ministration hospitals who perform evening, night, weekend, holidays, or overtime duty and to authorize payment for standby or on-call time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

H.R. 17752. A bill to provide indemnity payments to dairy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 1295. Joint resolution providing for annual audits of the Federal Reserve System by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 1296. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.J. Res. 1297. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 786. Concurrent resolution relating to the pay of the U.S. Capitol Police force for duty performed in emergencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

348. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to a proposed amendment to the Constitution on public school selection rights, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 17753. A bill for the relief of Eladio Pasamba Amador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 17754. A bill for the relief of Amante Catalda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 17755. A bill for the relief of Miss Ninfa Evola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 17756. A bill for the relief of Iraj Rigi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 17757. A bill for the relief of Epaminodas Stavrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 17758. A bill for the relief of Ephy Grace Peshek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Monday, June 10, 1968*

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose never failing love alone can heal our wounds and in whose keeping are the destinies of men and nations, in this time of grief and sorrow, when an empty desk in this Senate Chamber speaks of our tragic loss, we can but voice our deathless faith:

Jesus, I die to Thee
Whenever death shall come—
To die in Thee, is life to me
In my eternal home.

In life or death, O love divine, O helper ever present, through Thy abounding grace be Thou our strength and stay.

Lord, in this hour of tumult,
Lord, in this night of fears,
Keep open, O keep open
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears.
Not blindly, nor in hatred,
Lord, let us do our part—
Keep open, O keep open
Our eyes, our minds, our hearts.

We ask it in the name of the living Christ who is the resurrection and the life. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, late a Senator from the State of New York.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4919) to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 16027) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 16027) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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.

NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT AS A MEMBER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following nomination, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

JUNE 5, 1968.

The Senate of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, I, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia nominate the following named person for appointment as a Member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

Dean Stephen S. Davis, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after May 23, 1968.

WALTER WASHINGTON,
Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

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 and withdrawing the nomination of Edward Klimowich to be postmaster at Montville, N.J., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 6, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL WEDNESDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. Wednesday next.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TYDINGS ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the Journal on Wednes-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

day, June 12, 1968, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT AND THE FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1154, H.R. 16674.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 16674) to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, 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 a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1166), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill is designed to improve the capitalization of the Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations and enhance their capacity to meet the increasing credit needs of farmers and ranchers while retiring the remaining Government capital from the banks within a reasonable period. The bill would—

(1) Increase the debt-to-capital ratio of the Federal intermediate credit banks from a 12-to-1 ratio to 20 to 1, thereby permitting them to borrow more funds from investors;

(2) Permit each FICB to issue and sell participation certificates to other financing institutions;

(3) Authorize each FICB to equalize the ownership of the PCA's in its reserve account in reasonable proportion to the business done during the previous 3 years; and

(4) Permit the cancellation and retirement of class B stock of PCA's under Farm Credit Administration rules.

MAJOR PROVISION

The bill would relax the present statutory limitation on the maximum amount of their consolidated debentures that the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks may sell in the public securities market in order to obtain funds with which to finance production credit associations and other institutions in making loans to farmers and ranchers. Under existing law (12 U.S.C. 1041 (Supp. II, 1967)), the aggregate amount of such debentures and similar obligations outstanding may not exceed 12 times the surplus and paid-in capital of all such banks. Section 1(a) of the bill would make this debt-to-capital limitation 20 to 1 instead of 12 to 1. The need and justification for the amendment were made apparent at the hearing.

It is estimated that the debt-to-capital ratio of the Federal intermediate credit banks will reach 11.9 to 1 prior to the close of business on June 30, 1968. Meanwhile the production credit needs of farmers continue to increase. This is evidenced by the recent growth in outstanding loans and discounts of the credit banks for credit to farmers over the previous year, which was 14.1 percent at the end of fiscal 1966, 15.6 percent for 1967, and 14.3 percent for 1968 (estimated). If the banks are to continue in a position to meet such increasing credit needs, it is obvious that either their capital or the present 12-to-1 debt-to-capital limitation must soon be increased. While the Government might purchase additional capital stock in the banks, that would be contrary to the policy that all Government capital shall be retired from the banks within a reasonable period. The production credit associations also may be required to purchase additional capital stock in the banks and we are advised that they will be expected to do so. However, it is not deemed within the capacity of the associations to provide all the capital that would be required if the increasing credit needs of farmers are to be met within the present 12-to-1 limitation. Consequently, the bill would resolve the dilemma by increasing to 20 to 1 the permissible debt-to-capital ratio of the Federal intermediate credit banks.

As of June 30, 1967, the total amount of credit bank debentures outstanding was $3.3 billion; the maximum that then could have been outstanding under the 12-to-1, debt-to-capital limitation was $3.7 billion; and if the 20-to-1 limitation now proposed had been in effect, the legal maximum would have been $6.2 billion of debentures and similar obligations for all of the banks. Under a 20-to-1 limitation, it is anticipated that the increasing production credit needs of farmers can continue to be financed without requiring more Government capital for the banks, and that the $125,789,120 of Government capital now in the banks can be repaid within the next 5 years or so. The amount of debentures actually issued by the banks will continue to depend on the amount of loan funds required to meet the production credit needs of farmers. Although such needs are increasing, it is estimated that the amount of debentures issued for the first year under the 20-to-1 limitation should not exceed the amount issued in the previous year by more than about 15 percent.

A 20-to-1, debt-to-capital limitation for the Federal intermediate credit banks is now deemed justified not only by their own financial strength and negligible loss experience, but also because of the supporting relationship of the production credit associations which has been improved in several respects in recent years. To start with, a Federal intermediate credit bank will not suffer any loss on its financing of the production credit associations in its district, which represents from about 89 to 99 percent of its financing in the different districts, unless one or more of the associations become insolvent. However, this is well guarded against because the liabilities of each association, including its liabilty to the credt bank, may not exceed 10 times the paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus of the association (12 U.S.C. 1032). In fact, overall the associations are currently operating within about a 7-to-1, debt-to-capital ratio, and no change in this is contemplated.

Production credit association losses in the 33 years of their existence since 1933 have amounted to only 0.08 of 1 percent of the total cash advanced to farmers and ranchers. This has not resulted in any loss to the credit banks, which have sustained no losses on any of their loans or discounts made since 1933, when the associations came into being. Taking into account losses suffered from their organization in 1923, the net losses of the credit banks in 44 years of operation have amounted to approximately $1 for each $9,000 of credit extended.

Today the likelihood of losses by the credit banks on their loans and discounts for the associations is even further reduced. As a protection for their capital and surplus, the associations have accumulated reserves for losses totaling $99.9 million, or 2.7 percent of total loans outstanding on December 31, 1967; and by annual additions these reserves will be increased to about 3.5 percent of outstanding loans. Further, the associations in the different districts, within the past few years, have adopted either loss-sharing agreements, participation loan agreements, or guarantee plans, or combinations of these, in connection with their loans. While these agreements for the different districts are in varying terms, the general effect is that certain losses by one association would be made up by contributions from the other associations. In this manner, the collective financial strength of the associations in a district serves to insulate the credit bank from losses on its loans or discounts for the associations.

The debentures issued by the Federal intermediate credit banks, therefore, are not only supported by a like amount of farmers' notes and the financial strength of the banks themselves, but also, to a considerable extent, by the financial strength of the associations. With due recognition of this, there is considered to be ample justification for the proposed amendment so far as concerns the financial stability of the Federal intermediate credit banks and the debentures issued by them.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The bill was requested by the Farm Credit Administration and the Budget Bureau advised that there is no objection to its presentation from the standpoint of the administration's program. The committee held a hearing on April 30, 1968, on a companion bill, S. 3292, and the hearing has been printed.

There was favorable testimony by all who appeared at the hearing. The bill has the support of the 12 district farm credit boards that serve as the board of directors of the Federal intermediate credit bank on their respective farm credit districts. One member from each of such boards (two from one district) was present at the hearing and either read or filed a statement indicating such support. The chairman of the National Advisory Committee of Production Credit Associations also appeared and endorsed the legislation on behalf of that group. Several of the farm organizations were represented at the hearing and either testified or filed statements in support of the bill.

The only provision of S. 3292, to which any opposition was indicated, was section 2(b) and it was deleted from H.R. 16674 by the House of Representatives. Section 2(b) would have authorized a production credit association to issue its capital notes for sale to borrowers and others. The opposition was that such capital notes would merely siphon funds from small country banks. Rather than delay action on the bill, in order to give further consideration to section 2(b), it was deemed preferable to strike it out, since there is some urgency for enactment of the major provision of the bill which is discussed separately earlier in the report. Since H.R. 16674 has been amended to omit this provision, the committee hearings showed that there is now no objection to the bill.

INFORMATION ON FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS AND PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS

The Federal intermediate credit banks, one in each of the 12 farm credit districts into which the 50 States and Puerto Rico are divided, were established in 1923. They were organized and operate under title II of the Federal Farm Loan Act as added by the Agricultural Credits Act of 1923 and since amended. Their primary function is to discount for, or purchase from, production credit associations and other financing institutions, with their indorsement, notes representing loans made by them to farmers and ranchers; and to make loans and advances to such associations and other financing institutions to enable them to make or carry loans for any agricultural purpose. Loans made to farmers or ranchers may be used as collateral

for loans and advances from the credit banks. There now are about 118 other financing institutions being served by the Federal intermediate credit banks, but approximately 95 percent of the discounting and lending by such banks is for production credit associations.

The Federal intermediate credit banks obtain funds for such discounting and lending by selling their consolidated debentures in the public securities market. These debentures, for which loans made to farmers or ranchers are pledged as collateral, are the joint and several obligations of the 12 credit banks and are not obligations of the United States. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $4.2 billion of such debentures were issued, and the total amount outstanding at the end of the year was $3.3 billion.

Throughout the country there are 459 production credit associations, with the number in the 12 farm credit districts varying from 22 to 65. The associations are chartered by the Farm Credit Administration and operate under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended. Each association has a prescribed territory, usually ranging from one or more counties up to as much as one State or more, within which it makes loans to farmers and ranchers. Loan maturities usually are not more than a year but loans may be made for terms up to 7 years. During fiscal 1967, the volume of this lending, with loan funds furnished by the Federal intermediate credit bank in each of the 12 districts, totaled $5.1 billion. Out of a total membership of 548,279 at the end of that year, there were 322,700 borrowing members of the associations with $3.7 billion of loans outstanding.

Production credit associations were first authorized in 1933. As each association was organized, all of the capital stock not purchased by the organizers or initial borrowers was held on behalf of the United States. In accordance with the original design the Government capital in each association was gradually retired as the borrowers acquired more and more capital stock. The required stock investment by each borrower is 5 percent of the amount of his loan. From a peak of $90.1 million invested in all production credit associations in 1934, the Government capital has been reduced to a total of $730,000 in three of the 459 associations. Only $30,000 of this is original Government capital; the other $700,000 represents Government capital more recently invested in two associations because of adversities in their territory.

From their beginning in 1923, all of the capital stock of the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks was owned by the United States and it was not until 1956 that provision was made for the Government capital to be supplanted by private capital. During 1957 and 1958, as required by the Farm Credit Act of 1956, the production credit associations purchased capital stock in the Federal intermediate credit banks in an aggregate amount equal to 15 percent of the capital stock in the banks then owned by the United States and a corresponding amount of the capital stock owned by the United States, or slightly more than $13.1 million, was retired. Further, seven of the banks have used earnings to retire about $454,000 more of the capital stock held by the United States.

Following the 1956 legislation, the production credit associations have also increased their holdings of capital stock in the banks because the annual patronage refunds by each Federal intermediate credit bank are paid to the associations of its district in the form of capital stock. In 1965, there was further legislation which authorized each Federal intermediate credit bank, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, to require the production credit associations in its district to purchase additional capital stock in the bank in order to meet its credit needs. A number of the banks are now preparing to do this. However, there has been no net reduction in the amount of capital stock in the banks held by the United States. This is because during the same period, out of the revolving found in the Treasury available for that purpose, it has been necessary for the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to purchase $51,950,000 of additional capital stock in eight of the banks in order to meet their credit needs. On the whole, therefore, the amount of Government capital put into the banks since 1956 is almost four times the amount that has been retired. Since the legal debt-to-capital ratio of the banks was increased to a maximum of 12 to 1 in 1965, though, there has been no change in the Government capital in the banks and the amount has remained at $125,789,120.

Since 1953 it has been the declared policy of Congress that the Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks eventually should be supplanted by capital provided by borrowers from the banks. The amendments enacted in 1956 and 1965 were intended to facilitate this. However, experience has shown, as explained at the hearing, that further legislation is necessary if the banks are to return their Government capital within a reasonable period and at the same time continue to serve the increasing needs for agricultural credit.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 or 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of pressure for the passing of antigun laws to prevent violence and to stop assassinations. I believe that it is imperative for the American people to understand that no type of gun law will prevent murder, and that any law passed will not prevent persons who are bent on breaking the law from acquiring guns or weapons of any sort. I believe that most guns used in the execution of a felony are bootlegged, stolen, or guns bought under the counter. It is my further belief that the persons who would be most affected are those law-abiding citizens who possess firearms for the protection of their families, their homes, their possessions, and their recreation.

I would point out that the Senate, on its own initiative before the assassination of our late beloved and respected colleague, Senator Kennedy, completed action on the safe streets and crime control bill.

The Congress completed action on this bill which bans interstate mail order sales of handguns and permits over-the-counter sales of handguns within a State only to residents over 21. Incidentally, 44 percent of the murders in this country were committed with handguns and only 16 percent by other guns. Rifles and shotguns are not covered by the restrictions. The bill also outlaws possession of any sort of firearms by persons convicted of a felony, mental incompetents, veterans with anything less than an honorable discharge, Americans who have renounced their citizenship and aliens illegally in this country.

The action of the Senate, concurred in by the House, does not ban the mail-order sale of rifles or shotguns, nor does it fulfill many of the recommendations cited by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. That Commission recommended:

First. The outlawing of private possession of such military-type firearms as bazookas, machineguns, mortars, and antitank guns.

Second. Prohibiting such persons as habitual drunkards, drug addicts, mentally incompetents, mentally disturbed, and ex-convicts from buying or possessing firearms. This has already been done by the Senate in the safe streets and crime control bill.

Third. Underscored the need for State registration of all firearms, and State permits to possess or carry handguns.

These requirements will not stop the killing; they may help to discourage it, and personally I would favor them.

The President and the people of this country can be assured that the Chief Executive's plea to close the "brutal loopholes" in our gun laws will be given every consideration.

I favor, and I have favored, the registration of all firearms, but I believe that it is basically a State function, and that the various States should accept this responsibility and not place it on the shoulders of the Federal Government. If the States will not act, then I think it will be the duty of the Federal Government to assume that responsibility, as it has all too often when the States refused to assume theirs.

As far as handguns are concerned, it is my belief that they should not only be outlawed, as they are in the bill passed by the Senate, but that the most serious consideration should be given to restricting their use to law enforcement authorities or other persons qualified to use them in the line of duty.

Again I want to repeat, so that the issue can be set forth in perspective, that we can pass all the gun laws in the country and still not prevent people from getting shot. Gun laws no matter how stringent are not the answers and are not a cure-all, and we all had better face up to that fact. The answer lies in a sense of responsibility, parental control, more and better trained police, improvement of environmental conditions, obedience to the law, and less protection for the criminal and more protection for the innocent. There is too much lawlessness, disrespect, and irresponsibility today, and as far as guns are concerned every weapon in the country could be seized and confiscated, but we would still have the problem of guns of a crude type which could be manufactured at home, could be used with deadly accuracy, and they could kill.

It is impossible to give total protection to any public figure today, and while some States, such as California, Michigan, and New York, have tight gun control laws, yet in California a suspect possessing a gun illegally, carrying it illegally, and using it illegally, took the life of our late colleague.

Any proposal on gun legislation will, I hope, and I am sure, be given prompt consideration by the Judiciary Committee or by whatever committee it may be referred to.

Any bill that is reported will be taken up promptly by the Policy Committee and will be brought to the floor of the Senate after that committee has acted.

We ought to think not only of public persons—and their deaths are, indeed, tragic—but also of the ordinary people, such as the two marine lieutenants, one of them from Fishtail, Mont., who were shot in a little hamburger stand in Washington during the past week; of the busdriver who was held up and murdered; of the high school boy from Wilson High School, who a week or 10 days ago was assaulted and murdered; and of the thousands of little people, who are likewise entitled to just as much protection as are public figures, although certain public figures, because of their particular circumstances, need a great deal more. I shall have more to say about that at a later time.

Mr. President, I conclude by stating again that it was the Senate that initiated a good bill for the control of handguns, and that the House also approved that bill. So far as I am concerned, I hope that the President will sign the safe streets and omnibus crime control bill, because I think it is not only needed, but is also long overdue.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I applaud the majority leader for the frank and candid way in which he has commented on this whole subject. An emotional outburst has suddenly found its way onto television and elsewhere, seeking to excite people into thinking that Congress has passed a bill that lacks teeth and is not commensurate with the problem that is before us.

I wish the people who rush so readily into print—and this goes for some of the columnists, too—would just take a little time off and read the bill that was initiated in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and was then even further improved on the floor of the Senate. Let them take a little time to read the Long amendment that was incorporated in the bill and see what a good job was done in the six or seven titles that are now in the bill.

I share the majority leader's hope—and I am confident, as well—that the President will sign the bill and let it go into effect. We can then see where we are before we undertake to tamper with it.

Of course there is going to be frustration and disappointment that some did not get all they wanted, but after all, this is a collective undertaking. Everyone has his own views on the matter. However, the sizable vote in the Senate and the vote of 368 to 17 in the House of Representatives speak for themselves. Let the bill be signed, get it on the books, and give it the force of law. Then, let us see where we go from there.

Incidentally, when the appeal was made to the country to become vocal and articulate to Members, I received a telephone call from a professor in one of the universities in Illinois. He said, "I want to say for myself and my associates that we think the position you took on the safe streets and anticrime bill, including the gun control title, and all the other titles, is so very eminently correct." That is the kind of reaction I have gotten thus far.

In connection with this entire matter, we all abhor the violence that struck the Nation in the last few days, from the assassination of Robert Kennedy to the shooting of two Marine officers in Georgetown.

An editorial entitled "The Shame of Washington" was published in the Chicago Tribune of today. Mr. President, it is a shame, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SHAME OF WASHINGTON

Yesterday's shocking news from Los Angeles has tended to obscure the news of another shooting that took place at almost the same moment in Washington. Two marine lieutenants eating hamburgers in a snack bar were murdered, and a third and his companion were wounded.

So far it is hard to ascribe the shooting of Sen. Kennedy and his companions to anything but sheer madness. But the shooting in Washington fits into a pattern of growing lawlessness and violence which has disgraced the capital for some time. It has risen to the point of terror since the riots following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., and especially since the arrival of the "poor people's march" and the accompanying militants, both white and Negro, who are determined "to turn this capital upside down."

The three young Negroes charged with the murders do not appear to be registered at Resurrection City, but they are from out of town—from California—and one of them says he came to Washington to join the poor people's march.

Be that as it may, the events of the last two months have made Washington a national disgrace. Serious crimes, mainly robberies and assaults, are running at double the rate of 1967. The city reports an average of 77 cases of arson a month—at least seven of them on one day, May 8. Public transportation has been curtailed because drivers refuse to work at night. Stores are shutting down at dusk. The tourist business has almost come to a halt.

The reasons for all this are not hard to find. Crime all over the country has risen in close proportion to the success of sobsisters and the courts in obstructing the work of the police—and now the Supreme Court has, in effect, ruled out the death penalty.

Washington's own record has been especially shameful. During the April riots, government officials followed a deliberate policy of "restraint," and they even congratulated themselves on what they regarded as its success. Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling appropriations for the District of Columbia, saw things more clearly. Policies designed to spare the lives of rioters and arsonists and looters, he said, have merely encouraged them to greater violence.

The attorney general himself, Mr. Clark, has proved the most willing pushover of all for the rioters. He was rewarded for his "restraint" by a delegation from Resurrection City who refused to let him speak, hurled insults at him, and arrogantly threatened violence. The top law enforcement officer of the country listened meekly until the show was over.

Washington has compounded its troubles by virtually welcoming this army of marchers and giving them squatting rights in the middle of the city, even tho it should have been clear to anybody that the "nonviolence" was wishful thinking and that, in time, the militants would take over.

Congress has control of the District of Columbia, and Congress is in session. It would be best for everybody concerned if the marchers were to pack up and go home quickly, before they wreck their own cause along with the city of Washington. But if they don't, then Congress had better be prepared to see that they leave when their permit expires or to assume the responsibility for a capital turned upside down.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a few moments ago my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], made some comments about gun control legislation.

He pointed out that before the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, the Senate had enacted substantial gun control legislation, had turned down some amendments on the floor of the Senate, and had also adopted other amendments on the floor of the Senate.

He pointed out further that no one in the Senate believes we should have bazookas or hand grenades or permit the sale of antitank guns or French 75's, or many other such weapons, but that they should be under strict control.

He also pointed out that, in his opinion, there should be registration of all guns. I concur in that statement. I would estimate that the State of Montana has about as many guns as any State in the Union; and I concur with the senior Senator from Montana that the people of Montana would agree to the registration of guns.

I think that we should have a complete prohibition of the sale of handguns. But, at this time of emotion, at this time when all of us grieve for the death not only of Senator Robert F. Kennedy but also for the deaths of the two marines who were mentioned, one of whom came from Montana, we must not let emotion run ahead of objective consideration of what can be done.

The senior Senator from Montana has made some substantial suggestions. This gun control bill that we have passed, should be given an opportunity to achieve its objectives, because it is ably conceived.

Columnists, cartoonists, and writers are all talking about stricter gun control. The law that was passed by the Senate and adopted by the House of Representatives the other day would take care of the kind of gun control that would eliminate handguns, one of which was used in the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

These things should be left to the States. I would hope that my State of Montana, through its legislature would pass the kind of registration law that would be operative in that State to control long guns, and that the State of Montana would prohibit the use of handguns except under very unusual situations, in gun clubs, and so forth.

But this is no time to yield to the emotion created by the assassination of a great Senator or the death of two young marines to reconsider legislation that has been carefully drafted in the Judiciary Committee, and debated on the floor of the Senate; legislation that has not yet been tried.

