bauer
Robert C. Baughman
Peter S. Beck
Raymond A. Becker
Pierre H. Begnaud
Daniel T. Benn
Arthur A. Bergman
Herbert T. Berwald, Jr.
Donald C. Bickel
Donald C. Bieger
Richard K. Biel
Edward A. Birzer
Carl E. Black
George M. Blackburn
Clay D. Blackwell
Ronald E. Blanchard
William A. Bloomer
George F. Boerman
George J. Bolland
James L. Bolton
Royce L. Bond
William Boone

Jerry T. Bowlin
Charles K. Breslauer
Clyde W. Brewer, Jr.
Lawrence J. Briggs
Robert O. Broad, Jr.
Earl E. Brown
Desmond F. Browne
Ralph E. Brubaker
Samuel P. Brutcher
John J. Burke, Jr.
Mervyn J. Burns
Marlon G. Busby
Peter M. Busch
John W. Butler
Richard D. Buttolph
Joseph C. Byram, Jr.
Pasquale L. Cacace
Michael P. Cady
John J. Caldas, Jr.
Robert C. Caldwell
Dougal A. Cameron III
Peter J. Canzano
Richard P. Capatosto
Ronald E. Cardwell
John D. Carlton
Robert T. Carney
Donald S. Carr
Richard W. Carr
Daniel I. Carroll
Edward P. Carroll
John E. Carroll, Jr.
Brendan J. Cassidy
James E. Cassidy
Donald E. Cathcart
John G. Celli
Charles W. Chain III
Ralph L. Chapman
Keith L. Christensen
Walter T. Chwatek
Richard J. Cisewski
Arthur B. Clark
Dale H. Clark
George Clark
Edward J. Clarkson
David M. Clauretje
Robert E. Cleveland
Thaddeus S. Coates
Joseph F. Cody, Jr.
John C. Coffin

Barry S. Colassard
Fred J. Cone
Thomas F. Conway
Richard J. Coogan
Ernest T. Cook, Jr.
Thomas D. Cooney
James L. Cooper
Wade H. Cooper
Roy G. Corbett
James M. Cox
Thomas C. Cox
John M. Coykendall
Ervin J. Crampton
James O. Cranford
John D. Crawford
Forrest W. Crone
Timothy J. Cronin, Jr.
Donald F. Crowe
Ernest C. Cunningham, Jr.
James L. Cunningham
John R. Curnutt
Kenneth D. Curry, Jr.
Edward W. Cuthbert
Stanley J. Czubal
John R. Dalley
Donald A. Dalrymple
Donald W. Dane
Clarence L. Davis
Neal L. Derickson
Donald E. Dilley
William E. Dodds
William C. Doerner
Thomas C. Dolson
John B. Donovan, Jr.
Edwin J. Doran
Richard T. Douglas
Lloyd J. Draayer
John L. Driefer
Bruce W. Driscoll
Thomas K. Duffy
Allen R. Edens
Orville R. Edmondson
Myrddyn E. Edwards
Robert F. Eggers
Stephen S. Eisenhauer
Franklin P. Eller, Jr.
Gerald L. Ellis
Gordon P. Emry
Eldon L. Erickson
George J. Ertmeier
William R. Etter
George G. Evans, Jr.
Richard L. Evans
William R. Falls
Alex E. Fazekas
Warren A. Ferdinand
Arthur P. Finlon
Robert C. Finn
Albert T. Fisher
Michael J. Fibich, Jr.
Robert L. Fischer
William M. Foley
Pat D. Ford
Clarence D. Foreman
Robert L. Formanek
William J. Forristall
Stephen R. Foulger
Marcus T. Fountain, Jr.
Robert D. Fowner
Ray M. Franklin
Charles H. Frazier, Jr.
Bobby H. Freeman
Allen L. Frucchi
Laurence S. Fry
Laurence R. Gaboury
John A. Gagen
Louis F. Gagnon
Dominick R. Gannon
John H. Gary III
Edward E. Gerding
Robert F. Goins
John C. Gonzalez
Frank E. Graham
James R. Green
Jimmie L. Green
Wallace M. Greene
III
Jesse R. Greer
Joe L. Gregorczyk
Charles E. Griggs