So I would hope that the statement of

the senior Senator from Montana will be heeded, urging consideration and moderation, and urging that the Judiciary Committee hold the hearings, and suggesting that the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the Congress, and all the various agencies involved, carefully consider the whole subject of additional gun control legislation in the light of not only what has happened recently but in the light of the welfare of all the people involved.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I listened to the remarks of my distinguished colleagues, the Senators from Montana and the senior Senator from Illinois, on gun legislation. I will have something to say in some detail Wednesday morning, together with some thoughts on what my colleagues should do if they are really concerned with the problem faced by this Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Thursday, June 6, 1968,

The Secretary of the Senate, on June 6, 1968, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5037) to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H.R. 5037. An act to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16911. An act to provide for U.S. participation in the facility based on special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1292. Joint resolution to authorize the U.S. Secret Service to furnish protection to major presidential or vice presidential candidates.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Thursday, June 6, 1968,

The Vice President, on June 6, 1968, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 2585. An act for the relief of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim;

H.R. 11308. An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; and

H.J. Res. 1292. Joint resolution to authorize the U.S. Secret Service to furnish protection to major presidential or vice presidential candidates.

The Vice President, also, on June 7, 1968, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 5037. An act to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16911. An act to provide for U.S. participation in the facility based on special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

LOAN TO SOUTHERN ILLINOIS POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, information on the approval of a loan to the Southern Illinois Power Cooperative of Marion, Ill. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

MOBILE TRADE FAIRS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 212(B) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the need to expand and relocate the internal audit function in the Department of Labor, dated June 6, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONVEYANCE OF TRACT OF LAND TO LILLIAN I. ANDERSON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 1205), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a tract of land to Lillian I. Anderson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS TO THE QUECHAN TRIBE OF FORT YUMA RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation, Calif., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 319, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA, COLO.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a proposed concession contract under which Messrs. R. D. Jackson and C. M. Voss, a partnership doing business as Curecanti Marinas, will be authorized to provide a marina and marine merchandising, camping, and food and beverage facilities and services for the public in Curecanti National Recreation Area, Colo. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, a report setting forth a method of determining the information necessary to establish entitlements within each of the several States under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the basis of data later than 1960; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT DEALING WITH THE INCIDENCE OF SERIOUS HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION AND HEALTH PROBLEMS INCIDENT THERETO

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report dealing with the incidence of serious hunger and malnutrition and health problems incident thereto (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON PROGRESS IN THE PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report describing progress in the national effort to prevent and control air pollution (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"A joint memorial pertaining to Federal participation in welfare payments to nonresidents

"Whereas, the Federal Social Security Act since its enactment in 1935 has permitted the various states to impose reasonable residence requirements for eligibility to the various public assistance programs whose costs are partly paid by federal funds; and

"Whereas, the Federal Social Security Act so provides at the present time with New Mexico having consistently required a reasonable continued residence as an eligibility factor for permanent public assistance payments; and

"Whereas, a federal court in California and in federal courts in many other states in the nation have declared the unconstitutionality of such residence requirements alleging that they contravene the 'equal protection of the law' guarantee of the Federal Constitution

and that they unduly restrict the freedom of Americans to travel at will within the country; and

"Whereas, if this new judicial theory is upheld by the United States Supreme Court, state costs of public assistance in New Mexico will be tremendously and permanently increased;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to amend the Federal Social Security Act at once so as to provide full federal financing of public assistance payments made to recipients who do not meet the length of residence requirements presently permitted by federal statute and contained in the welfare laws of this state and applicable statutes in other states, such federal financing to continue in each case only until the existing length of residence requirements have been met by each recipient;

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from New Mexico in the Congress of the United States.

"E. LEE FRANCIS,
"President, New Mexico Senate.
"BRUCE KING,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"CALENDAR No. S. 958

"A concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to Propose an Amendment to the Constitution Which Would Authorize Citizens to Exercise Freedom of Choice in the Selection of the Public Schools Which they Wish to Attend

"Whereas, a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court has taken away the right of citizens to select the public school which they may attend; and

"Whereas, this ruling contravenes the basic and traditional ideas of freedom which have successfully guided our Nation throughout its history; and

"Whereas, people of food faith of all races require a reasonable principle to guide them in their search for an orderly and equitable resolution of the difficult problems involved in the desegregation of our schools. Now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

"That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will authorize citizens to exercise freedom of choice in the selection of the public schools they wish to attend and insure thereby an orderly and equitable approach to the difficult problems involved in the desegregation of our schools.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the President of the Senate."

DEATH OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Vice President, the President of the Senate, and I have received a number of communications from around the globe, from officials, and from private citizens as well, expressing their deep sorrow and profound regret at the passing of our respected and esteemed colleague, the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that these communications may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the communications were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

STRASBOURG,
June 7, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The tragedy which has struck your country is deeply felt in Europe. On behalf of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe I beg you to accept our deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

GEOFFREY DE FREITAS.

TOKYO,
July 7, 1968.

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply shocked at the tragic news of the sudden and deplorable death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. The demise of this great statesman is an immeasurable loss not only to your country but also to the whole world at this time of crucial importance. On behalf of the House of Councillors I wish to express my profound sentiments of condolance and sympathy to you, the bereaved family and the people of the United States.

YUZO SHIGEMUNE,
President of House of Councillors.

PRAHA,
June 6, 1968.

Mr. HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate of the U.S.A.,
Capitol Hill, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with deep emotion and indignation that the deputies of the National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic received the news about the attempt on the life of Senator Robert Kennedy and his tragic death. Accept please on my behalf as well as on behalf of all deputies the assurance of our deepest sympathy and kindly present our sincerest condolence to the family of the deceased Senator.

JOSEF SMRKOVSKY,
President of the National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

ADDISABABA,
June 6, 1968.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Congress of U.S.A.,
Capital Hill, Washington, D.C.:

I wish to convey through you my heartfelt grief and condolence to the Senate of the United States of America over the untimely death of Senator Robert Kennedy who championed the cause of humanity in his short but fruitful life. Senator Kennedy's death is a loss not only to the United States of America but also to mankind at large.

KETEMA YIFRU,
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia.

SAIGON,
June 7, 1968.

PRESIDENT,
Senate, Washington, D.C.:

President Commission Contre Corruption Chambre Legislative Vietnam profondement touche nouvelle assasinat Senateur Robert Kennedy. Presente a senat ainsi qua Madame Robert Kennedy et toute famille Kennedy respectueuses condoleances et souhaite tout coeur miracle operation chirugicale sauvera Senateur Robert Kennedy pour usa ut monde libre.

Respects,

PHANHUYDUC.

TOKYO, JAPAN,
June 7, 1968.

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

On receiving sad news of the sudden death of Senator Robert Kennedy, my sorrow knows no bound. I respectfully express my deep condolences. Please convey my profound sympathy to the bereaved family.

MITSUJIRO ISHII,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

GERMAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1968.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The President of the German Bundestag has asked me to transmit to you in your capacity as President of the United States Senate the following message of condolence of the German Bundestag:

"Tiefbewegt spreche ich Ihnen, Herr Präsident und dem Senat der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika die aufdichtige Anteilnahme des Deutschen Bundestags aus zu dem überaus schmerzlichen und tragischen Verlust, den Sie und die Vereinigten Staaten durch den Tod von Senator Robert Kennedy erlitten haben. Der Deutsche Bundestag trauert mit Ihnen um eine grobe Hoffnung Ihres Landes. Er gedenkt in herzlicher Anteilnahme auch der zweifach schwer geprüften Familie Kennedy.

"Ihr aufrichtig ergebener,
"GERSTENMAIER,
"Präsident des Deutschen Bundestags."

The English translation reads as follows:

"Deeply moved, I express to you, Mr. President, and to the Senate of the United States of America, the sincere participation of the German Bundestag in the painful and tragic loss which you and the United States have suffered through the death of Senator Robert Kennedy. The German Bundestag is in mourning with you over a great hope of your country. It also is thinking with heartfelt sympathy of the again so severely tried Kennedy family.

"Very sincerely yours,
"GERSTENMAIER,
"President of the German Bundestag".

Respectfully yours,

H. KNAPPSTEIN.

BUCURESTI,
June 6, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Deeply grieved at the news of the assassination of Senator Robert Francis Kennedy an outstanding member of the United States Senate and a remarkable figure of American political life. I convey my most sincere condolences as well as those of the members of the Grand National Assembly of The Socialist Republic of Romania. May I also request you to transmit to Mrs. Ethel Kennedy and to the bereaved family the expression of our profound sympathy at this time of harsh trial.

STEFAN VOITEC,
President of the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 6, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the U.S.,
Washington D.C.

Following upon my visit to the Senate yesterday, I received the sad news of Senator Robert F. Kennedy's death. On behalf of the Danish Government, I ask you to convey to

the Senate the expression of my sincere condolences on this tragic occasion.

POUL HARTLING,
Foreign Minister of Denmark.

GRENADA,
June 6, 1968.

LEADER OF U.S. SENATE,
Washington:

Please convey to the United States Senate the sympathy of the Government and people of Grenada on the tragic loss of Senator Robert Kennedy.

PREMIER.

BRUXELS,
June 6, 1968.

Mr. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Vice President,
Washington, D.C.:

President, Members and Secretariat North Atlantic Assembly convey deepest sympathy on tragic death of Robert Kennedy.

DESHORMES,
Secretary General.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 6, 1968.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President,
Washington, D.C.:

I learned with great shock of today's brutal attempt on Senator Robert F. Kennedy's life.

I hasten to express to your Excellency, in my name and in that of my fellow Senators my heart-felt sympathies.

Please accept, Excellency, my best wishes for Senator Kennedy's speediest recovery and return to his well-being.

IBRAHIM SEVKI ATASAGUN,
President of the Senate of the Turkish Republic.

ADDISABABA,
June 6, 1968.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington:

It is with great sorrow that we have learnt the tragic news of the death of Senator Robert Kennedy. The untimely death of this distinguished and dynamic Member of the U.S. Senate will undoubtedly be a great loss to the United States and the world. We join you and the people of the United States in mourning this great loss.

HAILE SELASSIE,
Emperor.

LUXEMBOURG,
June 6, 1968.

Mr. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply affected by the dreadful news of the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy. I wish to convey to you and to the Senate of the United States of America my heartfelt condolences as well as those of the Parliament of Luxembourg.

ROMAIN FANDEL,
President of the Luxembourg Parliament.

PRAGUE,
June 6, 1968.

THE SENATE OF THE U.S.A.
Washington, D.C.:

The Chechoslovak Society for International Relation received the news about the tragic decease of the Senator Robert Kennedy with deep emotion. In his personality passed away a significant politician, one of the best sons of the American Nation. We are paying homage to his memory with deep reverence.

Professor Dr. JAROSLAV MARTINIC,
The President of the Chechoslovak Society for International Relations.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 6, 1968.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President,
Washington, D.C.:

I learned with great shock of today's hateful attempt on Senator Robert F. Kennedy's life.

I hasten to express to your excellency in my name and in that of my fellow Senators my heartfelt sympathies. Please accept excellency, my best wishes for Senator Kennedy's speediest recovery and return to his well-being.

IBRAHIM SEVKI ATASAGUN,
President of the Senate of the Turkish Republic.

PAKISTAN,
June 6, 1968.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Rudely shocked at dastardly assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy at prime of life. Kindly accept and convey to bereaved family heartfelt condolences on behalf of myself and members of National Assembly of Pakistan.

ABDUL JABBAR KHAN,
Speaker, National Assembly of Pakisan.

STOCKHOLM,
June 6, 1968.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my deepest condolences at the terrible loss of one of the Senate's most outstanding members.

ERIK BOHEMAN,
President of the Swedish Senate.

June 6, 1968.
BELGRAD,

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply moved by the tragic news of the violent death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Please accept on behalf of the Federal Assembly and in my own name the expressions of our most sincere condolences. Please convey Mr. President to the family of the deceased, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, the expressions of our heartfelt sympathies.

MILENTIJE POPOVIC,
President, Federal Assembly of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the United States of America, President of the Senate of the United States, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have been asked to convey the following message to you from the Hon. Sydney J. Smith, Speaker of the Senate of Canada:

"MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On behalf of my colleagues of the Senate of Canada and as Co-Chairman of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, I extend our deep sympathy at this time, through you to all members of your Senate and members of the family of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

"May we all dedicate our efforts to achieve the worthy purposes to which he devoted his life.

"Yours sincerely,

"SYDNEY J. SMITH,
"Speaker of the Senate of Canada."

Yours sincerely,

A. E. RITCHIE,
Ambassador.

MANAGUANIC,
June 6, 1968.

Hon. Senor HERBERT HUMPHREY,
Presidente, Del Congreso,
Washington, D.C.:

Congreso Nacional de Nicaragua hace propio el universal dolor causado por el fallecimiento Del Honorable Senador Doctor Robert F. Kennedy y manifiesta por su medio a ese alto cuerpo sus sentimientos de pesar. Punto. Cordialmente suyo.

ORLANDO MONTENEGRO MEDRANO,
Presidente, Congreso Nacional de Nicaragua.

[Spanish translation]

Hon. HERBERT [sic] HUMPHREY,
President of the Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Congress of Nicaragua shares in the universal sorrow caused by the death of the Honorable Senator Doctor Robert F. Kennedy and expresses through you to this high body its feelings of sympathy. Stop. Cordially yours.

ORLANDO MONTENEGRO MEDRANO,
President, National Congress of Nicaragua.

[Russian translation]

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate and Vice President of the United States of America, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We wish to express our most sincere sympathy on the occasion of the villainous killing of the outstanding leader of the USA Robert F. Kennedy. The infamous crime to which Robert F. Kennedy fell victim arouses a feeling of indignation in the Soviet people.

I. SPIRIDONOV,
Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R..

PALECKIS,
Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, U.S.S.R.

MOSCOW, *June 6, 1968.*

MOSCOW,
June 6, 1968.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the United States of America, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Vyrajaem Iskrennee Soboleznovanie Po Povodu Zlodeiskogo Ubiistva Vidnogo Deiatelia Ssha Senatora Roberta F. Kennedi. Gnusnoe Prestuplenie, Jertvoi Kotorogo Stal R. Kennedi, Vyzyvaet U Sovetskih Liudei Chuvstva Negodovania. Predsedatel Soveta Soiuza Verhovnogo Soveta USSR.

I. SPIRIDONOV,
PALECKIS,
Predsedatel Soveta Nazional Nostei Verhovnogo Soveta USSA.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 6, 1968.

Senator CARL HAYDEN,
President, pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my sincere condolences on the tragic passing of Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

VASCO LEITAO DA CUNHA,
Brazilian Ambassador.

SAIGON,
June 7, 1968.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate of the United States, Washington, D.C.:

Learned with great emotions death of Senator Robert Kennedy in the name of Senate Republic of Vietnam please acept our most sincere condolences.

NGUYENVANHUYEN,
President, Senate Republic of Vietnam.

JUNE 8, 1968.

PRESIDENT OF U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C.:

Central American Aeronautical Navigation Service Corporation extends deepest sympathy and regret in the loss of your colleague and our beloved friend Robert Kennedy. Please pass our condolences to his wonderful family.

LISANDRO ROSALES ABELLA,
General Manager, Cocesna.

[German translation]

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington:

To you and to the Members of the United States Senate I wish to express and also in the name of the members of the German Federal Council my heartfelt condolences in connection with the death of Senator Robert Kennedy. The human language is too poor to allow us to express what we are perceiving at the death of this outstanding politician. The horrid crime of Los Angeles has put an end to the life of a man on whose struggle for peace justice and freedom innumerable men all over the world have set their hopes. The news of his death is inconceivable to me.

KLAUS SCHUETZ,
President of the German Federal Council.

BONN,
June 6, 1968.

Herrn. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Praesidenten des Senats der Vereinigten Staaten Von Amerika, Washington, D.C.:

Ihnen und den mitgliedern des Senats der Vereinigten Staatenvon Amerika spreche ich auch im namen der mitglieder des Deutschenbundesrates meine aufrichtige teilnahme zum tode Von Senator Robert Kennedy aus die col menschliche sprache erweist sich als ohnmaechtig das auszudruecken was U S beim tode dieses hervorragenden politikers bewegtdas abscheulicheverbrechen von Los Angeles hat dem leben einesmannes ein ende gesetz auf dessen eintreten fuer frieden gerechtigkeit und freiheit sich die hoffnungen zahlloser menschen in aller welt gruendeten die nachricht von seinem tode ist fuer mich unfassbar.

KLAUS SCHUETZ,
Praesidentdes, Deutschen Bundesrates.

[Spanish translation]

PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

In the name of the Congress of the Republic of Venezuela I express to you and through your worthy instrumentality to the Senate and people of the United States our most profound condolences at the death of the Honorable Senator Kennedy. The Congress of Venezuela condemns the crime whose victim is the Honorable Senator Kennedy, leader in the fight against racial discrimination and champion of peace and understanding among all people.

ARMANDO VEGAS,
President, Congress of Venezuela.

CARACAS,
June 6, 1968.

PRESIDENTE,
Senado Estados Unidos,
Washington, D.C.:

A nombre Congreso Republica de Venezuela expreso a usted y por su digno organo al Senado y Pueblo de Estados Unidos nuestro profundo pesar por sentida muerte del Honorable Senador Kennedy punto el Congreso de Venezuela condena el atentado de que ha sido victima el Honorable Senador Kennedy lider de la lucha contra la discriminacion racial y combatiente por la paz y comprension entre los pueblos punto.

ARMANDO VEGAS,
Presidente, Congreso de Venezuela.

[Spanish translation]

PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply terrified by the tragic death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, illustrious citizen who had been admired by all socially sensible men all over the world and especially in Latin America. We address our prayers to the Lord for his eternal rest and we share the sorrows of his wife, parents, children, brothers and sisters and citizens of the country.

PANAMENIAN ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESS EXECUTIVES.

PANAMA,
June 6, 1968.

PRESIDENTE,
Del Senado de Los,
Washington, D.C.:

Profundamente consternados tragico fallecimiento Senador Robert F. Kennedy ilustre ciudadano admirado por los hombres de sensibilidad social del mundo y especialmente America Latina elevamos nuestras plegarias al Senor por su eterno descanso y acompañamos en su dolor a su esposa padres hijos hermanos.

FAMILIARES Y CIUDADANOS,
De ese Pais Asociacion Panamena de Ejecutivos de Empresa.

[Translation, German]

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate, Vice President of the United States of America, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Austrian federal government has received with consternation the painful news of the death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy who perished under such tragic circumstances. This so early broken life makes us suddenly realize to what extent his advocating the high aims of humanity, of peace, freedom and justice has taken possesion of our thinking and feelings. In this deep sorrow that so hard befell the American Senate and the whole American Nation, I ask you, Mr. Vice President, to be assured of the deep sympathy of the federal government and of the Austrian people.

JOSEF KLAUS,
Federal Chancellor of the Republic of Austria.

JUNE 6, 1968.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Praesident des Senats, Vizepraesident der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Die Oesterreichische Bundesregierung hat die schmerzliche Nachricht vom Tode des Senators Robert F. Kennedy der unter so tragischen Umstaenden verschieden ist mit Bestuerzung vernommen. Im Angesicht dieses frueh gebrochenen Lebens wird uns ploetzlich bewusst in welchem Masse sein Eintreten fuer die hohen Ziele der Menschlichkeit, des Friedens, der Freiheit und der Gerechtigkeit von unserem Denken und Fuehlen Besitz ergriffen hatte. In dem schweren Leid das den amerikanischen Senat und die ganze amerikanische Nation so hart getroffen hat, bitte ich Sie, Herr Vizepraesident, an das tiefe Mitgefuehl der Bundesregierung und des oesterreichischen Volkes zu glauben.

JOSEPH KLAUS,
Bundeskanzler der Republik Oesterreich.

MEXICO, *June 7, 1968.*

Senor Senador MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Office of the Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.:

Profundamente conmovidos por el deceso del senor Senador Robert F. Kennedy el senado de la Republica Mexicana le manifiesta su hondo pesar por este infausto anconteciemiento y le suplica recibir el testimonio de su condolencia mas sincera por la perdida de tan distinguido representante del pueblo norteamericano.

Senador MANUEL BERNARDO AGUIRRE,
Presidente, de la Gran Comision.

BRUSSELLS.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.:

The great loss caused to the United Senate by the appalling death of Senator Robert Kennedy is shared by parliamentarians the world over. My deepest sympathy and my thoughts are with you the American people and the bereaved Kennedy family.

VICTOR BODSON,
President, Assocation Internationale des Parlementaires de Langue Francaise.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 6, 1968.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

With the greatest concern and astonishment I received the news of the attempt against the life of Senator Kennedy. All my prayers went to the Almighty for his full recovery. The fatal out-come has filled me with the deepest of sorrows. The tragic death of Robert F. Kennedy constitutes an irretrievable loss for this great Nation and for those of us throughout the world who love democracy. I also feel that the violent passing of such an outstanding public figure is a most despicable attack against democracy.

JULIO A. RIVERA,
Ambassador of El Salvador.

RIO DE JANEIRO,
June 5, 1968.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Astonished brutality attempt against Senator Robert Kennedy please accept expression my grief with best wishes fast recovery great Democratic leader.

Senator VICTORINO FREIRE,
Brazilian Senate.

ECHEGARAY, MEXICO,
June 8, 1968.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senado de los Esados,
Unidos de America,
Washington, D. C.:

Personalmente me uno al sentir del pueblo Americano por la lamentable tragedia que sinceramente lamento y condeno.

LEOPOLDO REYNA.

PARIS,
June 6, 1968.

MEMBERS DU SENAT,
Des Etatsunis Palais,
du Capitole,
Washington, D.C.:

Au nom du senat de la republique francaise qui unit dans le meme respect la memoire de John et de Robert Kennedy je exprime au senat des etatsunis da merique notre douloureuse emotion et notre profonde sympathie.

PRESIDENT SENATE.

GENOVA,
June 6, 1968.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Sentite condoglianze.

AMICI NAVAL REGISTRO,
Italiano.

TOKYO,
June 6, 1968.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply dismayed by unfortunate incident involving Senator Robert Kennedy stop we

are with you in prayers for his recovery and for your country.

TOKUSABURO KOSAKA.

MEXICO CITY, MEX.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Wishing the best for you, for Kennedy and for your country.

CARMEN T. MORENO SANCHEZ.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 8, 1968.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Deepest sympathy for the loss of the great Senator Robert Kennedy. He died for the ideas which we believe and fight for.

DENNIS GIANNAKES,
International President,
the Greek Society.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
June 6, 1968.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator, Montana, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The city of Great Falls has extended our sympathy and condolences to the Kennedy family through a telegram to their home in Hyannis Port. We would also appreciate your conveying our personal messages of sympathy to any of the family or relatives with whom you come in personal contact. We are flying the flag at half mast over the Civic Center from 8:00 o'clock this Thursday morning until after the funeral.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MCLAUGHLIN,
Mayor, City of Great Falls, Mont.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
June 8, 1968.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Condolences to the Senate on the loss of Senator Robert Kennedy.

MRS. FELICIA ELEANOR ALPERT.

TWO DOT, MONT.,
June 6, 1968.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

With deep grief we unite with you over the loss of a great American. May his ideals live on.

With love,

MARY and PETE WHITE.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 214. A bill for the relief of Erman-Howell Division, Luria Steel & Trading Corp. (Rept. No. 1176).

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

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Rivercliff Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 1180); and

S.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases (Rept. No. 1181).

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

H.R. 13439. An act to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other puropses (Rept. No. 1177).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 3865. An act for the relief of Mauritz A. Sterner (Rept. No. 1179).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 660. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1178).

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

S. 2490. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan de Moya (Rept. No. 1182);

S. 2516. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose A. Sierra (Rept. No. 1183);

S. 2517. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Salazar (Rept. No. 1184);

S. 2559. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Luis Bejar Arias (Rept. No. 1185);

S. 2587. A bill for the relief of Dr. Roberto Garcia-Rivera (Rept. No. 1186);

S. 2599. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto M. Hernandez (Rept. No. 1187);

S. 2609. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Zirau (Rept. No. 1188);

S. 2651. A bill for the relief of Dr. Aurelio Julian Andres Jimenez Cortina (Rept. No. 1189);

S. 2698. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carlos T. Toledo (Rept. No. 1190);

S. 2724. A bill for the relief of Peter Rudolf Gross (Rept. No. 1191);

S. 2825. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacinto Felix de la Presilla-Elias (Rept. No. 1192);

S. 2826. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carlos Jesus Aguilar Lima (Rept. No. 1193);

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rogelio J. Barata (Rogelio Jose R. Barata y Rivero) (Rept. No. 1194);

S. 2848. A bill for the relief of Enrique C. Sanchez (Rept. No. 1195);

S. 2859. A bill for the relief of Margarete Reinhold Hallett (Rept. No. 1196);

S. 2897. A bill for the relief of James T. O'Brien (Rept. No. 1197);

H.R. 2709. An act for the relief of Suh Yoon Sup (Rept. No. 1198);

H.R. 4030. An act for the relief of Yong Chin Sager (Rept. No. 1199);

H.R. 4370. An act for the relief of Sandy Kyriacoula Georgopoulos and Anthony Georgopoulos (Rept. No. 1200);

H.R. 7042. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Del Rio (Rept. No. 1201);

H.R. 7431. An act for the relief of Gilmer County, Ga (Rept. No. 1202);

H.R. 8241. An act for the relief of Victorino Severo Blanco (Rept. No. 1203);

H.R. 15462. An act for the relief of Lennart Gordon Langhorne (Rept No. 1204);

H.R. 15591. An act for the relief of Pfc. John Patrick Collopy, US51615166 (Rept. No. 1205); and

H.R. 15972. An act to permit black and white or color reproductions of U.S. and foreign postage stamps under certain circumstances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1206).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2577. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou (Rept. No. 1207);

S. 2610. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Seda (Rept. No. 1208);

S. 2706. A bill for the relief of Yung Ran Kim (Rept. No. 1209);

S. 2733. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Solar (Rept. No. 1210);

S. 2756. A bill for the relief of Dr. Heldo Gomez and his wife, Olga Enrique Gomez (Rept. No. 1211);

S. 2759. A bill conferring U.S. citizenship posthumously upon S. Sgt. Ivan Claus King (Rept. No. 1212);

S. 2764. A bill for the relief of Dr. Santiago Jose Manuel Ramon Bienvenido Roig y Garcia (Rept. No. 1220);

S. 2827. A bill for the relief of Eloy Rene Tuya Hernandez (Rept. No. 1213);

H.R. 4544. An act for the relief of Giovanna Ingui Dallara (Rept. No. 1214);

H.R. 4976. An act for the relief of Theofane Spirou Koukos (Rept. No. 1215);

H.R. 11287. An act for the relief of Amir U. Khan (Rept. No. 1216); and

H.R. 13301. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Private First Class John R. Aneli (Rept. No. 1217).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1506. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Alunday (Rept. No. 1218);

S. 2547. A bill for the relief of Juan Antonio Lopez (Rept. No. 1219);

S. 2568. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leonel E. Enriquez (Rept. No. 1221);

S. 2783. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cesar Baro Estava (Rept. No. 1222);

S. 3024. A bill for the relief of Richard Smith (Noboru Kawano) Rept. No. 1223);

S. 3488. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain inhabitants of the Bonin Islands (Rept. No. 1224); and

H.R. 1879. An act for the relief of Stanislaw and Julianna Szymonik (Rept. No. 1225).

REPORT ENTITLED "CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1167)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Criminal Laws and Procedures," pursuant to Senate Resolution 31, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1168)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," pursuant to Senate Resolution 37, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1169)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Immigration and Naturalization," pursuant to Senate Resolution 32, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "REVISION AND CODIFICATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1170)

Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Revision and Codification," pursuant to Senate Resolution 39, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1171)

Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Constitutional Rights", pursuant to Senate Resolution 29, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1172)

Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Administrative Practice and Procedure," pursuant to Senate Resolution 25, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1173)

Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Constitutional Amendments," pursuant to Senate Resolution 28, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1174)

Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "National Penitentiaries," pursuant to Senate Resolution 36, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1175)

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "The Federal Judicial System," pursuant to Senate Resolution 34, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY ACTIVITIES, 1967"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1226)

Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Antitrust and Monopoly Activities, 1967," pursuant to Senate Resolution 26, 90th Congress, first session, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report filed earlier today by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] on Antitrust and Monopoly Activities, 1967, be printed together with the individual views of Senators DIRKSEN and HRUSKA.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 3604. A bill to require the registration of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3605. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide adequate regulation of certain sales of shotguns and rifles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bills, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 3606. A bill to amend section 4356 of title 39, United States Code, relating to certain mailings of State departments of agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 3607. A bill to make it a Federal offense to assassinate, kidnap, or assault a Member of Congress or a Member of Congress elect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3608. A bill to amend sections 871 and 1751 of title 18, United States Code, relating to threats against the President and Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault, so as to protect Cabinet members and Members of the Congress against similar offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3609. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3610. A bill for the relief of Daisy M. Tharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3611. A bill for the relief of Venancio Lorenzo and his wife, Maria Rumina Barcena Lorenzo; and

S. 3612. A bill for the relief of Hoon Kyubyuk Kiem, his wife, Uesuk Peark Kiem, and their two daughters, Jin-A Kiem and Jin In Kiem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3613. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolf V. Heydebrand and his wife, Ruth Heydebrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3614. A bill to amend section 302 of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 to continue for a period of three years the time for filing petitions for adjustment assistance under title III of such Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HATFIELD):

S. 3615. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., a certain interest in lands in the State of Oregon for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3616. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3607—INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROTECTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS-ELECT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill which would make it a Federal crime to assassinate, kidnap, or assault a U.S. Senator or Representative.

The bill would correct an obvious oversight in our Federal criminal statutes.

That oversight lies in the fact that there is no Federal prohibition against assassinating Senators or Representatives, while Federal jurisdiction is extended over the President and Vice President, Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, a wide variety of Federal law officers and a host of minor Federal employees.

My bill provides the ultimate deterrent—the death penalty—for persons convicted of the first-degree murder of Senators or Representatives.

This becomes significant when one considers that the late Senator Robert Kennedy's assassin might have shot his victim in any one of eight States which have no death penalty at all or in any of six other States where the death penalty applies only in extraordinary circumstances, such as murders of peace officers or murders committed by persons already serving life terms for previous murder convictions.

I do not believe that assassins should be permitted to strike down Members of Congress without fear of capital punishment and I hope, in the wake of the tragedy which we witnessed last week, that this will be a feeling shared by all.

My bill, which covers Senators-elect and Representatives-elect, provides stringent penalties for kidnapings or attempted assassinations or kidnapings of the individuals over whom jurisdiction is extended.

It provides for prison terms up to and including life for the crime of kidnaping and it provides for life imprisonment or the death penalty in kidnaping cases which result in the death of the victim.

Attempted murders are punishable by sentences of up to life, and assaults are punishable by fines of up to $10,000 and/or prison terms of up to 10 years.

Mr. President, there is ample legal precedent for such legislation as I have proposed and I therefore urge that we move with utmost haste to enact this bill and correct a glaring inequity in our laws.

I ask unanimous consent that chapter 51, section 1114, and chapter 84, section 1751 of title 18, United States Code, which establish the legal precedent, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the sections of the United States Code referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3607) to make it a Federal offense to assassinate, kidnap, or assault a Member of Congress or a Member of Congress-elect, introduced by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The sections of the United States

Code, presented by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, are as follows:

§ 1114. Protection of officers and employees of the United States.

Whoever kills any judge of the United States, any United States Attorney, any Assistant United States Attorney, or any United States marshal or deputy marshal or person employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, any post-office inspector, any officer or employee of the secret service or of the Bureau of Narcotics, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any officer or employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any officer, employee or agent of the customs or of the internal revenue or any person assisting him in the execution of his duties, any immigration officer, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce any Act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any employee of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out any law or regulation, or to perform any function in connection with any Federal or State program or any program of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, or the District of Columbia, for the control or eradication or prevention of the introduction or dissemination of animal diseases, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty, in the field service of the Bureau of Land Management, any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, or any officer or employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration directed to guard and protect property of the United States under the administration and control of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or any security officer of the Department of State or the Foreign Service, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 756; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, § 24, 63 Stat. 93; Oct. 31, 1951, ch. 655, § 28, 65 Stat. 721; June 27, 1952, ch. 477, title IV, § 402(c), 66 Stat. 276; July 29, 1958, Pub. L. 85-568, title III, § 304(d), 72 Stat. 434; July 2, 1962, Pub. L. 87-518, § 10, 76 Stat. 132; Aug. 27, 1964, Pub. L. 88-493, § 3, 78 Stat. 610.)

Legislative history

(REVISER'S NOTE.—Based on title 18, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 253 (May 18, 1934, ch. 299, § 1, 48 Stat. 780; Feb. 8 1936, ch. 40, 49 Stat. 1105; June 26, 1936, ch. 830, title I, § 3, 49 Stat. 1940; Reorg. Plan No. II § 4 (f), eff. July 1, 1939, 4 F.R. 2731, 53 Stat. 1433; June 13, 1940, ch. 359 54 Stat. 391).)

The section was extended to include United States judges, attorneys and their assistants, and officers of Federal, penal and correctional institutions in view of the obvious desirability of such protective legislation.

Employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry have been included in this section to complete the revision of section 118 of title 18, U.S.C., 1940 ed., which was consolidated with the assault provisions of section 254 of said title 18 and is now section 111 of this title. There seemed no sound reason for including such officers in the protection against assaults but excluding them from the homicide sections.

For like reasons the section was broadened to include officers or employees of the Secret Service or of the Bureau of Narcotics.

Changes in phraseology were made.

Amendments

1964—Pub. L. 88-493 inserted "or any security officer of the Department of State or the Foreign Service."

1962—Pub. L. 87-518 included employees of the Department of Agriculture performing any function connected with any Federal or State program, or program of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or the District of Columbia, for control, eradication, or prevention of animal diseases.

1958—Pub. L. 85-568 included officers and employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1952—Act of June 27 1952, substituted "any immigration officers" for "any immigrant inspector or any immigration patrol inspector".

1951—Act Oct. 31, 1951, substituted "the field service of the Bureau of Land Management" for "the field service of the Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior".

1949—Act May 24, 1949, inserted "any officer, employee * * * of his duties".

Transfer of functions

All functions of all other officers of the Department of the Interior, and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department, were, with two exceptions, transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, with power vested in him to authorize their performance or the performance of any of his functions by any of such officers, agencies, and employees, by 1950 Reorg. Plan No. 3 §§ 1, 2, eff. May 24, 1950, 15 F.R 3174 64 Stat. 1262, set out in note under section 481 of Title 5, Executive Departments and Government Officers and Employees. Officers and employees of the National Park Service, and of the Indian field service, referred to in this section, are officers and employees of the Department of the Interior.

All functions of all other officers of the Department of Justice, and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department, were, with a few exceptions, transferred to the Attorney General, with power vested in him to authorize their performance or the performance of any of his functions by any of such officers, agencies, and employees, by 1950 Reorg. Plan No. 2, §§1, 2, eff. May 24, 1950, 15 F.R. 3173, 64 Stat. 1261, set out in note under section 291 of Title 5, Executive Departments and Government Officers and Employees. United States Attorneys, Assistant United States Attorneys, United States marshals, and deputy marshals, referred to in this section, are officers within the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, also referred to in this section, is a bureau of such Department, and officers and employees of United States penal or correctional institutions and immigration officials, also referred to in the section, are officers and employees within such Department.

The Grazing Service of the Department of the Interior, referred to in this section as the "Division of Grazing", was abolished and its functions consolidated with those of the former General Land Office (likewise abolished) to form a new agency in such Department, to be known as the Bureau of Land Management, by 1946 Reorg. Plan No. 3, § 403, eff. July 16, 1946, 11 F. R. 7876, 60 Stat. 1100, set out as a note under section 1 of Title 43, Public Lands.

All functions of all officers of the Department of the Treasury, and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department, were transferred, with certain exceptions, to the Secretary of the Treasury, with power vested in him to authorize their performance or the performance of any of his functions, by any of such officers, agencies, and employees, by 1950 Reorg. Plan No. 26, §§ 1, 2, eff. July 30, 1950, 15 F. R. 4935, 64 Stat. 1280, set out in note under section 241 of Title 5, Executive Departments and Government Officers and Employees. The Secret Service and the Bureau of Narcotics, referred to in this section, are agencies in the Treasury Department, the customs and internal revenue officials, referred to in this section, are officials in such Department, and the Coast Guard, referred to in this section, is generally a service in such Department, but such Plan excepted, from the transfer, functions of the Coast Guard, and of the Commandant thereof, when the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy under sections 1 and 3 of Title 14, Coast Guard.

Immunity from criminal prosecution

Section 5 of Pub. L. 88-493 which provided that nothing in Pub. L. 88-493, which amended this section and section 112 of this title, and enacted section 170e-1 of Title 5, Executive Departments and Government Officers and Employees, shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under the laws of any State, territory, possession, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, is set out as a note under section 112 of this title.

Cross references

Assaulting, resisting, or impeding officers or employees designated in this section, see section 111 of this title.

Federal forms of criminal procedure

Indictment for murder in the first degree of federal officer, see form 1, Appendix to this title.

CHAPTER 84.—PRESIDENTIAL ASSASSINATION, KIDNAPING, AND ASSAULT

§ 1751. Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault; penalties.

(a) Whoever kills any individual who is the President of the United States, the President-elect, the Vice President, or, if there is no Vice President, the officer next in the order of succession to the office of President of the United States, the Vice President-elect, or any individual who is acting as President under the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be punished as provided by sections 1111 and 1112 of this title.

(b) Whoever kidnaps any individual designated in subsection (a) of this section shall be punished (1) by imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or (2) by death or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, if death results to such individual.

(c) Whoever attempts to kill or kidnap any individual designated in subsection (a) of this section shall be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

(d) If two or more persons conspire to kill or kidnap any individual designated in subsection (a) of this section and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be punished (1) by imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or (2) by death or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, if death results to such individual.

(e) Whoever assaults any person designated in subsection (a) of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

(f) The terms "President-elect" and "Vice-President-elect" as used in this section shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained from the results of the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2.

(g) The Attorney General of the United States, in his discretion is authorized to pay an amount not to exceed $100,000 for information and services concerning a violation of this section. Any officer or employee of the United States or of any State or local government who furnishes information or renders service in the performance of his official duties shall not be eligible for payment under this subsection.

(h) If Federal investigative or prosecutive jurisdiction is asserted for a violation of this section, such assertion shall suspend the exercise of jurisdiction by a State or local authority, under any applicable State or local law, until Federal action is terminated.

(i) Violations of this section shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Assistance may be requested from any Federal, State, or local agency, including the Army, Navy, and Air Force, any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding. (Added Pub. L. 89-141, § 1, Aug. 28, 1965, 79 Stat. 580.)

S. 3608—INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROTECTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CABINET MEMBERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the entire Nation was shocked and revolted by the events of the last week when the distinguished Senator from New York, Robert Kennedy, was struck down by an assassin's bullet.

It was a saddened and sorely troubled Nation which watched as the Senator, young in years and with so much still to offer his fellow citizens, was laid to rest beside his brother, also felled by an assassin.

When will it all end? When will the criminal permissiveness and lack of respect for the lives and rights of others be banished from this land, to be replaced by good will among all and an understanding of each other?

But we cannot legislate what should be in the hearts of men.

However, we can take steps to set penalties for those who would defy the laws of reasonable men. A crime such as that of last week is so heinous as to know no State borders. Although the victim was elected by the people of only one State, the crime was nationwide in import and thus should be subject to Federal jurisdiction.

For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would make it a Federal crime to kill or attempt to kill, assault, kidnap, or conspire to kill or kidnap the head of an executive department of the United States or a Member of Congress.

This legislation would mean that we would complete the work that Congress began 3 years ago.

In the present state of the law, a State and not the Federal Government has jurisdiction over crimes such as the one committed against Senator Kennedy. The laws of the various States differ considerably. So do the law enforcement procedures and security capabilities. Without taking anything away from the many fine law enforcement officials of the States, cities, and localities of the Nation, I believe such crimes against key officials of the Nation should fall within Federal jurisdiction—with the alleged assailants held in Federal custody, tried by a Federal court, and punished under Federal law.

In 1963, after the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy, I introduced a bill which would make it a Federal crime to kill or attempt to kill the President or Vice President; my bill also included members of the Cabinet and Members of Congress. Subsequently, the provisions covering the President and Vice President were enacted in August of 1965.

Thus, section 1751 of title 18 of the United States Code provides criminal penalties for Presidential assassination, kidnaping, or assault. Also, as the law now stands, severe penalties are prescribed for persons who murder or attack Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, postal inspectors, Secret Service officials, customs agents, and various employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. But, for some strange reason, the laws for the protection of officers and employees of the United States do not cover Members of Congress or Cabinet members.

Mr. President, my bill would fill the gap. It would extend the coverage of the law dealing with Presidential assassination and kidnaping to Members of Congress and the Cabinet. My bill would also amend section 871 of title 18 to extend that provision to cover assaults and threats against Cabinet members and Members of Congress, as well as the President and Vice President.

I strongly urge that this bill be given immediate and favorable consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary and by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3608) to amend sections 871 and 1751 of title 18, United States Code, relating to threats against the President and Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault, so as to protect Cabinet members and Members of the Congress against similar offenses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 871 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever (1) knowingly and willfully deposits for conveyance in the mail or for a delivery from any post office or by any letter carrier any letter, paper, writing, print, missive, or document containing any threat to take the life of or to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, the President-elect, the Vice President or other officer next in the order of succession to the office of President of the United States, or the Vice President-elect, or the head of any Executive department specified in section 101 of title 5, or a Member of Congress, Member of Congress-elect, Resident Commissioner, or Resident Commissioner-elect, or (2) knowingly and willfully otherwise makes any such threat against any individual designated in clause (1), shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

(2) The section heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 871. Threats against President and successors to the Presidency, Cabinet members, and Members of Congress".

(b) The analysis of chapter 41 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the section reference to section 871 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"871. Threats against President and successors to the Presidency, Cabinet members, and Members of Congress.".

SEC. 2. (a)(1). Subsection (a) of section 1751 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately preceding "shall", the following: "or the head of any Executive department specified in section 101 of title 5, or a Member of Congress, Member of Congress-elect, Resident Commissioner, or Resident Commissioner-elect,".

(2) The section heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1751. Assassinating, kidnaping, and assaulting President, Cabinet member, and Member of Congress".

(b)(1) The chapter heading of chapter 84 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 84.—PRESIDENTIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL ASSASSINATION, KIDNAPING, AND ASSAULT".

(2) The analysis of such chapter is amended to read as follows:

"Sec.

"1751. Assassinating, kidnaping, and assaulting President, Cabinet member, and Member of Congress.".

(c) The table of contents to "PART I.—CRIMES" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the chapter reference to chapter 84 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"84. Presidential and Congressional assassination, kidnaping, and assault 1751".

S. 3609—INTRODUCTION OF BILL GRANTING EASEMENT FOR MISSOURI LEAD BELT LINE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in an effort to expedite congressional action needed on a situation of importance in my State, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill identical to H.R. 17320 now on the House Calendar, having been favorably reported by the House Committee on Agriculture.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain national forests to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.

The Frisco has constructed a new railway called the Lead Belt Line, 14 miles of which traverse the Clark National Forest. The National Forest Service issued a special use permit to the railroad covering the proposed route. This was satisfactory to the railroad for its construction. However, the railroad now has undertaken long-term financing of the $6 million project. The financing arrangements cannot be concluded unless the company has a greater interest in the right-of-way than it presently has under the revocable special use permit.

This new railroad serves an area in the Ozark Mountain region which is now developing by reason of its lead deposits. The railroad and the mining facilities are helping to provide new jobs and improve the economic picture in this section of Missouri.

Under terms of the bill the granting of

the easement would be paid for by the railroad and therefore no cost is expected to be borne by the Federal Government. Public protection is afforded by a provision in the bill which permits the granting of the easement only if the Secretary of Agriculture finds it compatible with the public interest.

Because of the need to complete the financial arrangements this month and because of the importance of the railroad to the communities in Missouri which it serves, we would urge affirmative action by the Committee on Agriculture and subsequently by the Congress at the earliest possible date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3609) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3614—INTRODUCTION OF BILL EXTENDING ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE UNDER AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on May 28, 1968, the President of the United States in his message on the Trade Expansion Act of 1968 recommended that Congress extend the adjustment assistance provisions of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 through June 30, 1971. On the same day in the House of Representatives, Congressman MILLS introduced the Trade Expansion Act of 1968 as H.R. 17551. Included as title V of that bill is the provision to extend the adjustment assistance provisions of the Automotive Products Trade Act as proposed by the President. I am today by separate legislation introducing in this body a bill which will amend section 302 of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 to continue for a period of 3 years the time for filing petitions for adjustment assistance under title III of that act. This is as requested by the President in his message and as is contained in title V of H.R. 17551.

I urge prompt approval by the Congress of this important legislation since otherwise the opportunity for applications for such assistance by firms or employees terminates on June 30. The Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 was the enabling legislation enacted by Congress to implement the Canadian Automotive Agreement. This latter is an executive agreement between the United States and Canada for the removal of tariff duties between the two countries for importation of vehicles by certain preferred automobile manufacturers and for the importation of original automotive equipment parts between the two countries. The adjustment assistance provisions of the enabling legislation, the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965, were designed to provide economic adjustment assistance to firms and workers who were adversely affected by the agreement.

Recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 29, 1968, I had occasion to comment on the adverse results of the agreement insofar as it related to our balance of payments. Referring to the President's second annual report to the Congress on the operation of the agreement, I noted that, contrary to the representations of the administration at the time the enabling legislation was before the Finance Committee, our automotive trade surplus with Canada had, in the 3 years that the agreement has been in effect, diminished from $578.3 million in calendar year 1964 to $285.8 million in calendar year 1967 for a reduction of more than 50 percent.