Billy M. Grimes
Roy M. Gulick, Jr.
Richard A. Gustafson
Darold L. Guttormson
Charles R. Habgood
Robert D. Hagan
Don K. Hanna
Richard O. Harper
Frederick R. Hasler
Donald J. Hatch
Manuel H. Hedges
Charles A. Henry
Richard T. Henry
William T. Hewes
John M. Hey
Arthur R. Hickle
Jimmie A. Hicks
Gary W. Hintz
Gregory G. Hoen
Lyle H. Holmes
John I. Hopkins
Thomas C. Houston
Thad A. Hoyer
Robert R. Hull
William S. Humbert
III
Donald L. Humphrey
Ralph S. Huston
Richard C. Hyatt
Will D. Isbell
Henry C. Ivy, Jr.
Donald E. Jacobsen
Eugene S. Jaczko, Jr.
James D. Jahn
Gerald D. James
Russell E. Jamison
Fidelas W. Jarnot
Edward P. Janz
Leroy E. Johnson
Richard J. Johnson
Robert C. Johnson
George E. Jones
Homer P. Jones
Walter A. Jupp
Carl W. Kachauskas
Billy J. Kahler
Orville R. Kartchner
Arthur C. Katen
John F. Keane, Jr.
John M. Keenan
Francis J. Kelly
Raymond G. Kennedy, Sr.
William L. Kent
Richard J. Kenworthy
Hugh T. Kerr
Alvah J. Kettering
Donald E. Kirby
James P. Kizer
John R. Koch
Joseph B. Knotts
Russell I. Kramer
Billy D. Kraxberger
Ronald G. Kropp
Harold F. Kuhn
Allan W. Lamb
Thomas J. Lapham
Neil M. Larimer II
Erik Larsen
Ralph L. Lary, Jr.
Herbert F. Lawson, Jr.
George H. Leach
Thomas G. Leach
Jerry W. Ledin
Alex Lee
Arthur E. Lee
Howard V. Lee
Victor M. Lee
Julius M. Lewis, Jr.
Orville V. Lippold, Jr.
Charles M. Lively
John A. Livingston
Perry T. Llewellyn
Robert H. Lockwood
Francis M. Logan, Jr.
Robert E. Loehe
Edward H. Loney
William H. Long
Edmund P. Looney, Jr.
John E. Lorzing
William J. Lottman

Peter F. Lottsfeldt
Thomas P. Lougheed
Arthur S. Loughry
Bruce D. Luedke
Darwin D. Lundberg
Jarvis D. Lynch, Jr.
Cornelius W. MacFarlan
Joseph M. Magaldi, Jr.
Gordon E. Malone
Marvin P. Mann, Jr.
Frank M. Manrod
John A. Manzzone, Jr.
Samuel J. Marfia
James W. Marks
Harry T. Marren
Lawrence A. Marshall
Manuel O. Martinez
Frank W. Martino
Andrew G. Marushok
Robert B. Mason
Carlos K. McAfee
Donald J. McCarthy
Howard J. McCarty
Charles A. McCluskey
Melvin W. McCoury, Jr.
Charles J. McDoanid, Jr.
Leemon B. McHenry
Jimmy B. McInroe
James L. McManaway
William J. McManus
James P. McWilliams, Jr.
Ernest U. Meier
Paul F. Melcher
Donald R. Miller
Henry G. Miller, Jr.
James E. Miller
John G. Miller
Neil P. Miller
Ralph D. Miller
Robert G. Mitchell
John P. Monahan
Jack P. Monroe, Jr.
Hubert A. Monteau
Harvey J. Morgan
Richard J. Morley
Donald L. Morris
McLendon G. Morris
Frank C. Mullen, Jr.
Carl E. Mundy, Jr.
David H. Murch
Douglas G. Murphy
John D. Murray
Ronald L. Murray
Robert D. Myers
Arthur A. Neibach, Jr.
Marvin R. Nelson
Harl W. Newton
Lloyd B. Nice
Joe B. Noble
Richard A. Noll
Robert L. O'Brien
David E. Obuhanych
Leo K. Odrudy, Jr.
Don J. Ogden
Curtis W. Olson
Stephen Ondrako, Jr.
Robert P. O'Neal
James W. Orr
Alfonso Oseguera
Patrick E. O'Toole
Robert F. Overmyer
Ronald L. Owen
Billy E. Pafford
James E. Page
Carroll A. Palmore
Dorsie D. Page, Jr.
Marvin E. Palmateer
Ralph K. Park
Charles E. Parker
William K. Parker
Donald C. Pauley
Marvin E. Peacock
Edward R. Perron
James M. Perryman, Jr.
Robert L. Peterson
David W. Phifer