Similar adverse consequences have resulted in the dislocation and unemployment of workers. The President's report on the agreement notes that during the calendar year 1967, 15 petitions for adjustment assistance were filed by groups of workers of which 13 were acted upon and nine certifications of eligibility were issued. The report notes—page 28—that—

> From the inception of the assistance program through 1967, nearly 2,500 workers have been certified as eligible to apply, and 2,064 of these have been found eligible for weekly benefits. Total adjustment assistance payments since the inception of the program through calendar year 1967 have amounted to $3.1 million of which $2.5 million has been paid out in calendar year 1967.

I fear that further disruptions and dislocations in our economy will continue to occur as a result of this unwise agreement. Apparently the President has similar fears in urging as he has the continuation of this assistance program. In light of the unwise commitment of the United States it becomes obligatory that Congress continue to afford relief to those who have to bear the economic consequences of our imperceptive and injudicious action. I urge that Congress promptly act on this measure and I ask that the text of the bill appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3614) to amend section 302 of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 to continue for a period of 3 years the time for filing petitions for adjustment assistance under title III of such act, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3614

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 302(a) of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-283; 19 U.S.C. § 2022(a)) is amended by striking therefrom "July 1, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1971."

S. 3616—INTRODUCTION OF BILL ON LIVES WE CAN SAVE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs. In brief, my measure is designed to save approximately 6,000 American lives each year.

The need for immediate action in this area can best be shown by the fact that over 25,000 people die each year from terminal kidney disease. Of this number, at least 20 percent of these persons die needlessly. They die simply because they do not have the money or the facilities available to prevent their slow agonizing death from this dreadful disease.

Congress has in the past allocated vast sums of money to combat cancer and heart disease. The success with which cancer and heart disease patients are being cured is in direct relationship to the money, research and development, and energies expended in these two areas.

I call to the attention of my colleagues that the estimated cost to the U.S. taxpayer over the next 6 years to combat kidney disease would be approximately $1 billion. Yet this 6-year cost equates to what we are spending every 2 weeks to support the Government of South Vietnam.

A special blue ribbon committee commissioned by the President, and headed by Dr. Carl W. Gottschalk of the University of North Carolina School of Medicine, reported to the White House on September 14, 1967, that of the estimated 7,000 new patients in fiscal year 1968 with chronic uremia who are medically suitable, treatment by transplantation will be available to only 450, and by dialysis, approximately 550 persons. In addition, some 750 patients from previous years can be maintained on dialysis.

The kidney machine has been in use since 1960; however, current facilities now accommodate few more than 1,000 persons at a cost ranging from $3,000 to $14,000 a year, thus condemning less fortunate sufferers. Few can personally afford it; in one case, the employer is paying; in another, the entire suburban community put on a drive and raised the money. Only patients who meet certain tests and have no other physical ailment, and who demonstrate sound psychological stability to follow the rigid regimen, are accepted.

Because of the limited number of places and facilities, and the large number of applicants, it has been necessary to set up a board of evaluation which, in actuality, decides which person gets a place on the machine and therefore who is to live and who is to die. This type of arbitrary selection in choosing among patients because of the limited facilities cannot be tolerated any longer in a nation as rich as ours.

Chronic kidney disease is a fact of life, just as cancer and heart disease are. However, because of the vast amount of money, research, and effort put forth in curing these two killers, the gap between life and death is closing, though not rapidly enough. It is time to also give attention to the prominent killer, kidney disease and expend some money and energies needed in curing this dreadful disease.

In the past several months, several very illuminating articles have been written on this subject, and I ask unanimous

consent that they appear in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

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

The bill (S. 3616) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The articles presented by Mr. HARTKE, are as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1968]

KIDNEY FAILURE DILEMMA: 6,000 A YEAR WHO COULD BE SAVED DIE BECAUSE TREATMENT IS SO EXPENSIVE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Each year 6,000 Americans die whose lives could be saved at a cost of $28,000 each. They are the victims of kidney failure whose lives could be saved by kidney dialysis.

The kidneys contain millions of small groups of cells called glomeruli. Their function is to filter out the body's waste material that is carried to them through the bloodstream. They are, in turn, connected with millions of tubules that carry the waste through the urine into the bladder for excretion.

Fortunately, nature has given the various organs of the body tremendous powers of overcompensation. When one kidney is removed the remaining kidney enlarges to take over the function and thousands of people today live normal lives with only one kidney.

When the kidneys become diseased and fail in their function then nitrogenous wastes accumulate in the blood. This condition is called uremia.

It is usually accompanied by albumin in the urine, often high blood pressure, progressive weakness, associated heart failure and anemia, and eventually if the condition is not corrected, death.

To separate out the poisonous waste, needles are placed in a vein and artery in the forearm. The blood then circulates through a cellophane membrane with a fine mesh that allows the small toxic waste material to filter through but retains the large protein molecules that are life sustaining in the blood. This process is called dialysis.

A SLOW, AGONIZING DEATH

Dialysis treatment initially requires hospitalization. After the original diagnosis, evaluation and treatment the patient is discharged but must return to the hospital for an overnight stay two evenings a week.

Currently there are an estimated 7,000 terminal uremic patients who could benefit from dialysis but only about 1,000 can be treated in existing facilities.

For the other 6,000 the future is a slow, agonizing death from insidious poisoning, often with convulsions that end with a coma.

It has been estimated that to create a nationwide network of dialysis centers that could save their lives would cost $28,000 per case.

A letter received by this writer recently describes the agony of such impending death when life is possible. This patient wrote as follows: "I worked my way through school and following graduation taught in a rural high school. After seven years of teaching, I returned to New York and obtained a job with the Navy as a civilian worker in the education field. For the first time I received a salary commensurate with my experience and training. I lost my job in 1965 when the New York Navy Shipyard was closed. I moved with my family to another community in order to maintain tenure with the Federal Government and was assigned to work in another state. I received two promotions and my rating has been outstanding.

"All went well until Feb. 9, 1968, when I was taken ill at work. I was admitted to the hospital and my case was diagnosed as kidney failure. Through the efforts of the doctors and staff I was saved, yet I was 'hooked.' The hooking refers to being an artificial kidney patient. The first two weeks in the hospital passed quickly. I felt better but I became concerned about the bills. After two weeks I asked if I could be discharged. The hospital and medical bills then totaled $4,700. Even with hospitalization insurance meeting the major share of these expenses, it is impossible for me to maintain this life-saving therapy and feed my family.

"Now, I report to work at 7:30 A.M. on Monday and leave at 3:30 P.M. for the hospital I am connected with the artificial kidney, and at 7:30 A.M. the following morning, I am disconnected and go back to work. This is repeated on Thursday. I work a 34-hour week.

"Six or seven patients are treated together in one large room. The cost of this biweekly treatment is in excess of $300 per week and $100 additional for special nurses.

"This treatment is essential for my survival. Therefore, I can only say it is 'survival for the wealthiest—survival that depends on the size of your pocketbook.' I was told that if I were unable to borrow the money and pay the treatments would have to be stopped.

"I was then advised to buy equipment for 'home dialysis.' The equipment costs $3,000 and generally it is estimated that such home treatment would cost in excess of $10,000 a year in addition to the equipment.

"I want to live for the sake of my family. I have to live. I am still paying for hospital bills incurred last year. Is there any place I can turn? Please help me."

Five years ago, one of the young research physicians responsible for the dialysis program stopped in my office on his way to the World Health Organization in Geneva. He was truly a man beside himself.

"How long can I continue to play God?" he added, "I have facilities in my hospital to dialyze six patients. There are 300 on the waiting list. I have to decide who is going to live and who is going to die. I simply can't stand it much longer."

Man cannot be in a more difficult position. We talk so much about bringing the work of the research laboratory to the bedside of desperately ill patients at the earliest possible time. Here we have the knowledge, we know it's life-saving, but we don't have the money. We can't go on arbitrarily selecting patients for dialysis on the basis of ability to pay. It is intolerable and unconscionable.

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1968]

AID TO KIDNEY PATIENTS: PANEL URGED UNITED STATES TO SPEND $1 BILLION TO HELP SAVE LIVES THROUGH DIALYSIS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

As reported in this column last Sunday, each year 6,000 Americans with kidney disease die whose lives could be saved if sufficient resources were available to provide kidney dialysis.

Last November the White House received a report from a special committee on chronic kidney disease that recommended the Federal Government spend about $1-billion during the next six years to save their lives.

Currently there are about 7,000 terminal uremic patients each year who could benefit from dialysis, the process in which a "mechanical kidney" is used to remove the poisonous waste that accumulates in the blood. There are only, however, facilities for accommodating about 1,000.

In New York City and Westchester County, for example, there were only 66 beds in November 1967, although it is expected this number will double by January 1969.

The committee therefore pointed out that about 25,000 lives could be saved during the next six years under the program it recommends.

Currently the Federal Government supports dialysis through Public Health Service Demonstration Grants to a number of states and through vocational rehabilitation in some states.

The Veterans Administration also has a program for patients eligible for its services.

JOHNSON RECOMMENDATION

Last year, President Johnson recommended amending Title 18, the Medicare section of the Social Security Act, to cover persons who regardless of age, were permanently disabled.

Congress, however, rejected the proposed amendment.

Had it been adopted, terminal uremic patients who could benefit would have been eligible for dialysis care.

Unfortunately, the Public Health Service Demonstration Grants for dialysis are running out.

New York State, however, last year voted to establish a kidney disease center with satellites throughout the state and a special committee has been established to advise the State Department of Health on the implementation of this legislation.

Dialysis costs are constantly being lowered and will continue downward with technological improvements and increased use.

Currently, dialysis in a hospital costs about $14,000 per year, but following initial hospitalization, patients can be transferred to a home dialysis program at a cost of about $3,000 to $4,000 per year.

As Dr. Norman Deane, director of the dialysis program at New York City's Lenox Hill Hospital, has pointed out in a booklet, "Hemodialysis at Home," that there are many other advantages to home dialysis.

Dr. Deane also warns against general public feeling that the problem is merely "shortage of hardware." He also points out that there are many patients with kidney disease who are not suitable for dialysis because of other complications.

He urges that all patients in the early stages of kidney disease should be sent to qualified specialists for evaluation and treatment that may prevent or delay the patient's reaching the stage of irreversible uremia that may be terminal.

Copies of the booklet may be obtained on request from Dr. Norman Deane, Lenox Hill Hospital, 77th Street and Park Avenue, New York 10021.

In its report the committee on chronic kidney disease pointed out its belief that kidney transplantation is the preferred therapeutic route. Today, about 2,000 kidney transplants have taken place with approximately 75 per cent chance of function for more than a year if a related donor is used. The chances are signficantly lower if the kidney is obtained from a nonrelative or a cadaver.

ADVANCED TYPING METHODS

With advanced typing techniques there has been a steady increase in the chances of success. The chances of finding a compatible donor through typing techniques is good as the recipient can be sustained indefinitely on dialysis while a search is conducted for a compatible donor.

The transplant patient, if the graft takes is essentially a well person with few restrictions on his activities. In contrast the dialysis patient must be hooked up to his machine for several hours twice weekly.

The experts report also that a person who receives a transplant can expect to live twice as long as a patient on dialysis.

As facilities for kidney transplantations are extended the need for dialysis will increase as each transplant patient requires an average of three months of preoperative dialysis plus further treatment on the dialyzer if his graft fails.

A small but growing voluntary agency, The National Kidney Foundation, 315 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y., 10010, is seeking to improve the current treatment of kidney disease patients, control and reduce its occurrence by means of detection programs and increase support for research.

The Administration is now being pressed by Congress to cut nonmilitary spending by $4-billion to $6-billion before it will consider the President's request for an increase in income taxes.

The fate of the 6,000 Americans with kidney disease who now die each year is squarely in the hands of those responsible for these budget cuts.

Unfortunately, unless this program receives financial support new knowledge developed in the laboratory cannot be used at the bedside and individual physicians must continue to make the decision as to who will live and who, unfortunately, will die, with the ability to pay being a primary consideration.

[From the Evening Star, May 23, 1968]

SPENDING CUT A DEATH SENTENCE

(By Judith Randal)

"If it were possible to save the lives of 6,000 Americans each year, at a cost of $28,000 each, should it be done?"

This question comes from a magazine for physicians called "Medical World News." It is now clear that whether or not such a life-saving program should be undertaken, it almost certainly won't be—not because it is impractical, but because the money for this "luxury" simply is not to be had.

Why the need for—and lack of—funds? The answers are both simple and complex.

The 6,000 Americans are men and women whose kidney function has failed so that only regular dialysis sessions with an artificial kidney or a transplant operation can enable them to survive. A blue-ribbon White House Commission indicated last year that if such programs were set up, at a cost of $1 billion over the next six years, thousands of people could be rescued from imminent death to lead useful lives.

The money will not be available because Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., powerful chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has made a $6 billion expenditure cut the price of his support for an "anti-inflationary" tax increase. At least $500 million and more likely as much as $1 billion of this reduction would come from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which already pared its budget earlier this year.

Since certain of HEW's obligations, such as welfare payments, are untouchable, a large part of the bite must be taken out of new projects. So it is that one man's tax increase may be another's death warrant.

There are, for example, more than a dozen HEW-supported demonstration projects offering dialysis. Together they can meet the needs of fewer than 1,000 patients, and even these people now are living on borrowed time.

The projects were financed for one year with the understanding that the states, assisted financially by the Comprehensive Health Planning and Health Services Act, would take over from there. But this money, too, is almost sure to be cut and the original demonstration grants are running out. There will be money for any center after mid-1969, as things now stand.

This will leave only Veterans Administration hospitals in the business of providing treatment for terminal kidney diseases for those who cannot afford the vast sums necessary for private treatment and few who require this treatment are eligible for VA care.

From here on, any sufferer lacking the $14,000 or so that a year of dialysis cost, or the price of a kidney transplant operation, will be doomed to die.

Heart-rending as is this situation, the broader outlook for health services is bleaker still. Consider the matter of health costs, now rising so fast that many experts believe hospital charges will reach $100 a day within five years.

The Comprehensive Health Planning and Health Services Act, also known as "Partnership for Health," was passed in 1966 and strengthened in 1967 with the idea of streamlining allocation of federal funds to the states. Lump sums would be granted, rather than disease-by-disease allotments. The states could use the money to best fit their particular needs. The thinking was that greater flexibility would encourage efficiency.

Still other programs are being emasculated. Already the House has cut $65 million from the 1969–70 budget authorizations of the Regional Medical Program, best known for its concern with heart disease, cancer and stroke.

Another cutback has weakened the financial and philosophical underpinnings of a related program intended to provide incentives for establishment of community mental health centers. The bill as originally written would have permitted centers to establish halfway houses for alcoholics, but subcommittee members feared that these would turn into flophouses and struck this feature out.

Besides directly affecting health services and facilities, the cuts almost certainly will aggravate the already serious shortage of doctors, nurses and technicians. Support of medical education, already long overdue, can be expected to remain a token affair at best.

These are the immediate prospects. The long-range picture is even gloomier. The National Institutes of Health research budgets—founts of further medical progress—are also vulnerable. Research cannot guarantee results, and in a time of pragmatic budget-cutting such high-risk enterprises are certain to be sacrificed to goals with much more immediate probability of payoff.

One discouraged NIH scientist summed it up this way: "What people and Congress don't realize is that when you dam up a swiftly flowing river it becomes a deep and apathetic lake."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN MARITIME PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 846

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 15189) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nomination: George W. Renchard, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Burundi.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY—IN MEMORIAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise to speak in sorrow for the second time in less than 5 years of the death of a member of the Kennedy family. On December 11, 1963, the Senate dedicated a day in memory of John F. Kennedy, murdered in the month before. Today, we speak of another Kennedy, foully slain as was his brother before him:

On Horror's head, horrors accumulate.

Again the Nation and the world stand with bowed heads in mourning the loss of a gallant American. Again, a whole people are shocked over another cruel and senseless act of violence.

May I say that on Thursday of last week from the top of the capitol of my State of Alabama in Montgomery, the Confederate flag flew at half mast for Senator Robert Kennedy, and Gov. Albert Brewer spoke these words:

It would be my prayer that this shocking event will precipitate a return to what has been absent from this Nation for much too long—a true respect for law and order and an end to senseless violence.

Mr. President, it was as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which Robert Kennedy served since he entered the Senate in January 1965, that I had occasion to work with him day by day and to best come to know him and admire him.

It is worth noting, Mr. President, that never before in our history has one family sent three of its sons to the U.S. Senate: John, Robert, and EDWARD KENNEDY. All three have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; all three during the time I have been privileged to be the committee's chairman; all three helping make major contributions to our country's welfare. These three brothers eagerly sought membership on the committee because it afforded them the greatest possible opportunity to search out and help enact solutions to the most pressing human problems of our time—the physical and mental health of our people; the education of our children and youth; the elimination of poverty and human misery in the cities and on the farms; rehabilitation of the handicapped; juvenile delinquency; protection of our elderly citizens; improvement of the wages and working conditions of the people employed in commerce, industry, and agriculture; fair and equitable relations between labor and management, the health, education, and adjustment to civil life of veterans of our Armed Forces, and many similar social and human problems.

During his 8 years as a Senator, John Kennedy served with grace and distinction as a member of the committee, rising to become chairman of its Subcommittee on Labor.

EDWARD KENNEDY has served on the

committee for the past 6 years and has become chairman of its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

Robert Kennedy, as I have said, came to the committee immediately upon his entering the Senate 3½ years ago.

Robert Kennedy was one of the most active and diligent members of our Labor and Public Welfare Committee. He sought to shoulder the greatest possible load of responsibilities that a junior member could undertake. He was a member of five of the seven standing subcommittees: Education, Labor, Veterans' Affairs, Migratory Labor, and Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. In addition, beginning in September of last year, he became chairman of our Special Subcommittee on Indian Education in which he showed intense interest and passionate concern. Although he was not a member of the Subcommittee on Health, of which I am chairman, he always strongly supported any and all legislation designed to protect and improve the health of our people.

While, at times, I found myself in disagreement with some of his proposals and positions, I could not and did not ignore the fact that he was motivated by a deep conviction that the goals he pursued were for the best interests of the Nation. He was a sincere and eloquent advocate of the causes he favored. He was genuinely moved by the evidences of misery, disease, and misfortune he observed in his extensive travels in connection with committee work. He took his membership on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and his duties thereon with utmost seriousness.

Last year, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of which he was a most active member, conducted an extensive survey of poverty, hunger, and malnutrition in America. With the subcommittee he traveled thousands of miles from the slums of Harlem to the Watts section of Los Angeles and the fruit fields of central California; from the Mississippi Delta to northern Wisconsin; from Appalachia to the south side of Chicago. In all his travels, in all his subcommittee work, he was always an assiduous and devoted participant. He did his best, despite the many other duties pressed upon him as a Senator representing the great State of New York, to attend every committee hearing and every executive session. His keen intellect, the absorptive power of his mind, the retentive grasp of his memory, coupled with his extraordinary energy, drive, and zest, made him in a short time one of the best informed and knowledgeable experts among us on the vast range of public questions with which our committee is concerned.

One of his principal contributions in the effort to reduce the toll of human poverty was his amendment creating the special impact program, which established economic and business development programs in heavily populated low-income urban areas, to create job opportunities and training programs for the underemployed and the unemployed.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, he was a powerful ally of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] in our successful struggle to establish a GI program for veterans of the cold war period.

On the Subcommittee on Education he worked hard and long beside the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in broadening and improving Federal assistance to our Nation's schools and colleges and to the young people who attend them.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, he was a strong right arm to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in helping bring about decent health, education, and living conditions for hundreds of thousands of migrant workers and their families.

On the Subcommittee on Labor, he staunchly supported the efforts of the late Senator McNamara of Michigan and his successor as chairman of that subcommittee, Senator YARBOROUGH, in bringing about major changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act, raising the minimum wage, and extending the act's protection to millions of additional workers.

Not only did he become expertly informed on all the great social problems we face, not only did he seek always to translate this knowledge into effective legislative responses, Senator Robert Kennedy likewise became a movingly expressive spokesman of the needs and aspirations of the disadvantaged, the poor, the sick, and the ill-nourished members of society.

As Solomon the Wise said:

> The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there no torment shall touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die; and their going from us to be utter destruction: but they are in peace.

As we unite in prayer that the soul of Robert Kennedy may rest in peace, let us unite in determination to bring peace to the souls of those who live on.

In closing, Mr. President, may I extend to Robert Kennedy's beloved wife, Ethel, and her bereaved children, his brother, EDWARD, and the other members of the Kennedy family, Mrs. Hill's and my deepest sympathy in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate and commend the distinguished statesman from the State of Alabama for his moving and eloquent remarks about our late beloved colleague, Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

I know the very high esteem and affection which Senator Robert F. Kennedy felt for the distinguished Senator from Alabama—the same high esteem and affection which we all feel for him.

The Senator's remarks have been so well articulated that I am reminded of the wonderful passage Senator Robert F. Kennedy quoted from Shakespeare in describing his late, beloved brother, John Fitzgerald Kennedy to the convention in Atlantic City.

Let me recite those lines again because they are so moving:

> . . . and, when he shall die,
> Take him and cut him out in little stars,
> And he will make the face of heaven so fine,
> That all the world will be in love with night,
> And pay no worship to the garish sun.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his most kind and generous words, and for his beautiful tribute to Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to express my personal appreciation for the eloquent remarks which the distinguished chairman of the committee, on which the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy served, has given in tribute to his life and service.

With the noble sentiments which the Senator has expressed, I wish fully to associate myself.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his generous remarks and express to him my appreciation and say to him that I am privileged to have him join in tribute to Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I join the great Senator from Alabama in his tribute to Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Last week, I tried to say how I felt about Robert F. Kennedy. The tribute of the Senator from Alabama this morning is a most eloquent and fitting one, with which I wish to be associated.

Mr. HILL. I want to thank the Senator from Connecticut for his most generous remarks. I appreciate his joining me in this tribute.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from Alabama has listed the record of accomplishment on the Committee on Labor and Welfare—attendance and diligent attention to routine committee activities not only of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, but also of Senator EDWARD KENNEDY. It shows that these three brothers have contributed to the welfare, the health, and the education of this country. Their compassionate natures have developed many programs of assistance to aid the less fortunate people of America.

The Senator from Alabama has made a significant contribution to the eulogies of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy. He has demonstrated that as a Senator in this body, Robert Kennedy's contributions have been significant and important to the welfare of the United States.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for his most kind and generous words and express to him, too, my appreciation for joining in this tribute to Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join my colleagues in expressing my deep appreciation for the most significant speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Alabama relative to the brothers Kennedy—all

three of whom have served so ably under his chairmanship, one of whom still with us and who will be with us for many decades to come, I am sure—is still serving.

The Senator from Alabama has had the experience of having eagles with him on the committee in the persons of John Fitzgerald, and Robert Francis—men who soared high, who tried to achieve objectives which would benefit all of us, in all sections of the country, in all segments of society; men whose contributions will be long remembered not so much because their names happened to have been Kennedy but because of what they did, what they attempted to do and what they stood for.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of yesterday, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., an outstanding historian, a close personal friend of our late President John F. Kennedy, a close personal friend of our late colleague, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, wrote what I feel is a very accurate, definitive essay entitled "Kennedy's Stature More Than Legacy."

I ask unanimous consent that this tribute to Senator Robert Kennedy be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1968]

KENNEDY'S STATURE MORE THAN LEGACY

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

No one ever forgot, of course, that Robert Kennedy was the brother of a President of the United States, and some accused him of running for the Presidency on his brother's coattails. Yet Robert Kennedy had not only an identity but a record of his own—an identity and a record which would have entitled him to consideration for the Presidency had none of his relatives even been elected to anything higher than city assemblymen.

This record began in a serious sense when, amid almost total skepticism on Capitol Hill and among the press, John Kennedy appointed Robert Kennedy his Attorney General. Skepticism was understandable. Robert Kennedy was hardly 35. His legal experience had been limited to service as counsel for senatorial committees, and there his role had been one of a zealous—many thought overzealous—prosecutor.

His chief fame then was as the manager of his brother's campaign. His designation as the Nation's chief law-enforcement officer seemed an act of dynastic indulgence. Why not, someone said, make him Postmaster General, like Jim Farley?

But Robert Kennedy was a good deal more than a party manager. His brother valued his intelligence and judgment and wanted him by his side. They had thought for a moment of a deputy or assistant secretaryship—perhaps in Defense or in Latin American affairs at State—but their father had pointed out this would put the official who stood between the brother and the President in an impossible position.

So the President-elect decided to go ahead with the Attorney Generalship. He later told Ben Bradlee how he planned to announce the appointment: "I think I'll open the front door of the Georgetown house some morning about 2 a.m., look up and down the street and, if there's no one there, I'll whisper, 'It's Bobby.'"

When the moment finally came, and the brothers started out the door to face the press, he said, "Damn it, Bobby, comb your hair." We were still saying that 7½ years later.

THE RACIAL CRISIS

As Attorney General, Kennedy was plunged into the heart of the racial crisis. He came to this crisis with strong general sympathies but without much specific background, and he learned very quickly. He learned above all of the determination of his black fellow citizens to achieve their rights. He believed in the justice of their cause and respected their courage, and his own exceptional feeling for the excluded groups, his curious sense of identification with the casualties and victims of American society, gave him the power to command the confidence of those who had no one to trust.

He called out the troops to put James Meredith into the University of Mississippi. He managed the passage of sweeping civil rights legislation. And his concern extended to the poor in general, especially through his Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, which originated many of the ideas and programs later carried forward in the war against poverty.

His relationship to his brother, moreover, meant his involvement in a far wider range of public questions than any other Attorney General in our history. He did not take part in the meetings which preceded the Bay of Pigs, but thereafter President Kennedy took no crucial decision in foreign policy without making sure that Robert Kennedy was there.

Next to the President, Robert Kennedy played the most important role in the peaceful resolution of the Cuban missile crisis. At the start, he led the opposition to the proposal that we take out the missile bases by surprise air attack and, at the end, when two messages of different import arrived from Khrushchev, he conceived the idea of ignoring the second and harsher message and responding to the more reasonable negotiating terms set forth in the first.

NERVE CENTER OF NEW FRONTIER

Beyond all this, Robert Kennedy was, in effect, the nerve center of the New Frontier. Every New Frontiersman, chopping his way through the thickets of Government, tended to turn to Robert Kennedy when he encountered obstacles and frustrations. The Attorney General had a sort of roving mandate through the Government, and he used it with discretion and imagination to reinforce liberal ideas and initiatives on matters from the release of Junius Scales to our policy in Africa, Latin America and Indonesia.

There was a tendency to feel that Robert Kennedy as a Senator was more liberal than he had been as Attorney General and to attribute this to his New York constituency. This was not so. The effect of Dallas was not to transform his convictions but to give them a new dimension and quality. His brother's murder intensified his own sense of the awful fortuity of life.

He now inclined more than ever toward that fatalism which saw human existence in terms of a tragic destiny but did not relieve man from his obligation to strive as best he could for the right. He found comfort in Aeschylus and also in Camus, and he evolved for himself a personal faith, a kind of Catholic stoicism and existentialism.

Elective politics also developed latent qualities in what had been a somewhat abstracted and diffident man. He became, for example, an excellent speaker, and he was at his best when he went among the poor and the helpless, whether in hospitals or Indian reservations, in hovels along the Mississippi delta or in the teeming ghettos of New York or Los Angeles. These years strengthened his sense of identification with the untouchables of American society. He made himself in the Senate the particular champion of those who in the past had been the constituents of no one. He was the representative of the unrepresented.

MOST PROMISING LEADER

This made the fashionable complaint of 1968 that he was a divisive figure so irrelevant. No doubt he was divisive in the country clubs and the manufacturers' associations. But in the context of the great and terrible divisions of American society—affluent America vs. destitute America, white America vs. black America—he was the most unifying figure in our politics. No one else offered such a possibility of a bridge between the alienated groups and the official American community.

He continued his fight, of course, for restraint and rationality in foreign affairs, and he spoke out against military escalation in Vietnam as early as the spring of 1965—long before any other of the current presidential aspirants.

It was an intense sorrow for him that his hesitation in entering the presidential competition of 1968 lost him the support of so many among the young and in the intellectual community; these he regarded as his natural constituency. But I have no doubt that after California and South Dakota he could have been well on his way to regaining their confidence and backing.

He was a brilliant and devoted man, superbly equipped by intelligence, judgment and passion for the great tasks of national leadership. He was, indeed, better prepared for the Presidency than his brother had been in 1960. His experience had been wider, and he had been exposed to more of the terrible problems of his own country and the world. He was, I deeply believe, our Nation's most promising leader.

In his private relations, he was a man of exceptional gentleness and generosity—the best of husbands and fathers, the dearest of friends. He was, in addition, a man of the most irresistible and rueful wit. I spent Thursday, May 30, with him as he whistle-stopped through the Central Valley of California. What lingers in memory are the faces of the crowd, worn and tired faces, weathered in the sun, lighting into a kind of happy hope as he appeared on the back platform of the train and launched into that characteristic combination of banter and intensity with which he beguiled and exhorted his audiences.

He went through this all with his sense of fatality. Perhaps no one would have been less surprised than Robert Kennedy himself by the tragic conclusion of his life. He was vividly aware of the interior tensions of American society; that is why he mingled his attack on social and racial injustice with insistence on the defense of the peaceful processes of change. He loved his fellow citizens and was prepared to trust himself to them, and the quality of his love was such that it would surely have survived the depraved and terrifying act that destroyed him.

Just two months earlier, he had stood at dusk on a street corner in Indianapolis, his voice breaking with emotion, telling a black audience that the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. had been murdered. He said, "In this difficult time for the United States, it is perhaps well to ask what kind of a nation we are." Black people, he said, might understandably be "filled with bitterness, with hatred, and a desire for revenge." We can move in that direction as a country, he said. "Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand and to comprehend, and to replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand with compassion and love."

That stain of bloodshed is now deeper than ever. With the murder of Robert Kennedy, following on the murder of John Kennedy and the murder of Martin Luther King, we have killed the three great embodiments of our national idealism in this generation. Each murder has brought us one stage further in the downward spiral of moral deg-

radation and social disintegration. "What we need in the United States," Robert Kennedy said that sad spring evening in Indianapolis, "is not violence or lawlessness, but love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country."

"A TIME OF VIOLENCE—A TIME OF TRADEGY"—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a commencement address which I delivered at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., on Saturday last, be incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I made the speech between attending the funeral of our late beloved and distinguished colleague Robert Kennedy at St. Patrick's Cathedral and returning to Washington for the culmination of the events of that tragic week.

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

A TIME OF VIOLENCE—A TIME OF TRAGEDY

(Commencement address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, delivered at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., June 8, 1968)

I shall be brief because of the death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy has made all words inadequate. The remarks which I had intended to make to you are prefixed now with a deepening of the concern which I have long felt with respect to the nation's direction. The tragedy in Los Angeles has added another dimension to our urgent national difficulties.

These are, indeed, times which try men's souls. I grieve for Senator Kennedy and his family. I grieve even more for my country.

There is something wrong, very wrong, when the attempt of reason and understanding to cope with grave national problems is ripped apart time and again by the bullets of irrationality and hatred. Senator Kennedy was among the most civilized and sensitive of political leaders and one of the nation's most thoughtful. His death lights up the threat to the very survival of freedom which is posed by this orgy of political violence. It has already brought down political and social and other leaders of the quality of President Kennedy, Medgar Evers, Martin Luther King, Jr., two young Marine lieutenants in Washington, D.C. this week, one of them from my own state of Montana, and now Senator Robert F. Kennedy. These are rare men. As a nation, we could not afford the untimely loss of any of these men. We can afford no more.

This epidemic of horror, this pathology of political and social violence strikes at the very heart of the American structure—we will either put an end to it or it will put an end to American freedom.

I look to you young people of today in the hope of glimpsing a better tomorrow for America. It may be that you will be able to make that decisive contribution which will turn the crises of today into the resolved problems of yesterday.

This is your commencement. In a larger sense, however, it must also be seen as a time of commencement for the nation. We live, today, in a nation torn apart by old tensions and in a world strained by new. There are difficulties abroad, serious difficulties. There are, clearly, even more serious difficulties at home. I refer not only to the assassinations of American public figures and others, but to the whole range of problems which afflict the nation.

You who graduate, today, have lived without surcease from critical national and international problems. Crisis is your dubious birthright. You were born almost at the same time as the birth of nuclear power. Abroad, you have grown up with an accumulation of national commitments which stretch around the world. Most of these commitments were undertaken before your time. More often than not, however, the bills are falling due in your time. Viet Nam is such a commitment.

At home, you inherit the massive accumulation of physical and human neglect which has led to the current conditions in the nation's cities. It is a measure of the nation's plight that we have tended to ignore these domestic volcanoes until an outburst of violence comes as a shocking reminder of their smoldering presence. It ought not to be necessary to wait for an assassination to focus realistically and with determination on these problems which Senator Kennedy and others have long insisted ought to be faced as a matter of exterme urgency.

Viet Nam is still there. So, too, are a dozen or more other focal points of trouble in this nation. Indeed, international conflict and domestic strife seem to have joined together under the common symbol of the bullet and the gutted city.

So I reiterate, your time of commencement must also be a time of commencement for the nation. If the tragic event in Los Angeles a short time ago, plus the accumulated tragedies of the past few years are to have any meaning, we will begin, now, to convert the difficulties of today into the solutions of tomorrow.

In this process of conversion, the contribution of young people is indispensable. It was not by accident that Robert F. Kennedy turned to young people. It was not by accident that young people turned to him. Rather, I believe it was because the attitudes of young people reflect a perspective of the contemporary world and times which is much sharper and yet more flexible than that exhibited by those of us who have borne adult witness to the events of the past two decades. And by the same token, young people saw in Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy a source of inspiration and leadership in coming to grips with the world of today and tomorrow.

That the questions which young people are asking sometimes show a disdain for conventional and entrenched approaches to our national problems is not surprising. It in no way alters the importance, indeed, the necessity of trying to find the answers. That, indeed, was what Robert F. Kennedy was seeking to do.

If you who are young tend to look at the long-accepted and dogmatic descriptions of the world scene with a degree of healthy pragmatism, it is perhaps because you are not bound by the furies, fixations, and fears of the past 20 years. It may be, and I hope it is, that your thought-processes are still flexible enough to permit you to perceive an obvious need for adjustments in the policies of this government in the light of the way Yugoslavia, Albania, not to mention China and Viet Nam and most recently Romania and Czechoslovakia, have undercut the old theory of a Russian communist monolith.

Whatever the reasons, it seems to me that you know enough to insist upon more than patent-medicine responses to the problems of international life in these closing decades of the 20th century. You know enough, too, to insist that this government assume a direct responsibility in the face of unrest and violence at home with at least as great a determination as it has sometimes displayed in taking on responsibilities for the curbing of unrest and violence abroad. In short, what your questions add up to is a call for a continuing appraisal of the premises of our foreign policies particularly in the light of changes abroad and urgent needs at home. To a considerable degree Senator Kennedy succeeded in setting in motion that kind of appraisal in his all too brief years in the Senate and in these past few weeks as a candidate for the Presidency. He knew, as I believe all of us sense, that there is an intimate association between the achievement of peace abroad and the realization of peace at home.

It is not at all certain that the negotiations at Paris will end the Vietnamese conflict in the near future. Indeed, the pace at which those negotiations have proceeded to date provides no basis for sanguine expectations. Nevertheless, Paris remains and I feel must remain, the hope for a peaceful settlement. The President and his negotiators should receive every possible support from the rest of us in their current effort to bring about that settlement.

Let me close these remarks on the same note with which I opened them. This commencement finds the nation entering upon a time of testing. Our difficulties are underscored, personified, and emphasized by the tragic death of Senator Kennedy. We must face up to the question of violence within the nation. We must face up to the threat which it poses to an orderly, peaceful, and free political structure in this nation.

To deal with this difficulty and others which plague us at home and abroad involves material resources. Far more than material resources, however, the very survival of the nation, I believe, cries out for the resolve and the ingenuity, the wit and the integrity to face firmly the situation which confronts us. It requires us to look long and hard at the bitter experiences of these past few years. It compels us to search in the unspeakable and barbaric tragedy of Viet Nam, in the assassinations of American leaders, and amidst the burnt out cities of the nation, for clearer definitions of the evolving problems of our times and to develop new approaches and new policies which look to their solution.

In that pursuit the participation of the young people of this nation is essential. I ask you to join your fresh courage, your fresh conviction, your fresh concern and your fresh outlook to the longer experience of the rest of us. Together, we can repair the weaknesses in the nation's society and mend the fences that have broken down. Together, we can cut out the dry-rot in our policies, both foreign and domestic. Together, we can build anew the inner structure and the inner peace of this nation. Together, we can act to shape a new society in a new world. Far more than words of eulogy, a dedication of heart and mind to that purpose would be a fitting tribute to the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Will you give it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I join Senators in paying tribute to our departed colleague, Robert F. Kennedy of New York.

Words cannot adequately express the sympathy which I feel for the Kennedy family during this hour of further tragedy in their lives. They have suffered far more than their share of sorrow.

The events surrounding the funeral, which we have all observed these past days, have once again been a witness to the courage and faith which these noble people possess. The Nation has been inspired by their magnificent strength. The love and solidarity displayed by the family is a testimony and an example of the highest ideals of mankind.

I add my name to those who express that this act of tragedy does not represent a diseased society. One man alone pulled the trigger. The rest of the Nation mourns the senselessness of the deed.

With all of the sorrow in the life of Robert F. Kennedy, his faith in democ-

racy never wavered. In February of 1966 he stated:

. . . Democracy is no easy form of government. Few nations have been able to sustain it. For it requires that we take the chances of freedom, that the liberating play of reason be brought to bear on events filled with passion; that dissent be allowed to make its appeal for acceptance; that men chance even in their search for truth.

Senator Robert Kennedy dared take the chance of freedom. He will best be remembered for his inspiration to youth and for his valiant stands against poverty and oppression and war. His dedication and vitality were examples to us all.

We are deeply touched by his loss. But we are bettered by having known him. His contribution to the Nation can well be summarized by a challenge he issued to himself in a speech delivered in June of 1961:

My faith is that Americans are not an inert people. My conviction is that we are rising as a people to confront the hard challenges of our age—and that we know that the hardest challenges are often those within ourselves. My confidence is that, as we strive constantly to meet the exacting standard of our national tradition, we will liberate a moral energy within our nation which will transform America's role and America's influence throughout the world—and that upon this release of energy depends the world's hope for peace, freedom and justice everywhere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Nation passed a weekend of grief which, like a black ominous cloud has descended over men of good will everywhere and yet on this Monday, when we must try to pick up the pieces and carry on our business which must go on, the deep and forboding sense of loss will not be dissipated. Mr. President, we have lost one of our own; we have lost a colleague of unusual ability and extraordinary perception, a most uncommon Senator and American. Our sense of loss is great. The Senate of the United States will not be the same without the junior Senator from New York. We will miss his quiet wit, his perceptive mind, and his genuine concern with the problems of America. But ours, of course, is not the only loss. We have lost a friend, a colleague, a fellow legislator, but our loss will never match the unspeakable tragedy which must be borne silently by the Kennedy family.

The great American family which has contributed an unmatched heritage of service to this land of ours, a family that has given our Nation a President, a wartime hero, an Ambassador, and two U.S. Senators. The grief of that family must certainly be without parallel in American history. It is unspeakably outrageous that two great American men, men who were in the prime of their lives and whose service to the Nation was in midcourse, have been brutally murdered. It is outrageous that the wives were suddenly widowed and that their children have only the memories of a father, and that for them in a very personal sense, life will never again be as rich.

But, Mr. President, may I suggest that the American people, too, have suffered an immeasurable loss. They have lost a great and courageous national leader. Perhaps most important, they have lost the man who embodied our Nation's struggle with ignorance, intolerance, injustice, and deprivation. They have lost a man who was vitally committed to guaranteeing to all Americans the great ideals on which this Nation was founded. They have lost a man who was concerned with meeting the plight of the poor and the ignorant and the disadvantaged. A man who was alarmed that in a nation of unprecedented prosperity and economic growth, men, women, and children are still hungry, homeless, jobless. They have lost a man who was outraged by the prejudice and injustice which befalls our fellow Americans simply because their skin happens to be black. And they have lost a leader who had a vision of American cities as exciting, cosmopolitan, amenable places in which all could live in decency, prosperity, and justice. In short, Mr. President, our Nation has lost a man who had a vision of a better future and the political and moral courage to fight for a better America.

And let us not forget too that the loss of Senator Kennedy is particularly keenly felt by America's young. Those men and women who will assume the burden of leading our Nation tomorrow. Senator Kennedy did offer a new voice. To many, he was the hope of a better future. Mr. President, although Senator Kennedy is gone, his memory, and his aspirations for America will live on in this Chamber. He was a good man and a great American and we would all do well to seek to pick up the burden for the future which he carried so gracefully. May God let him rest in peace.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in respect of the late Senator Robert Kennedy.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I share the shock and sorrow of all Senators and of the nation at the tragic loss of our colleague, Senator Robert Kennedy. My deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and to all the Kennedy family, a family that has given so much and lost so much.

Once again we find ourselves mourning the loss of one of our most able leaders through a barbarous, senseless act. Once again violence has torn at our society.

Senator Robert Kennedy was one who exhibited a consistent and profound concern about the serious problems facing our nation. He was a man of intelligence and courage, who believed in America and was totally committed to the service of the nation.

We must stop the violence and heal the divisions in our society. We must dedicate our efforts to meeting the urgent social needs of this country. Senator Robert Kennedy recognized the seriousness of the foreign and domestic problems which we face, and, as a man of action, dedicated himself to their resolution.

I earnestly hope that the memory of our fallen colleague and the example of service rendered by him will serve as an inspiration to all Americans to work for peace in the world and tolerance, justice, and order at home.

S. 3604 AND S. 3605—INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSED GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send to the desk two bills. I shall explain them briefly. I ask unanimous consent that I may continue to 15 minutes.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, one bill (S. 3604) would require the registration of all firearms of every kind and every type. It would provide for a period of amnesty at which time all citizens and all persons in this country would be required to register their firearms, and if they failed to do so within that period of time they would thereafter be subject to penalty for failure to do so.

The second proposal (S. 3605) which I have sent to the desk would restore the long gun amendment which was defeated here on the floor of the Senate after it was offered by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 3604. A bill to require the registration of firearms; and

S. 3605. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide adequate regulation of certain sales of shotguns and rifles.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to my fellow Senators who spoke of Senator Kennedy's assassination. We have lost here personally in the Senate a beloved Member. Not only did we lose President Kennedy, but there was Medgar Evers, and then there was Malcolm X, and then there was an attempt to kill General Walker, and then there was the murder of Rev. James Reeb in Selma and the brutal killing of civil rights workers in Mississippi, and then there was Dr. Martin Luther King.

I did not agree with a few of the people I have just named but the political fact is that political assassination is becoming almost a habitual thing in this Nation.

Private citizens are no less important than those in public office who have taken a position on this or that cause, and something should be done to protect all of them. For 7 years I have been trying to get a modest gun control bill through Congress, and for most of those years I could never get anywhere with it. Finally, one tragedy after another made it possible for us to get some firearms control legislation, not enough, but something. Now the situation in this country is so bad, so terrifying, so frightening that our people are demanding that something more be done.

Who fears registration? No honest man is afraid to have his gun registered. The bill I introduce today is a self-protective bill, and it ought to be passed.

As I have said so many times before, a gun has only one purpose. Its purpose is to put a bullet through something, to kill something, or somebody, and it is in

the public interest that this kind of device be registered. I repeat: Who is going to be hurt if we require that we do so?

I do not know of any other country that pretends to be advanced that does not have such a requirement. There are hundreds of thousands, probably millions, of guns in the hands of people who should not have them. We do not even know about them. This killing will go on, and we will keep talking about possible remedies. The gunrunners will tell us we are getting "hysterical." If that is being hysterical, as was said before on the memorable occasion of the assassination of President Kennedy, then let the gunrunners make the most of it.

We want our streets safe. We want our people safe. We want control over these dangerous weapons. If Federal registration is the only way to do it, and I am convinced that it is, then let us do it. Let us face up to it.

I should have also mentioned that my bill includes control over the sale of ammunition. It requires a person to prove his gun is registered in order to purchase bullets for it. That provision is aimed at the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of guns which are already in irresponsible hands. Nobody knows anything about them. It is about time that we know who owns them and stop the sale of ammunition to criminals and children.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Nation has spoken its grief and its horror and shame over the tragedy that took place in Los Angeles last Tuesday night.

The life or death of one man is something of infinite importance. Indeed, if there is any single concept that can be defined as the essence of religious morality, it is the transcendent concern for the individual, for human life and human dignity. This is, or should be, what distinguishes the civilized man from the barbarian, the free man from the totalitarian fanatics of left and right.

But if this is the criterion, then one begins to wonder whether our Nation truly qualifies as civilized. For the assassination of Senator Kennedy was not an isolated incident. It was only the latest of a series of assassinations and attempted assassinations which have been occurring with increasing frequency in recent years.