Reed Phillips, Jr.
Robert Plant
Bruce A. Pifel
John L. Pipa
Arthur S. Piper
Louis J. Piantadosi
James A. Poland
Earle G. Poronto
Charles R. Porter
Robert R. Porter
George E. Pratt
Lee A. Preble
Leonard T. Preston, Jr.
William G. Price
Robert N. Rackham
Henry R. Raines
David A. Ramsey
Lionie E. Ramsey
John T. Rapp
Eugene W. Rawlins
William T. Read
Thomas S. Reap
Ralph L. Reed
Van S. Reed
John A. Reese, Jr.
Michael P. Reeves
Frank C. Regan, Jr.
Elwin Reichert, Jr.
James K. Rellly
James F. Rice
Richard G. Ritchie
James A. Roberts
Richard S. Robertson
Charles D. Robinson
Jon R. Robson
Robert T. Roche
George F. Rogers, Jr.
Barry P. Rust
Colin J. Ruthven
Louis G. Sasso
Peter C. Scaglione, Jr.
Kenneth L. Scarborough
Donald E. Schaet
Norbert F. Schnippel, Jr.
Harold Schofield
Jack T. Schultz
James E. Schulken
James A. Schumacher
Leo J. Scolorio, Jr.
Roger F. Scott, Jr.
Charles C. Seabrook
Henry L. Searle
Donald R. Seay
Robert L. Sfreddo
Walter C. Service III
Karl E. Sharff
Paul J. Shank, Jr.
Glenn J. Shaver, Jr.
James F. Sheehan
Jerry L. Shelton
John J. Sheridan
Michael K. Sheridan
William P. Shunkey, Jr.
Con D. Silard, Jr.
Colben K. Slime, Jr.
Frederick E. Sisley
Paul D. Slack
John Smallman
Clarence E. Smith, Jr.
Norman A. Smith
Norman H. Smith
Robert W. Smith
Rodgers T. Smith
William D. Smith
William R. Smith
William W. Smith
Vito M. Solazzo
Robert P. Spaete
Donald R. Sparks
Early W. Spiars
Richard P. Spreier
David N. Sprott
Victor D. Stauch, Jr.
Robert M. Stauffer
Richard G. Steffy
Hardy R. Stennis
Arthur L. Stewart, Jr.

Walter L. Strain
Francis T. Sullivan
Michael P. Sullivan
James E. Swab
Carter P. Swenson
Bernace M. Symm
Leonard J. Szafranski,
Jr.
Robert C. Tashjian
George H. Taylor III
Charles H. Taylor, Jr.
Richard B. Taylor

John J. Tharp
Jerry R. Thompson
William J. Tirschfield
Frederic L. Tolleson
Robert W. Topping
Edward F. Townley,
Jr.
David C. Townsend
James B. Townsend
Everett P. Trader, Jr.
Jerome P. Trehy
Everett L. Tunget

Terry Turner
John T. Tyler
Mario S. Valentini
James H. Vandever
Jan H. Vangorder
Neil R. Vanleeuwen
Fredric J. Vanous
Richard S. Varney
Donald J. Verdon
Peter J. Vogel
William R. Vonharten
Norman H. Vreeland

Paul H. Wagener
Ralph V. Walker, Jr.
Lorin C. Wallace, Jr.
Robert L. Walsh
Alphonse I.
Warczakowski
Charles Ward
Lloyd K. Warn
Donald E. Webb
Gerald A. Weiland
Stuart L. Weinerth,
Jr.