There was President Kennedy. And there was Medgar Evers. And there was Malcolm X. A bit further back, there was the attempt on General Walker's life. There was the murder of the Rev. James Reeb in Selma and the brutal killing of three civil rights workers in Mississippi. And only a few short weeks ago there was Martin Luther King.

And now a young Senator, the father of 10 children, a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, has been cut down by an assassin's bullet.

And the same newspapers that carried the news of the shooting also reported on the opening of the trial of a group of black extremists charged with plotting the assassination of Negro leaders Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young.

We must all ask ourselves: What is wrong with our society?

For some time now the suggestion has been bandied about that the most effective way of dealing with the problem of the political assassinations would be to conduct a study of the psychopathology of political assassins.

Such a study, I am afraid, would get us absolutely nowhere because it proceeds from a false premise. The epidemic of assassinations cannot be considered in isolation from the epidemic of violence which has been growing with each succeeding decade, and which now infects our society at every level.

When a political leader is shot by an assassin, this is an item that commands worldwide attention in the press.

But political leaders are not the only victims of guns and gunmen.

Each day in our country 15 or 20 Americans are shot down by gunmen. Because they are ordinary citizens and because their names are not nationally known, we accept these tragedies for the most part without even lifting an eyebrow.

As incredible as it may seem, far more people have been killed by firearms in our country since the year 1900 than have died in all of our wars, from the American Revolution to Vietnam. Between 1900 and 1966, firearms were responsible for 280,000 murders, 370,000 suicides and 145,000 deaths by accident—making a grand total of 795,000 since the onset of the century. Against this figure, the total number of American war dead, from the beginning of this Nation to this date in Vietnam, stands at 550,000.

As I pointed out in my Senate speech in support of title IV, our annual rate of murder by gunfire has been astronomically higher than the rate for other civilized countries. Let me repeat a few of these statistics, because they are essential to any intelligent discussion of the problem.

The last year for which the Library of Congress could give me comparative statistics was 1963. In that year we showed almost three homicides by gunfire for every 100,000 population. This rate was 55 times the rate for Great Britain; 25 the rate for Germany; 55 times the rate for Japan; 90 times the rate for the Netherlands; and so on down the line.

Reduced to round figures instead of statistical rates, the facts are equally impressive. Thus, we find that major countries like Great Britain and Japan during the early sixties averaged approximately 30 firearms homicides per year, a figure roughly equivalent to the number murdered by guns in our country in 2 days. And we also find that for a period of 3 years in the early sixties the Netherlands did not have a single case of murder by firearms.

This appalling massacre has been possible because of our delinquency, our gross and unforgivable delinquency, in regulating the interstate traffic in firearms in the United States.

True, some of our States have for years had reasonably good gun laws.

But the gun laws of our various States have been violated wholesale and rendered ineffective because of the lack of supporting legislation at the Federal level. Hundreds of thousands of weapons have been sold to our citizens in circumvention of their own laws, in across-the-counter transactions in neighboring States and by mail-order sale.

Until this week it has been possible for anyone—criminal, a juvenile, or a lunatic—to clip an advertisement from a score of magazines, order either a handgun or a long gun for a few dollars from a dealer in a distant State, and, in a matter of weeks have the gun delivered to him with virtual anonymity.

We have now taken the first step in the direction of effective gun control.

On Thursday of last week Congress completed the approval of the gun controls which were incorporated as title IV of the omnibus crime bill.

This bill is far from perfect.

But it represents a major step ahead in a number of respects.

First, it prohibits all mail-order sales of handguns to non-State residents.

Second, it prohibits the sale of handguns to non-State residents.

Third, it prohibits the sale of handguns to minors.

Fourth, it requires that all purchasers of firearms from Federal licensees be required to identify themselves by name, address and age.

Fifth, in order to eliminate the fraudulent and fly-by-night dealers, it requires the Federal licensing of dealers, manufacturers and importers of firearms, and establishes certain minimum standards that must be met by applicants for licenses.

Sixth, it prohibits the import into the United States of all military surplus handguns, destructive devices, and other nonsporting guns, including rifles and shotguns.

Seventh, it stringently controls the sale of destructive devices.

I do not underestimate the importance of this legislation. Indeed, I consider its approval by Congress a major triumph for the forces of law and order and decency and sanity in this country. But the fact is that it does only a part of the job that has to be done.

THE SALE OF LONG GUNS

One of its chief weaknesses is that it does not establish controls over the sale of long guns.

As the Senate knows, the terms of the bill which I recently submitted also applied to rifles and shotguns. In the course of a prolonged committee debate, however, rifles and shotguns were removed from the coverage of title IV.

In my opinion, as I said at the time, this was a mistake.

I also supported the amendment introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts which sought to extend the coverage of title IV to include rifles and shotguns. On this amendment, the vote in the Senate went against us.

I have tried hard to understand the reasoning of the opposition, but I find that their reasoning defies understanding.

The opponents of long gun control tell us that the rifle and the shotgun are sporting weapons and that they are

rarely used in the commission of crimes. But the fact is that long guns figure in approximately one third of the gun murders committed in our country. Our law-enforcement authorities across the country have urged legislation to control the sale of long guns.

Mr. Quinn Tamm, representing the International Association of Chiefs of Police has told us that—I quote—"the long arm has taken its place in 20th century crime with a demolishing force" and he has urged the enactment of supporting legislation.

His views have been echoed by the chiefs of police of our major American cities, almost to a man.

And now the President of the United States has pointed to this unfortunate weakness in the gun legislation approved by Congress, and he has asked Congress to enact legislation that would extend the controls of title IV to the sale of rifles and shotguns.

A questionnaire which our subcommittee sent out to various police departments across the Nation developed the following very revealing statistics on the role of long guns in illegal activities of all kinds for a 5-year period for the 40 cities that responded to the questionnaire: 805 rifles and shotguns were confiscated from juveniles, 1,210 rifles and shotguns were used to commit murder, 2,908 robberies were perpetrated with long guns, 4,179 assaults were committed with long guns, 14,035 long guns were misused in other crimes, 23,130 rifles and shotguns were confiscated from persons involved in illegal activities, 4,478 long guns were seized on illegal weapons charges. This makes a total of 50,745 cases where longarms were used in crimes of violence or other illegal activities.

These are facts which cannot be ignored.

To this date, the opponents of long gun control have displayed a cavalier disdain for the opinions of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and Mr. Quinn Tamm and Attorney General Ramsey Clark and of our metropolitan chiefs of police. What their opposition adds up to is that they do not think J. Edgar Hoover and the Department of Justice and the chiefs of police of our major cities know about the problem of crime and enforcement.

In their arrogant omniscience, they apparently believe, that they, the members of the gun lobby, are the only ones who know what to do about crime.

But now that the President of the United States has once again appealed, in the most urgent terms, for legislation establishing effective controls over the sale of long guns, I earnestly hope that Members of the Senate who have thus far voted against such controls will reconsider their position. Yes, and I even venture to hope that the directors of the National Rifle Association, who are, after all, good citizens if misguided ones, will reconsider the implications of their opposition to such a measure.

Mr. President, one of the bills I am introducing today would have the effect of extending the provisions of title IV of S. 917 to cover the sale of rifles and shotguns.

If we claim to represent the American people, who cannot as a body persistently vote against legislation which three-fourths of the American people want.

And if we claim to be truly concerned about our growing crime rate and truly desirous of giving our law enforcement authorities the legislative assistance they need in order to combat crime, then we cannot go on ignoring the advice of the Department of Justice and the FBI and of our law enforcement authorities at every level.

We cannot ignore the fact that one third of all gun murders and a large part of all gun crimes involves the use of rifles and shotguns or sawed-off rifles and sawed-off shotguns.

We cannot ignore the fact that the high-power rifle is the favorite weapon of the assassin.

We cannot ignore the fact that the rifle is the favorite weapon of the berserk killer.

We cannot ignore the fact that the rifle has been the main weapon of the snipers who have taken so murderous a toll in our big city riots, and whose activities have done so much to aggravate the general violence that has characterized these riots.

Finally, we cannot ignore the fact that rifles and shotguns are being used with increasing frequency in a wide variety of crimes, and that they are bound to play an even more prominent role in crimes of violence if we impose restrictions on the sale of handguns without imposing parallel restrictions on the sale of long guns.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote of confidence in our law enforcement authorities.

I ask for legislation which will give them the assistance they themselves have asked for in the fight against crime.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator grant me the privilege of being a cosponsor of the bill he is introducing?

Mr. DODD. I will be honored.

Mr. President, I neglected to say that I should like to have the bill remain at the desk for 5 days, to give any other Senators who would like to cosponsor the measure an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Connecticut will recall that I was a cosponsor of the original bill which he offered.

Mr. DODD. I do; and the Senator from Ohio was of great help in the long fight to obtain some sensible gun control legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request that the bill be held at the desk for 5 days?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I personally would have no objection, but will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his request until the Senator from Illinois has seen the bill? I think he may have some suggestions.

Mr. DODD. Certainly.

How much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining of the time he requested.

Mr. DODD. Could I have 5 more minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut may have an additional 5 minutes, or until the hour of 1 o'clock, to complete his remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Does the Senator withdraw his request to have the bill held at the desk?

Mr. DODD. Yes. As I understand, the Senator from Delaware has asked me to withhold the request until the Senator from Illinois could get to the floor. That was the way I understood him.

THE NEED FOR COMPULSORY GUN REGISTRATION

The second bill which I am introducing today provides for the compulsory Federal registration of all firearms.

There is too much hatred in our country and too many extremists of both left-wing and rightwing persuasions. There are also far too many guns in the hands of irresponsible elements.

I think that the time has come when we shall have to follow the examples of other civilized countries and make registration of all guns compulsory.

The fact is that the control of the future sale of guns solves only part of the problem. We are still left with the problem of disarming the countless thousands—the figure may well run into millions—of criminals and drug addicts and extremists and alcoholics and mentally unstable elements who have been able to secure weapons for themselevs under our hitherto lax and ineffective gun laws.

Compulsory registration of all firearms would enable us to move to disarm these dangerous and antisocial elements.

On the other hand, no law-abiding citizen would have anything to fear from compulsory registration. He could continue to own guns for sporting purposes or for self-protection; and he would do so more secure in the knowledge that something was being done to take guns away from those who should not own them.

The essential features of this legislation are the following:

First, it calls for compulsory Federal registration of all firearms under a machinery to be set up by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Second, it exempts those States which have or will have laws requiring compulsory registration.

Third, it establishes a nominal registration fee of $1 to cover the cost of administering the registration program.

Fourth, it provides for a period of 90 days after the law is enacted before it becomes effective. This will make it possible to set up the necessary administrative machinery before registration begins.

Fifth, it provides for a registration period that will commence 90 days after its enactment and will extend for a period of 6 months thereafter.

Sixth, my legislation grants an amnesty from prosecution under this act to all persons who come forward to turn in their firearms before the close of the registration period.

Seventh, it would prohibit any person, including a federally licensed dealer from selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of any ammunition to any person who does not furnish proof that the weapon for which he is purchasing ammunition has been registered under this act.

This, I feel, is a very necessary part of this legislation. There are millions of firearms presently in this country that are subject to misuse.

The availability of ammunition, however, is another question. It will be difficult for a criminal or juvenile to misuse an unregistered gun if it is illegal for him to buy ammunition for that weapon.

In addition, hearings before the subcommittee proved that until the cheap, imported handgun was made available, it was a simple matter for juveniles to manufacture guns. The much discussed "zip gun" of the juvenile gangs is a good example of the need to exert some control over the distribution of ammunition. It is a logical and reasonable extension of this act which calls for registration of all firearms, to require that a person purchasing ammunition for that firearm prove that the gun is, in fact, legally possessed.

Eighth, it establishes a penalty of a maximum of up to 2 years in prison and $2,000 fine, or both, for those who are found to be in violation of this act.

This is a simple and workable proposal. In fact, it closely resembles the gun registration laws in Switzerland, which have sometimes been held up by the National Rifle Association as an ideal gun country.

I want to repeat again that no law-abiding citizen has anything to fear from registration.

No one questions the need for automobile registration or motorcycle registration, or even bicycle registration and dog registration. They understand that this is essential for the protection of the owner as well as for the protection of the community. Nor does anyone question the need for drivers licenses or the right of the State to deny such licenses to juveniles and alcoholics and those convicted of reckless driving.

Why then should anyone object to the registration of guns in the interest of the community?

THE REACTION OF THE GUN LOBBY

I know that this proposal will encounter the violent opposition of the gun lobby and the gun runners.

I have no illusions about their persistence about their power. Indeed, their power is nothing short of frightening.

I have repeatedly discussed in this body during the last 7 years the unrelenting pressure which the firearms lobby, led by the National Rifle Association, has put on the Congress, and most recently on the Senate, as firearms legislation approached a vote.

I consider it the most stubborn, the most militant, the most effective, the most wrongheaded, and probably the most dangerous lobby that has ever existed.

They have fought effective gun legislation every single step of the way.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, first embarked on a study of the need for more effective gun legislation in 1961. We sent committee investigators to all parts of the country to ascertain the nature and scope of the problem, with particular emphasis on the problems of mail-order sale guns.

After days and weeks of hearings and investigations, and after meetings with the gun lobby and the gun manufacturers, I introduced, with the cosponsorship of four other members of the committee, a simple mail-order gun bill.

This was in 1963, just four months before the assassination of John F. Kennedy. The tragedy of the assassination aroused the public and it helped to persuade the Senate sponsors of gun control to seek broader legislation. Subsequent to the assassination in Dallas, I amended the bill to include rifles and shotguns.

For the next 2 years we fought with the gun lobby and the gunrunners and with the powerful political opposition which they fed and encouraged. I was accused of being part of a Communist conspiracy. It was charged that committee members wanted to do away with the second amendment to the Constitution. We on the committee were reacting "hysterically" on the subject of guns, trumpeted the firearms industry press.

In 1965, at the request of the administration, I introduced a gun bill that was stronger than any introduced in the history of the United States.

Despite the emergence of the civilian snipers in the Watts riots, we continued to meet increasingly violent opposition from the gun lobby, especially from its main mouthpiece, the National Rifle Association.

When the gun lobby's friends in Congress succeeded in stalling congressional action through 1966, I again introduced the President's bill in 1967. And we have been fighting up until only a few days ago to send to the President a bill that would make a significant contribution to the problem of gun control.

On April 4, 1968, the Senate Judiciary Committee finally reported a gun bill as title IV of the omnibus crime bill. The decision came after prolonged and stubborn debate. It may be a portent of some kind that the vote came within the very hour that the Reverend Martin Luther King was shot down by a gunman in Memphis, Tenn. I remember saying to my colleagues: "How many more good men must be shot down before we take action?"

Title IV in its present form was approved by a narrow margin. But the committee eliminated the very weapons that were used by Oswald, Whitman, the snipers of Watts and Detroit—the weapon, which, within the hour of the Judiciary Committee's imprudent action, was to snuff out the life of Dr. Martin Luther King.

I think it is painfully ironic, Mr. President, that one Senator who through the years supported my efforts to get a good gun law was Senator Robert F. Kennedy. And now he, too, has been felled by a blast from the gun of an assassin.

The gun lobby has already begun grinding out its propaganda, as they did after the assassination of President Kennedy, after the Whitman massacre, after the riots, and after the murder of Martin Luther King. They cry that "no gun law in the world would have prevented these tragedies." Then they piously conclude that the Congress should do nothing.

We are now witnessing the usual smoke screen and the usual call for "calmness and reason."

And for what?

To buy time for the gun lobby to spread its poisonous propaganda again and for the shock to wear off a Nation once again bereaved.

Before and during the recent Senate debate on title IV, representatives of the gun lobby operated openly and shamelessly in the Halls of Congress. Twice during debate on title IV, in passing through the reception room to the Senate Chambers, I met two top officers of the National Rifle Association.

This came as no surprise to me because of the unique position the National Rifle Association sees itself occupying in the affairs of the Congress.

Harold W. Glassen, president, opened the annual meeting of the National Rifle Association in Boston on April 6, 1968, a little over 6 weeks ago.

And he opened it with a threat.

In discussing the "real strength" of the National Rifle Association he said that its "1 million members are a unified force to be reckoned with in every corner of America."

And then, as president of a tax-free, nonpolitical, nonlobby, education organization he went on to discuss the politics of lobbying.

He said:

> . . . I should think our political enemies would keep this in mind when they're dreaming up some of those things they say about us. We're all voters, and I'm sure they're going to hear from us at the polls in November.
>
> I know darn right well they're going to hear from me.
>
> . . . I will tell you this much—the politicians who use this great American organization as a whipping boy in order to further their own selfish interests are not going to get my vote.

I am not cowed by his open political blackmail; but I am shocked by this blatant public threat of political retaliation issued to this Congress if it does not conform to its wishes. I believe this will be the reaction of every Member of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the annual report of the National Rifle Association dealing with their legislative service and their public relations service for the years 1963 through 1967 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I think the Senate and the general public should know something of the National Rifle Association's arrogant bragging to their members about their effectiveness in swaying firearms legislation.

Let me quote this one paragraph from the 1964 report which more than anything else shows the true purpose and

the true activities of the National Rifle Association:

Information to NRA members about firearms control proposals is supplied by three principal means—(1) the regular report, "What the Lawmakers are Doing," in The American Rifleman; (2) NRA Legislative Bulletin; and (3) direct contracts by mail or wire. During 1963, 350 bills of concern to gunowners were introduced in state legislatures and 32 in the U.S. Congress. Details about the more important ones were published in 42 columns of the magazine, and 42 legislative bulletins were mailed to 320,000 members and clubs in 50 states. *NRA members reacted promptly, firmly, and in force.* As a result, none of the legislation deemed *severe were enacted.*

The gun lobby, led by the National Rifle Association, will no doubt make another determined effort to deprive the public of the kind of firearms legislation it has requested, indeed demanded.

For weeks before and during the debate on the gun bill, officials of the gun industry, "conservation" groups, and the National Rifle Association have stalked the Halls of Congress waving the flag, repeating arguments they knew to be spurious, and hinting at political reprisals.

They were in the cafeterias, the elevators, in the reception rooms and in the galleries waiting for a chance to buttonhole what looked to them like another vote for their own perverted view of the public interest, a view that shows a total and callous indifference to the epidemic of mail-order death that has been sweeping across our country like some modern-day black plague.

The gun apologists argued only yesterday that the Dodd bill would not have prevented the shooting of Senator Kennedy.

Maybe it would have and maybe it would not have.

It is impossible to prove in mathematical terms that even the most stringent gun control legislation would have prevented a specific murder. But no law can prevent all the crime it is intended to deal with. And the statistics which I have already quoted demonstrate conclusively that those countries with tight gun controls have far fewer murders and far fewer crimes of violence, on a pro rata basis, than the United States.

It is a fact to reflect on again that the rate for gun murders in this country is 55 times the rate for Britain and 90 times the rate for the Netherlands.

It is a fact to reflect on, too, that every single law enforcement officer who has testified on the subject has expressed the conviction that our soaring crime rates are directly related to the easy availability of guns of all kinds and the lack of adequate gun controls.

I do not say that enactment of the gun bill or even of compulsory registration will prevent all murders or any specific murder. I do say that they will result in the saving of many thousands of lives over the years. And this is more than ample justification.

If we fail to take these stringent measures in the immediate future, then it can be predicted as a certainty that our land will be the scene of more assassinations and attempted assassinations, and that these crimes will occur with increasing frequency.

Pious condolences over the assassination of President Kennedy or of Dr. Martin Luther King, or over the assassination of Senator Kennedy, will no longer suffice. If our country is not to be regarded by the rest of the world as a nation of murderers and assassins, we must take the most energetic action to put an end to the conditions that today makes America a land of murder and violence.

Let me add a final word. We are all saddened by the assassinations that have occurred. But that is not enough. No one could be more truly stricken than we of the Senate. As a result of the assassination of President Kennedy, the assassination of Dr. King, and now the awful murder of Senator Robert Kennedy, our country has come to be regarded by the rest of the world as a Nation of murderers and assassins. We must take energetic action to put an end to the condition that today makes America a land of murder and violence.

I know there is more to murder and violence than the availability of guns. I remember when I was attempting to get shows exploiting crime, violence and brutality off the television screens. An attitude of mind is involved. How can we expect children, who see mostly beatings, killings, and shootings on television screens, to behave themselves and to be nonviolent?

I think the Juvenile Delinquency Committee hearings may have served a good purpose. I believe it is clear that we must do more than pass gun laws in order to reverse the violence prevalent in our country today. I hope that we will face up to doing what is necessary to accomplish our purpose.

Clearly, the most immediate need is the enactment of stronger firearms legislation.

I thank the majority leader for his courtesy in granting me extra time during the morning hour.

Perhaps it would be easier for those who wish to cosponsor the bills to have them lie on the desk for cosponsorship for the rest of the day. Some Senators called my office and wanted to cosponsor the bills. Will it be satisfactory to let them lie at the desk for the rest of the day?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DODD. I make that request.

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

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1968.

To the Board of Directors:

The membership and financial position of our Association is greater today than ever before in its history.

Progress in meeting the long-term objectives adopted by the Board of Directors in 1960, the NRA Centennial Plan, continues at a rapid pace. The original goal of 500,000 individual members was surpassed by the end of 1962. We now are "shooting for a million," with a total of 902,000 members at the end of 1967. Our official journal The American Rifleman, has been improved so that it is the most complete monthly publication on firearms and shooting available anywhere in the world. NRA activities with the greatest potential growth are being promoted, and new activities are being established to attract new supporters. We constantly are strengthening our relationships with organizations which will help to carry our program to the people.

A careful study of the information presented in this report will show that the National Rifle Association has made great strides in the accomplishment of its mission. These results have been achieved with the wholehearted support and unselfish dedication of its officers, members and staff. Our success has been made possible because individuals in all parts of our land are willing to devote time and effort, without financial compensation, to help in the establishment of a comprehensive nationwide program to promote and conduct NRA activities in local communities. With continued enlightened guidance by our leadership and the enthusiastic support of our membership, we can look to the future with confidence in our ability to grow and to be of greater service to our members, to our communities and to our nation.

FRANKLIN L. ORTH,
Executive Vice President.
LOUIS F. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

LEGISLATIVE SERVICE

The principal function of the NRA's Legislative Service is the collection and dispensing of evaluated information concerning existing and proposed firearms controls. The principal means of transmitting such information is the regular monthly "What the Lawmakers are Doing," appearing in The American Rifleman. In addition, special legislative bulletins, memoranda and direct contact by mail, telephone, telegram or personal conversation are utilized to accomplish this information gathering-reporting function.

Retrospectively, the year 1967 was active and productive in terms of proposed legislation. Forty-seven state legislatures were in session, and interstate firearms controls was a subject of frequent Congressional comment. Seventy-six columns in The American Rifleman were devoted to legislative news; one special bulletin on proposed federal legislation was sent to all NRA members and clubs; and 18 legislative bulletins were mailed to all NRA members and clubs in states or cities in which crucial firearms legislation was under consideration.

Federal

The first session of the 90th Congress convened on January 10, 1967. That night, President Johnson delivered his State of the Union message outlining his legislative program for the year, in which he recommended "strict controls on the sale of firearms." The next day, Senator Thomas J. Dodd (Conn.) introduced the Administration's bill, S. 1, to amend the Federal Firearms Act. This bill was identical to S. 1592, as amended, in the 89th Congress. In his message to Congress on February 6, 1967, the President referred to further delay in enacting strict firearms controls as being "unconscionable" and he recommended that all states enact a Sullivan-type law. Shortly after this, the President's Crime Commission published a report recommending strict regulation of firearms, including registration. On February 8, 1967, S. 1 was amended so as to prohibit the interstate sale of all firearms, except between federally licensed manufacturers and dealers.

On February 15, 1967, Representative Emanuel Celler (10th Dist.-N.Y.) introduced H.R. 5384, identical to the Dodd Bill as amended. Representatives Casey, King, Horton, Sikes, Dingell and others introduced legislation reflecting the NRA three-part legislative program of 1965–66. At its Annual Meetings, however, the Association added a fourth part, providing for an affidavit proce-

dure for the interstate or mail order purchase of pistols or revolvers. The affidavit approach was initially reflected in H.R. 8645, introduced by Representative Cecil King (17th Dist.-Calif.) on April 17. On May 24, Senator Hruska introduced his now famous bill, S. 1853, similar to H.R. 8645, as well as a bill, S. 1854, to control destructive devices.

Four days of hearings were held on the Celler Bill (H.R. 5384) in April. There were eleven days of hearings on the Dodd and Hruska Bills, in July and August. The NRA testified in both houses in opposition to the Administration bills, and spoke in support of legislation reflecting the NRA's four-part program.

Late in the session, both Administration bills were reported from subcommittee to the parent Judiciary Committee in each house. The version of the Dodd proposal reported was S. 1 as amended in February; the Celler measure was reported by a substitute which retained the ban on interstate sales.

At the close of the first session of the 90th Congress there were a total of 16 bills either reflecting or similar to the NRA four-point program (14 in the House and 2 in the Senate). There was a total of nearly 40 general bills to regulate firearms introduced in the first session of the 90th Congress, all of which carry over to the second session.

On November 2, 1967, NRA Executive Vice President Franklin L. Orth testified before the Subcommittee on Wildlife of the House Merchant Marine Committee in support of H.R. 11190, by Rep. John Dingell of Michigan, to provide that one-half of the excise tax on pistols and revolvers be used for target ranges and firearms safety training programs and the other half of such revenue be used for wildlife restoration under the Pittman-Robertson Act. This bill is still in subcommittee.

State

This past year, there was a noticeable trend toward more restrictive firearms controls in various states. There were nearly 500 bills pertaining to firearms or hunting and game conservation matters, several of which included proposals to place rifles and shotguns under further controls—including a permit to possess or acquire, license to carry, identification cards or registration.

The long firearm came under particular attention in New York, Illinois, Maryland, Washington, Hawaii and Michigan. With the exception of Illinois, no bill to cover rifles or shotguns became law.

The outstanding development on the state level this year was the enactment of a new firearms law in Illinois to require an identification card for the acquisition or possession of any firearm, pellet gun or ammunition. The new Illinois statute differs from the ID card requirement of the 1966 New Jersey law by providing for the mandatory issuance of the identification card after the applicant has met certain generally reasonable and clearly set forth conditions.

The following states adopted resolutions opposing the Administration-backed Dodd-Celler Bill: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Montana, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and Texas.

Connecticut has a new law to provide for the establishment of a board of firearms permit examiners, including sportsmen's representatives, to review denial of application for a handgun permit or renewal thereof.

In Texas, a long-standing requirement that handgun dealers submit quarterly reports to the Department of Public Safety was repealed, thus removing a cause of annoyance to both dealers and their customers.

Amended and added to in several important respects was California's firearms law. Perhaps the most publicized change was prohibiting the carrying of a firearm in any public place or street in an incorporated area or in a prohibited area of an unincorporated area, with certain exceptions.

Hunter safety training bills failed of passage in Colorado, Florida, Michigan and Nebraska, and are pending in Pennsylvania. In Illinois, a new law provides for the initiation, promotion and development by the Conservation Department of a safe firearms handling program for persons between 12 and 21 years of age.

Local

The most significant development on the local level in 1967 was the adoption by New York City of perhaps the toughest gun law in the nation. In November the City Council passed, and the Mayor signed, an ordinance to require the registration of all rifles and shotguns in addition to handguns, as well as a permit to purchase and possess such firearms.

Attempts at additional controls on the municipal or county level were made in Chicago, Miami, Coral Gables (Florida), and Maryland's Montgomery County, among others. Miami adopted a 72-hour waiting period; Coral Gables, a registration requirement; and Montgomery County, an expansion of the area in which firearms may not be discharged, with certain exceptions.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

As a public service organization, the entire NRA Headquarters operation contributes to the Association's total public relations effort. However, the Office of Public Relations carries out a basic public relations program designed (1) to inform the general public on the various aspects of Federal, state and local firearms legislation; (2) to increase the prestige and public acceptance of the NRA in its various programs; (3) to establish and promote civilian marksmanship training as essential to the national defense; (4) to emphasize that shooting is safe; (5) to promote recreational shooting in its various forms; (6) to identify shooting as an essential international sport; and (7) to identify the NRA as *the* authority on guns and the shooting sports.

In order to accomplish this mission, the NRA Office of Public Relations operates in several broad general categories: (1) general publicity, which includes almost daily use of the printed media, radio and television; (2) shows and exhibits; (3) personal appearances and interviews; and (4) personal assistance to media representatives.

Publicity

The Office of Public Relations had a particularly active year in 1967. During this time 71 special releases were written with a total of 234,300 stories distributed. These stories related to major activities or statements concerning the Association's programs and policies on various issues. In addition, 5,372 "Hometown" releases were prepared and distributed to local newspapers and broadcasters. These releases on individual NRA members concerned personal accomplishments, awards, instructor certification, club organization and other pertinent accomplishments.

Complete news coverage of the National Matches, the International Tryouts, the Pan American Games, the National Police Championships, the National Collegiate Championships at Manhattan, Kansas, and the major Police Regional at Winter Haven, Florida, was provided by staff members of the NRA Office of Public Relations. Clippings and transcripts received indicate excellent use of stories concerning these matches. Also, prior to the National Matches, 7,100 "Hometowners" on individual participants were issued to local media. Similar stories were released on the Pan American Team and the participants in the National Police Championships. All news stories on shooting resulting from the Pan American Games were written and placed with the wire services by the OPR staff men in attendance.

Prior to, and during the Annual Meetings, the OPR prepared and distributed 12 major stories. Clippings indicated that "pick-up" was very good. Also, during the Meetings, OPR arranged three radio interviews and a news conference for the NRA President.

During the fall months, OPR staff members attended and arranged news coverage of two major Home Firearms Safety programs. Unusual interest in these programs was generated among the media, and favorable coverage was accomplished.

During 1967, the NRA feature column, "Target, Woods and Gun Room," was used by 675 newspapers and magazines, with a total of 15,725 columns being distributed. In addition, NRA safety spots were used on 603 radio stations for a total of 264,000 broadcasts. This represents several million dollars in public service air time. The "Fess Parker" TV spots were still in use on 171 TV stations and a new animated spot was released late in the year. Figures on use of this spot were not available for calculation by the end of 1967.

The Gary Anderson "Shooting Tips" strips were placed in 675 newspapers and magazines in 1967, and the "Tipper Flintlock" safety mats were in use by 516 newspapers. "Tipper" will be replaced by 1968 by the new safety symbol, "Keeneye."

In 1967, OPR distributed 325,825 pieces of promotional material for use by clubs at sportsmen shows and for other activities.

Over the Report period, OPR personnel arranged for, prepared, or "planted" 12 major stories in national publications such as the "Club Woman," "Presbyterian Life," and the AP feature story, "Why Americans Shoot." This represents a "breakthrough" in NRA relations with previously unused media sources.

Of major significance during 1967 was a debate arranged by OPR between the NRA President Harold Glassen and Senator Joseph Tydings at the National Press Club in Washington. This marked the first time that a debate has been held in this news club, the largest in the United States. Several hundred newsmen were in attendance and press and TV coverage was heavy. Since that time, President Glassen and Senator Tydings have appeared on two television debates.

Speaking engagements, interviews and radio and television appearances were arranged for NRA Officers, Directors and personnel during 1967, and OPR staff members appeared before 73 civic and professional groups during the year. In addition, OPR personnel appeared on 13 different radio and television programs. Speaking engagements arranged for NRA Officers included such influential groups as the National Society of State Legislators and the American Dental Association.

Staff personnel from the Office of Public Relations attended 13 major conventions or meetings during 1967, including such important programs of the National Association of Sporting Goods Dealers, the Industrial Recreation Association, the Boy's Clubs of America, the National Sheriff's Association, the National Association of Counties, the American Association for Health, Recreation and Physical Fitness, the Outdoor Writers Association and others.

General

The NRA Office of Public Relations began 1967 with a staff of three public relations professionals and three clerical personnel. In September, a highly qualified news writer was added to the staff and a similarly qualified TV-radio man was added in October. In November, the name of the division was changed from the Office of Public Affairs to its present designation. Through the addition of the two staff members, the OPR has been able to cover more newsworthy events and arrange more appearances for NRA Officers and Directors.

Late in 1967, the OPR developed plans for organizing a volunteer public relations network from qualified NRA Life Members and

others selected by the OPR Director. Plans called for initiating the network early in 1968.

Over the past year, the majority of NRA's public service films were in the hands of members of the Infoplan field operation. It is not known how many showings these films received during the report period. However, films were being recovered in late 1967 for placement in TV distribution during 1968.

One of the most important aspects of a public relations program is the establishment cultivation and maintenance of favorable contacts in the various media and major national organizations. Over the past year OPR personnel have been successful in establishing such contacts, and it is through these that the NRA will be able to receive fair treatment from the media and reach the public with its story.

NRA field representatives

To promote the best interests of NRA, six NRA, Field Representatives were active in 1967. These men direct their efforts to promoting individual memberships and organizing new clubs. Special consideration is given to appearances before sportsmen's clubs, civic groups and other organizations for the purpose of creating a better understanding of the objects and purposes of NRA and to encourage support of its programs.

Their activities by days break down as follows for the entire year:

Legislation	182
Competitions	174
Training	76
Administration	327
Travel (contacts)	958
Meetings	257
Other	65
Total days	2,039

They attended and participated in 501 meetings during the year, with a total attendance of 41,065 people. They traveled 313,886 miles on 1,533 days while in travel status. All 50 of the states were visited, and 1,219 visits were made to cities and towns.

The types of contacts made break down as follows:

NRA Clubs	746
Law Enforcement Agencies	562
Sporting Goods Dealers	409
State Officials	403
Ranges	328
Press, Radio and TV	328
Directors, Council Members	274
Instructors	270
Sportsmen's Organizations	244
Referees	215
State Associations	200
Competitors	186
Fish and Game Departments	155
Non-NRA Clubs	141
Military Establishments	101
Parks and Recreation Departments	100
Gun Collector Associations	84
Civic Clubs	78
Colleges and Universities	73
All Other Contacts	721
Total	5,618

Grant Sanborn joined the Field Staff in February. Clem Theed retired at the end of May and was replaced by Merle Preble. Mary Driver also retired at the end of May and was replaced by Joe Peot.

[The 1966 report]

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1967.

To the Board of Directors:

The strength and influence of our Association is greater today than ever before in its history. Its financial condition is excellent, and the number of individual members continues to grow.

Progress is meeting the long-term objectives adopted by the Board of Directors in 1960, the NRA Centennial Plan, continues at a rapid pace. The original goal of 500,000 individual members was surpassed by the end of 1962. We now are "shooting for a million," with a total of 790,000 members at the end of 1966. Our plan to develop more shooting facilities has been highlighted by a project to research and develop a prototype outdoor "safety range." Our official journal, "The American Rifleman" has been enlarged and improved so that it is the most complete monthly publication on firearms and shooting available anywhere in the world. NRA activities with the greatest potential growth are being promoted, and new activities are being established to attract new supporters. We constantly are strengthening our relationships with organizations which will carry our program to the people, and our prestige in international shooting expands each year.

A careful study of the information presented in this report will show that the National Rifle Association has made great strides in the accomplishment of its mission. These results have been achieved with the wholehearted support and unselfish dedication of its officers, members and staff. Our success has been made possible because individuals in all parts of our land are willing to devote time and effort, without financial compensation, to help in the establishment of a comprehensive nationwide program to promote and conduct NRA activities in local communities. With continued enlightened guidance by our leadership and the enthusiastic support of our membership, we can look to the future with confidence in our ability to grow and to be of greater service to our members, to our communities and to our nation.

FRANKLIN L. ORTH,
Executive Vice President.
LOUIS F. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

One important function of the National Rifle Association which affects all gun owners in America is its activity in the field of firearms legislation. No other organization carries on such a continuous and successful effort to inform its members about proposed firearms legislation which would restrict the ownership and use of rifles, shotguns, or handguns. In the U.S. Congress and in the halls of state legislature, the NRA has come to be respected for its fairness, logic and wealth of information concerning firearms legislation.

The challenge to the right of reputable citizens to possess and enjoy firearms for legitimate purposes is assuming greater and more threatening proportions. This fact is attested to by the volume of anti-gun publicity in the communications media and the increasing number of firearms bills which find their way into the "hopper" every year. Some reasonable controls are to be expected, but vigilance is necessary to prevent discriminatory measures against legitimate ownership of firearms and safely-supervised shooting programs.

Through reporting machinery, legislation proposed at the federal and state levels usually can be discovered in time to inform NRA members when urgent action is required. Local legislation, however, may be enacted much more swiftly than national or state laws. Local communities must be alert and must act quickly and decisively, in a well-organized manner, to defeat such threats. Some communities have met the situation by means of a "watchdog" committee consisting of local NRA members and club representatives who are capable of quickly detecting restrictive measures and, as quickly, generating concerted, well-timed action.

Information to NRA members about firearms control proposals is supplied by three principal means: (1) The regular report, "What the Lawmakers Are Doing," in The American Rifleman; (2) NRA legislative bulletins and memoranda; (3) direct contacts by mail, telephone or telegram. During 1966 over 180 bills of interest to gun owners were introduced in 21 state legislatures and the U.S. Congress. Details about the more important proposals were published in 43 columns of the magazine, and 8 legislative bulletins were mailed to 91,754 members and clubs in 6 states. NRA members reacted promptly, firmly and in force. As a result, no severe legislation was enacted on the federal level; and only one significant control measure was enacted on the state level (New Jersey).

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

A total of 6 bills to regulate firearms in interstate and foreign commerce were introduced in the Congress (3 in the Senate and 3 in the House of Representatives) in 1966. No public hearings were held on any of these firearms bills. However, S. 3767, introduced by Senator Roman L. Hruska of Nebraska on August 25 was reported out of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in place of S. 1592, the Dodd bill. The Hruska Bill did not advance beyond that stage, and the second session of the 89th Congress adjourned without taking any additional action on any of the firearms bills.

Since its introduction in March 1965, the Dodd Bill has received nationwide publicity in all media. This bill was an outgrowth of, and reflected, the recommendations for firearms controls made by the President in his crime message to the Congress in March 1965. Extensive hearings were held on the Dodd proposal and other firearms bills in the Senate and House of Representatives in 1965. The NRA testified in both houses in strong opposition to the bills' general orientation and some specific provisions.

In another crime message to the Congress in March 1966, the President supported the Dodd Bill approach to the control of firearms in commerce. Shortly thereafter, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency (Chairman, Senator Dodd) approved S. 1592 with amendments by a vote of 6 to 3. On May 19, S. 1592, as amended, was reported to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

While the amended Dodd Bill did not contain several of the features objected to in public hearing, the "core" of this proposal remained the same. The bill still imposed a flat prohibition on the shipment or receipt of firearms by nonlicensed individuals in interstate or foreign commerce, and it still imposed rather vague and burdensome restrictions on the importation of firearms.

Repeated attempts by proponents of S. 1592 to have the Senate Judiciary Committee take favorable action on the bill from May to August failed. Consequently, the supporters of S. 1592, in a tactical move, decided on September 22 to report out an alternative bill, S. 3767, introduced by Senator Hruska on August 25. The Dodd Bill proponents did this "with the intention of substituting S. 1592 for S. 3767 once the bill came to a vote on the Senate floor." During the final week of the second session of the 89th Congress, 3 attempts to get the Hruska Bill to the floor for a vote failed. Finally on October 20, Senator Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, asked and received unanimous consent for the Hruska Bill to be referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce (Chairman, Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington). This was the situation when the Congress adjourned on October 22.

In addition to the Hruska Bill, other firearms bills introduced in the Congress in 1966 were: S. 3369, by Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona, and H.R. 14628, by Representative Robert L. F. Sikes of Florida, to prohibit any federally licensed manufacturer or dealer from shipping or transporting any firearm to any person in any state in violation of any law of such state; H.R. 16288, by Representative Ed Edmondson of Oklahoma, and H.R. 16359, by Representative James Kee of West

Virginia, to provide a mandatory penalty for the carrying or use of any firearm during the commission of any crime of violence; and S. 3868, by Senator Hruska, to place "destructive devices" under the tax and registration provisions of the National Firearms Act. These bills reflect the suggestions for legislation made by the NRA in its 3-part program set forth in the January 1966 American Rifleman.

STATE LEGISLATION

More than 170 bills were introduced at the state level. These proposals were concerned with firearms, ammunition, hunting and hunting safety, explosives and related matters.

The 1966 highlights: Maryland adopted a law to provide a 7-day waiting period for the purchase of a handgun and legislation to develop a statewide program of firearms safety. New Jersey has a new firearms law to provide, among other things, for a certificate of identity for the purchase of a rifle, shotgun or airgun, and for greater restrictions on the acquisition of firearms by certain classes of persons. In New York, the Governor vetoed (1) a bill to reduce the age for the possession and use of a firearm at a range from 12 to 11; (2) a bill to require that an applicant for a handgun license submit a certificate of his qualification to handle such firearm. In New York City a bill signed into law liberalizes the restrictions on the carrying of handguns in New York City by holders of a New York license issued other than in New York City. Of interest to Colorado Sportsmen was the enactment of a bill to empower the county commissioners to restrict the discharge of firearms in certain county areas.

Again in 1966, the Arizona Legislature adopted identical Senate-House resolutions against the passage of the Dodd Bill by the Congress.

Overall, shooter-sportsmen in several states, in addition to those mentioned above, were highly active in promoting the cause of reasonable firearms controls and opposing those contrary to the spirit of the right to possess and use firearms for lawful purposes.

LOCAL LEGISLATION

The NRA received many reports from members throughout the country on various kinds of proposed ordinances for their local jurisdictions. Of those reported to us, no seriously restrictive regulation was adopted by the local lawmaking body.

As a public service organization, the entire NRA Headquarters operation contributes to its public relations effort. However, the Office of Public Affairs carries out the basic public relations plan designed (1) to emphasize that shooting is safe; (2) to show that it is a form of recreation in which men, women, boys, and girls can easily participate; (3) to establish and promote civilian marksmanship training as essential to the national defense; (4) to identify shooting as an international sport; (5) to identify the NRA as the authority on guns and shooting; and (6) to increase the prestige of the National Rifle Association of America. NRA efforts in this broad field are divided into three general categories: (1) general publicity, including press, radio and television; (2) shows and exhibits; and (3) personal appearances and special contacts.

PUBLICITY

During 1966 the Office of Public Affairs arranged 55 press, radio and television interviews for NRA Officers, Directors and certain staff personnel. In addition, OPA arranged 23 speaking engagements for NRA Directors in the various states. The majority of the media interviews and appearances occurred during and immediately after the Austin incident in an effort to combat the unfavorable publicity the shooting sports received at that time.

In 1966 the Office of Public Affairs prepared and distributed radio safety spots to the nation's broadcasters. At the close of the year, 516 stations were broadcasting the spots on a regular basis. A total of 173 TV stations were telecasting the "Fess Parker" safety spot regularly. The "Tipper Flintlock" safety spots were used by 543 newspapers, and the Gary Anderson "Shooting Tips" strips were placed in 613 newspapers. New series of both items are in preparation for distribution in 1967. A 30-second color TV safety spot was prepared for distribution early in 1967.

The NRA Float in the 1966 Tournament of Roses Parade was entitled "Land of the Free, Home of the Brave" and featured the U.S. Capitol, cherry blossom trees, and Fess Parker portraying a frontiersman with his rifle.

During 1966 a total of 108,100 news releases were distributed. "Target, Woods and Gun Room" articles were used by 534 publications with 12,875 copies of the column being distributed. A total of 357,825 items of NRA material were mailed to clubs and individuals. Complete coverage, including press, radio and TV, was provided at the 1966 National Matches, the 1966 National Police Pistol Championships, the 1966 NRA International Shooting Championships and the 1966 World Shooting Championships.

The NRA Office of Public Affairs attended 13 conventions and made 76 personal appearances before civic groups. A total of 1,000 Press Kits were distributed. NRA officials and members of the staff keep in close contact with executives of national and state organizations with mutual interests and purposes by attending conventions and meetings.

[The 1965 report]

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 1966.

To the Board of Directors:

The strength and influence of our Association is greater today than ever before in its history. Its financial condition is excellent, and the number of individual members and affiliated organizations continues to grow.

Progress in meeting the long-term objectives adopted by the Board of Directors in 1960, the NRA Centennial Plan continues at a rapid pace. The original goal of 500,000 individual members was surpassed by the end of 1962. We now are "shooting for a million," with a total of 723,000 members at the end of 1965. Our plan to develop more shooting facilities has been highlighted by a project to research and develop a prototype outdoor "safety range." Our official journal The American Rifleman, has been enlarged and improved so that it is the finest publication on firearms and shooting available anywhere in the world. NRA activities with the greatest potential growth are being promoted, and new activities are being established to attract new supporters. We constantly are strengthening our relationships with organizations which will carry our program to the people, and our prestige in international shooting expands each year.

A careful study of the information presented in this report will show that the National Rifle Association has made great strides in the accomplishment of its mission. These results have been achieved with the wholehearted support and unselfish dedication of its officers, members and staff. Our success has been made possible because individuals in all parts of our land are willing to devote time and effort, without financial compensation, to help in the establishment of a comprehensive nationwide program to promote and conduct NRA activities in local communities. With continued enlightened guidance by our leadership and the enthusiastic support of our membership, we can look to the future with confidence in our ability to grow and to be of greater service to our members and to our nation.