William M. Whaley
Thomas M. Wheeler
William L. Whelan
Francis V. White, Jr.
Robert E. White
Fred T. Whitman
William W. Widener
Warrend H.
Wiedhahn, Jr.
Eric H. Wieler
Martin J. Williams
James W. Willkomm

Donald D. Wilson
Paul A. Wilson, Jr.
Walter M. Winoski
Henry F. Witter
Peter R. Worden
Joseph B. Wuerz
Neal B. Wynn
Walter N. Yanochik
Charles E. Yates
Richard C. Yezzi
Lewis J. Zilka
John T. Zych, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 15, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

And Thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord: That it may be well with Thee.—Deuteronomy 6: 18.

Reveal Thyself to us, our Father, as we draw near to Thee in spirit and in truth. We come to receive that uplift of spirit which will enable us to do our duties and to solve our problems ever seeking the good of our country and the best for the people of our land. Help us to see our way more clearly and to walk in it more faithfully.

We are weak, give us strength; we know so little, give us wisdom; we are selfish, make us kind. In all our contacts may we be more understanding and more sympathetic and may Thy kingdom come in all our hearts.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

ACTION TO REPEAL EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT ELEVATES HOUSE TO NEW HEIGHTS

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, ever since coming to this august body almost 9 years ago, I have been gladdened most by the fact that here in this House I have found great men—men of good will dedicated to promote the welfare of this great Nation and its people.

Yesterday, my admiration and respect for the Members of this body were lifted to even greater heights. Yesterday, by the exercise of considered good judgment on the part of an overwhelming majority of its Members, by an almost unbelievable lopsided vote of 356 to 49,

this House acted to repeal the repugnant Emergency Detention Act of 1950. By so doing this House elevated itself to new heights—it struck a real blow for individual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank my colleagues who joined me in support of H.R. 234. While I find it extremely difficult to single out anyone for special mention, I wish to express my deepest gratitude especially to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Judiciary Committee and a cosponsor of H.R. 234. Without his unwavering support and advice, the legislation would never have passed. To the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA), the original cosponsors of H.R. 234, go my special thanks. Their wise counsel and staunch support throughout the long struggle to final victory, served as a source of great encouragement to me. To Speaker ALBERT, Majority Leader BOGGS, and Majority Whip O'NEILL, and to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), I extend my appreciation for their active role in obtaining such a favorable response from the House.

My idealistic image of the Congress was made to appear brighter by the bipartisan support which I received in my effort to obtain passage of the legislation. For their active role on the Republican side, I extend my special thanks to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD), to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF), to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK), and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER). Their idealism transcended party lines. Together we have proven to the world that we Americans mean what we say when we say "There is no place for concentration camps in America."

To all my colleagues who joined me: again my heartiest thanks and mahalo.

REPEAL OF EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) in expressing my gratitude to the Members of the House in voting to repeal the Emergency Deten-

tion Act. I also want to express the appreciation of the people in my district, and the people of the United States, to Mr. MATSUNAGA for his untiring efforts in having this bill brought to the floor, and for its passage yesterday. I think the Members of this body should compliment the gentleman from Hawaii for what he has done. We have all been pleased to join in his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-163)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education is submitted herewith.

This Council, authorized by Public Law 89-329, has reviewed the administration and effectiveness of the program authorized by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

Several of the Council's proposals are highly commendable, especially those reflecting a concern for innovation and reform in post-secondary education, including the proposed National Foundation for Higher Education, and its recommendation that programs directed to continuing education for adults be coordinated and consolidated.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 15, 1971.

FEDERAL-INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR THE HUDSON RIVER BASIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 3 of Public Law 89-605 as amended by Public