FRANKLIN L. ORTH,
Executive Vice President.
LOUIS F. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

One important function of the National Rifle Association which affects all gun owners in America is its activity in the field of firearms legislative service. No other organization carries on such a continuous and successful effort to inform its members about proposed anti-gun laws which would restrict the ownership and use of shotgun, handgun and rifle alike. In the U.S. Congress and in the halls of state legislatures, the NRA has come to be respected for its fairness, logic and wealth of information concerning firearms legislation.

The challenge to the right of reputable citizens to possess and enjoy firearms for lawful purposes is assuming greater and more threatening proportions. This fact is attested to by the volume of anti-gun publicity in newspapers and magazines and the increasing number of firearms bills which find their way into the "bill basket" each year. Some reasonable controls are to be expected, but vigilance is necessary to prevent discriminatory measures against lawful ownership of firearms and safely-supervised shooting programs.

Through available reporting machinery, legislation proposed at the federal and state levels usually can be discovered in time to inform our members when effective action is deemed necessary. Local legislation, however, may be enacted much more swiftly than state or national laws. Members in a local community must be alert and must act quickly and decisively, in a well-organized manner, to defeat such threats. Some communities have met the situation by means of a "watchdog" committee consisting of local NRA members and club representatives who are capable of quickly detecting restrictive measures and as quickly generating concerted, well-timed action.

Information to NRA members about firearms control proposals is supplied by three principal means—(1) the regular report, "What the Lawmakers Are Doing," in The American Rifleman; (2) NRA legislative bulletins and memoranda; and (3) direct contacts by mail or wire. During 1965, 350 bills of concern to gun owners were introduced in 47 state legislatures and the U.S. Congress. Details about the more important ones were published in 99 columns of the magazine, and 28 legislative bulletins were mailed to 300,000 members and clubs in 14 states. NRA members reacted promptly, firmly, and in force. As a result, no severe legislation was enacted on the federal or state level.

A total of 35 bills to regulate firearms in interstate or foreign commerce were introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives during 1965. Public hearings were held on S. 1592 (Dodd Bill) by the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Public hearings also were held by the House Committee on Ways and Means on bills identical to S. 1592. The first session of the 89th Congress adjourned without taking any additional action on any of the firearms bills.

More than 350 firearms and related bills were introduced at the state level.

Several bills of interest to the sportsman were enacted in *California*. One bill exempts members of gun collector clubs from the requirement of a license to carry a handgun concealed while at or going to or returning from their meetings or activities. Another bill conforms the definition of a machine gun to that contained in the National Firearms Act. Another bill removes the difficulties that have arisen in the past concerning the old ten-shot definition of a machine gun in that state. In *Illinois*, a bill to require a license for the purchase and possession of a handgun was killed in the House. Efforts by the sportsmen to have enacted a law to impose a mandatory penalty for the commission of a crime when armed was vetoed by the Governor. In *Florida, Iowa* and *Massachusetts*, legislation was enacted clarifying controls governing the carrying of firearms.

South Carolina repealed an old and unwieldy statute against handguns and in its place enacted a realistic and reasonable law regulating the sale, transfer and possession of pistols. *New Hampshire* has a new law providing for a study leading to the future establishment of a state rifle range and park facilities. New hunter safety laws were enacted in *Maine* and *Wisconsin*. Significant is the number of state legislatures that adopted resolutions or memorials against the passage of restrictive federal firearms controls. They were *Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas, Vermont, Washington* and *Wisconsin*. Shooter-sportsmen in several states, in addition to those already mentioned specifically, were able to support reasonable and prevent ill-advised legislation.

As a public service organization, the entire NRA Headquarters operation contributes to its public relations effort. However, the Office of Public Affairs carries out the basic plan designed (1) to emphasize that shooting is safe; (2) to show that it is a form of recreation in which men, women, boys and girls can easily participate; (3) to establish civilian marksmanship training as essential to national defense; (4) to identify the NRA as the authority on guns and shooting; and (5) to increase the prestige of the National Rifle Association of America. NRA efforts in this broad field are divided into three general categories: (1) general publicity, including press, radio, and television; (2) shows and exhibits; and (3) special contacts by personal visits and by correspondence

In 1961 the NRA produced a motion picture film entitled "To Keep and Bear Arms"; in 1962 a film of Camp Perry entitled "Ready on the Firing Line" was finished; in 1963 a 15-minute picture of the ISU World Shooting Championships entitled "International Shooting" was completed; and in 1964 two safety films—"Sure as Shootin'," dealing with hunting safety, and "At Home with Guns," dealing with safety training—were produced. During 1965 a documentary motion picture, "There Oughta Be A Law," dealing with firearms legislation was produced. Also produced in 1965 for release in early 1966 is a motion picture, "Arms Of The Law," dealing with police marksmanship training.

Other special projects completed by our consultants, John E. Horton and James B. Deerin, were: (1) a shooting safety tip featuring Fess Parker as "Daniel Boone", (2) a TV hunter safety spot for all networks, (3) safety messages for 2,500 radio stations, (4) three "Tipper Flintlock" series provided to 8,000 newspapers, and (5) production of shooting tip strip featuring Gary Anderson for release in early 1966.

The NRA float in the 1965 Tournament of Roses was entitled "Let Freedom Ring" and featured the Liberty Bell, the American Flag, the Eagle and crossed rifles. It won the National Trophy Award.

During 1965 a total of 133,428 press releases were distributed. "Target, Woods and Gun Room" articles were used by 615 publications on a regular basis, with 17,520 copies of the column being distributed. A total of 153,721 items of NRA material were mailed to clubs and individuals, and 155,400 copies of "The Story Of NRA" were distributed. Complete coverage, press, radio and TV, was provided at the 1965 National Matches, the 1965 National Police Pistol Championships and the NRA International Championships.

NRA staff personnel manned exhibits at 8 large national conventions, and made 51 personal appearances before civic groups. A total of 750 Press Kits were distributed to journalists. NRA officials and members of the staff keep in close contact with executives of national and state organizations with mutual interests and purposes by attending conventions and meetings.

[The 1964 report]

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 1965.

To the Board of Directors:

The strength and influence of our Association is greater today than ever before in its history. Its financial condition is excellent, and the number of individual members and affiliated organizations continue to grow.

Progress in meeting the long-term objectives adopted by the Board of Directors in 1960, the NRA Centennial Plan, continues at a rapid pace. Already, the goal of 500,000 individual members has been surpassed, with an increase of 342,641 (105.4%) in the brief period of only five years, and we now are "shooting for a million." Our plan to develop more shooting facilities has been highlighted by a project to research and develop a prototype outdoor "safety range." Our official journal, The American Rifleman, has been enlarged and improved so that it is the finest publication on firearms and shooting available anywhere in the world. NRA activities with the greatest potential growth are being promoted, and new activities are being established to attract new supporters. We constantly are strengthening our relationships with organizations which will carry our program to the people, and our prestige in international shooting expands each year.

A careful study of the information presented in this report will show that the National Rifle Association has made great strides in the accomplishment of its mission. These results have been achieved with the wholehearted support and unselfish dedication of its officers, members and staff. Our success has been made possible because individuals in all parts of our land are willing to devote time and effort, without financial compensation, to help in the establishment of a comprehensive nationwide program to promtoe and conduct NRA activities in local communities. With continued enlightened guidance by our leadership and the enthusiastic support of our membership, we can look to the future with confidence in our ability to grow and to be of greater service to our members and to our nation.

FRANKLIN L. ORTH,
Executive Vice President.
LOUIS F. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

One important function of the National Rifle Association which affects all gun owners in America is its activity in the field of firearms legislative service. No other organization carries on such a continuous and successful effort to inform its members about proposed anti-gun laws which would restrict the ownership and use of shotgun, handgun and rifle alike. In the U.S. Congress and in the halls of state legislatures, the NRA has come to be respected for its fairness, logic and wealth of information concerning firearms legislation.

The challenge to the right of reputable citizens to possess and enjoy firearms for lawful purposes is assuming greater and more threatening proportions. This fact is attested to by the volume of anti-gun publicity in newspapers and magazines and the increasing number of firearms bills which find their way into the "bill basket" each year. Some reasonable controls in highly-populated areas are to be expected, but vigilance is necessary to prevent discriminatory measures against lawful ownership of firearms and safely-supervised shooting programs.

Through available reporting machinery, legislation proposed at the federal and state levels usually can be discovered in time to inform our members when effective action is deemed to be necessary. Local legislation, however, may be enacted much more swiftly than state or national laws. Members in a local community must be alert and must act quickly and decisively, in a well-organized manner, to defeat such threats. Some communities have met the situation by means of a "watchdog" committee consisting of local NRA members and club representatives who are capable of quickly detecting restrictive measures and as quickly generating concerted, well-timed action.

Information to NRA members about firearms control proposals is supplied by three principal means—(1) the regular report, "What the Lawmakers are Doing," in The American Rifleman; (2) NRA legislative bulletins and memoranda; and (3) direct contacts by mail or wire. During 1964, 210 bills of concern to gun owners were introduced in 27 state legislatures and the U.S. Congress. Details about the more important ones were published in 57 columns of the magazine, and 26 legislative bulletins were mailed to 141,000 members and clubs in 11 states. NRA members reacted promptly, firmly, and in force. As a result, no severe legislation was enacted.

Twenty-one bills to regulate firearms in interstate or foreign commerce were introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives since the introduction of the Dodd Bill in August 1963. No action was taken on the House bills, and the Senate Commerce Committee voted not to take any action during the 88th Congress. (Senator Dodd re-introduced his bill, with one minor addition, during the first week of the 89th Congress.)

A total of 189 firearms and related bills, a record number for an "off" year, were introduced at the state level. Numerous bills were drawn in an atmosphere of high emotion and sharp reaction not only to the assassination of the late President Kennedy but also to local tragedies. In a number of cases, the bills simply added control upon control with little thought given to the existing law and regulations. No seriously restrictive proposals were enacted.

Legislation was enacted in *Maryland* resulting in the appointment of a Governor's Committee to study the desirability of formulating a program for training in the safe handling of firearms; in *New York*, to allow, under certain conditions, a person holding a handgun license issued elsewhere in the State of New York to pass through New York City without first obtaining a similar City license in order to participate in registered pistol matches located elsewhere in the state; in *South Carolina*, to memorialize the U.S. Congress not to enact legislation which would limit the right of private citizens to purchase and possess firearms; in *Virginia*, to allow the use of handguns in the hunting of predatory or undesirable species of birds and animals, and a declaration by the General Assembly that no agency or political subdivision within the state would interfere with the right of law-abiding citizens to purchase, possess or use firearms for the purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, or other legitimate activities; in *Georgia*, to exclude bona fide collectors from the provisions of state law relating to the licensing of dealers; in *Massachusetts*, to allow an out-of-state person who is a U.S. resident and holds a permit to carry firearms in his state to carry a handgun in or through Massachusetts to attend a match or collectors meeting or exhibition; and in *Michigan*, to clarify certain provisions of state law relative to the sale, possession and use of handguns.

As a public service organization, the entire NRA Headquarters operation contributes to its public relations effort. However, the Office of Public Affairs carries out the basic plan designed (1) to emphasize that shooting is safe; (2) to show that it is a form of recreation in which men, women, boys and girls can easily participate; (3) to establish civilian marksmanship training as essential tc national defense; (4) to identify the NRA as the authority on guns and shooting; and (5) to increase the prestige of the National Rifle Association of America. NRA efforts in this broad field are divided into three general categories; (1) general publicity, including

press, radio, and television; (2) shows and exhibits; and (3) special contacts by personal visits and by correspondence.

In 1961 the NRA produced a motion picture film entitled "To Keep and Bear Arms"; in 1962, a film of Camp Perry entitled "Ready on the Firing Line" was finished; in 1963, a 15-minute picture of the ISU World Shooting Championships entitled "International Shooting" was completed; and in 1964, two safety films—"Sure as Shootin'," dealing with hunting safety, and "At Home with Guns," dealing with safety training—were produced. The two NRA movies, "To Keep and Bears Arms" and "Ready on the Firing Line," have been viewed by over 700,000 persons.

The special projects undertaken by our consultants, John E. Horton and James B. Deerin, included, in addition to producing the two motion pictures, the production and distribution of NRA Shooting Tips to 650 TV stations, assistance in filming the Olympic Shooting Team Tryouts for ABC-TV, preparation of the Tipper Flintlock safety messages for 5,200 newspapers and magazines, and development of the "Guns of America" feature for newspapers. In the radio field NRA "spot" safety announcements were used by 4,000 radio stations.

The NRA float in the January 1, 1964, Pasadena Tournament of Roses Parade featured a printing press actually producing copies of the Bill of Rights for distribution to the spectators.

During 1964 a total of 48,600 press releases and 4,582 photographs were distributed and important NRA announcements were carried by the nationwide wire services. The "Target, Woods and Gun Room" articles on NRA activities and programs are being carried by 498 newspapers, with 15,800 copies of this feature distributed during the year.

During the year a total of 160 NRA affiliated organizations participated in local exhibits with materials supplied by NRA Headquarters. NRA staff personnel manned exhibits at 8 large national conventions, and made 59 personal appearances before civic groups. A total of 157 Speech Kits were furnished to individuals, and 750 Press Kits were distributed to journalists. Members of the NRA staff, especially its elected officers, keep in close contact with executives of national and state organizations, with mutual interests and purposes, by attending conventions and meetings.

[The 1963 report]

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 1964.

To the Board of Directors:

Annually, the operating report affords an opportunity to review the progress of the National Rifle Association during the year. In this way, we can provide you with facts about its activities and bring to you, in words, pictures, and figures, something of what NRA is and report on its accomplishments.

The strength and influence of our Association is greater today than ever before in its history. Its financial condition is excellent, and the number of individual members and affiliated organizations continues to grow.

Progress in meeting the long-term objectives adopted by the Board of Directors in 1960, the NRA Centennial Plan, continues at a rapid pace. Already, the goal of 500,000 individual members has been surpassed, with an increase of 295,141 (90.8%) in the brief period of only four years. A more favorable public opinion for guns and shooting is being created as a result of our expanded public relations effort to emphasize the true value of NRA programs relating to all aspects of shooting, both as a sport and in support of the national defense. Our plan to develop more shooting facilities has been highlighted by the earmarking of $100,000.00 of the resources obtained from our building fund campaign to initiate a project to research and develop a prototype outdoor "safety range." Our official journal, the American Rifleman, has been enlarged and improved so that it is the finest publication on firearms and shooting available anywhere in the world. NRA activities with the greatest potential growth are being promoted, and new activities are being established to attract new supporters. We constantly are strengthening our relationships with organizations which will carry our program to the people, and our prestige in international shooting expands each year.

A careful study of the information presented in this report will show that the National Rifle Association has made great strides in the accomplishments of its mission. These results have been achieved with the wholehearted support and unselfish dedication of its members and staff. Our success has been made possible because individuals in all parts of our land are willing to devote time and effort, without financial compensation, to help in the establishment of a comprehensive nationwide program to promote and conduct NRA activities in local communities. With continued enlightened guidance by our leadership and the enthusiastic support of our membership, we can look to the future with confidence in our ability to grow and to be of greater service to our members and to our nation.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANKLIN L. ORTH,
Executive Vice President.
LOUIS F. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

LEGISLATIVE SERVICE

One important function of the National Rifle Association which affects all gun owners in America is its activity in the field of firearms legislative service. No other organization carries on such a continuous and successful effort to inform its members about proposed anti-gun laws which would restrict the ownership and use of shotgun, handgun and rifle alike. In the U.S. Congress and in the halls of state legislatures, the NRA has come to be respected for its fairness, logic and wealth of information concerning firearms legislation.

The challenge to the right of reputable citizens to possess and enjoy firearms for lawful purposes is assuming greater and more threatening proportions. This fact is attested to by the volume of anti-gun publicity in newspapers and magazines and the increasing number of firearms bills which find their way into the "bill basket" each year. Some reasonable controls in highly-populated areas are to be expected, but vigilance is necessary to prevent discriminatory measures against lawful ownership of firearms and safely-supervised shooting programs.

Through available reporting machinery, legislation proposed at the federal and state levels usually can be discovered in time to inform our members which effective action is deemed to be necessary. Local legislation, however, may be enacted much more swiftly than state or national laws. Members in a local community must be alert and must act quickly and decisively, in a well-organized manner, to defeat such threats. Some communities have met the situation by means of a "watchdog" committee consisting of local NRA members and club representatives who are capable of quickly detecting restrictive measures and as quickly generating concerted, well-timed action.

Information to NRA members about firearms control proposals is supplied by three principal means—(1) the regular report, "What the Lawmakers are Doing," in the American Rifleman; (2) NRA Legislative Bulletins; and (3) direct contacts by mail or wire. During 1963, 350 bills of concern to gun owners were introduced in state legislatures and 32 in the U.S. Congress. Details about the more important ones were published in 42 columns of the magazine, and 42 legislative bulletins were mailed to 320,000 members and clubs in 50 states. NRA members reacted promptly, firmly, and in force. As a result, none of the legislation deemed severe was enacted.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Before and after the assassination of President Kennedy in November, a total of 20 bills were introduced to restrict the interstate shipment of firearms obtained through mail-order channels. Seventeen bills were referred to the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means and one bill to the House Committee on Rules for possible future action. S. 1975, by Senator Thomas Dodd, was the subject of several open hearings by the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce. Through the efforts of the National Rifle Association, many restrictive features of this bill were removed and were substituted by several provisions aimed at limiting the accessibility of firearms to social undesirables and written in such a manner as not to infringe on the rights of shooter-sportsmen.

Of prime interest to the shooting fraternity was the enactment of Public Law 88-186, amending the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. Among its provisions is the amendment proposed by Senator Hickenlooper of Iowa and Congressman Sikes of Florida which reads as follows: "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by a Government Agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

STATE LEGISLATION

Bills concerning the registration of handguns were introduced in Maryland, Missouri, Ohio and Oklahoma. Various forms of firearms purchase controls were introduced in Connecticut, Georgia, Maryland, Missouri and Ohio. Convenience legislation or legislation providing a device to assist game-law enforcement officers to apprehend violators of fish and game statutes were introduced in Alabama, Indiana, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, Ohio and Vermont. Other bills dealt with prohibiting the discharge of firearms on Sunday; regulating or restricting the use of firearms by minors; sale of firearms and ammunition; and licensing of firearms dealers; to mention a few.

Legislation was enacted in *Connecticut* to permit members of rifle or gun clubs from out of state to participate in competitions without the necessity of having a Connecticut license to carry handguns, if such persons are so licensed in their home state; in *Montana* to allow children under 14 years of age to engage in supervised marksmanship programs; in *New York* to recodify those sections of the State Penal Code referred to as the Sullivan Law; and in *New Mexico* to eliminate the obsolete and undesirable provisions of the old State Firearms Law.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The public relations activities of our association continue to produce excellent results. The basic plan is (1) to emphasize that shooting is safe; (2) to show that it is a form of recreation in which men, women, boys and girls can easily participate; (3) to establish civilian marksmanship training as essential to national defense; (4) to identify the NRA as the authority on guns and shooting; and (5) to increase the prestige of the National Rifle Association of America. NRA efforts in this broad field are divided into three general categories: (1) general publicity, including press, radio, and television; (2) shows and exhibits; and (3) special contacts by personal visits and by correspondence.

Publicity

In 1961 the NRA engaged, as special consultants, John E. Horton and James B. Deerin for a special public service publicity campaign. The first major project was the production of a motion picture film entitled "To Keep and Bear Arms." The "Big Picture" TV program of the U.S. Army used this film at 350 stations in the United States and 44 stations overseas, and the 130 prints were made available to the public through Signal Corps libraries. Nine prints were delivered to the Army—Air Force Motion Picture Service for use at camps, bases and stations. "Ready on the Firing Line," a film of Camp Perry, was finished in 1962, and a 15-minute motion picture of the ISU World Shooting Championships at Cairo was completed in 1963. The two major films were viewed by over 470,000 persons during the year, and the Cairo film is being shown by the U.S. Army to all posts and stations.

Another project in this campaign includes firearms safety messages carried by a cartoon character, "Tipper Flintlock." In 1963, cartoon and copy features were produced and distributed to 15,000 outlets. A special hunting safety spot was distributed to TV and radio stations through the auspices of the Advertising Council as a public service activity. A new series, "Guns of America," consisting of 6 matted drawings of historic firearms, was distributed to 4,100 newspapers.

The NRA participated in the 1963 Tournament of Roses Parade in Pasadena, California, with a float depicting in theme "The Bill of Rights—Freedom to Keep and Bear Arms."

National news releases and photographs were distributed on major activities of NRA. Over 16,500 separate releases were issued covering new clubs, instructors and qualifications awards. Late in 1963, special articles on NRA activities and programs, under the heading of "Target, Woods and Gun Room," were offered to the nations newspapers. About 200 requests for this feature had been received at the year's end.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am delighted to observe that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], has introduced bills to strengthen the gun laws of the country. As he said, the passage of laws in and by itself will not cure an illness that besets the Nation today. I fully agree with his statement that the passage of laws alone will not achieve a restoration of law and order and the respect of the people of the world.

Our country is in a tragic plight. We do not know the source of our weakness or why, in the eyes of our own people and in the eyes of the people of the rest of the world, shame, in a measure, has fallen upon us.

In my judgment, if the problem is to be remedied, it will have to be through a coordination and a consolidation of efforts on the part of the people in public authority. First, government, especially the Government of the United States, must stop surrendering its authority to the lawless. The idea that by yielding to the masses, who deliberately precipitate disorder and who violate the law, we will in some manner influence them to perform their obligations as citizens, is fallacious. When we coddle those who defy Government and expect that through coddling them we will induce them to comply with the laws and eventually to perform their duties as citizens, we commit a grave wrong against the United States. The first place to begin to establish the idea that law and order must prevail, that the lawless shall not be permitted to take control, and that the innocent shall be protected is in the Government of the United States, especially in the Department of Justice.

Second, privately operated institutions should quit abdicating their authorities and responsibilities. They should not allow them to be taken over by groups which have become convinced that through anarchy and the willful precipitation of disorder they can achieve their objectives.

I have just observed while reading the New York Times, a picture which I suppose was taken at Columbia University. It is a picture of a long-haired student seated on a windowsill, with his legs hanging down the wall. He is showing the "V" sign of victory. The title of the article is "Willful Disorder Achieves Its Objective." Conduct of that type, accepted by those in authority, is an example for all who believe in violence to follow that type of conduct and to be convinced that it will achieve the objectives of those who do not believe in compliance with the law, or who are convinced that by the creation of mass disorder they will get what they want.

Third, I regretfully say that our courts have forgotten the innocent man. They are concerned only with what is supposed to be the unlimited and perfect protection of the criminal.

Mr. President, I was admitted to the bar in 1921. I am familiar with the principle of our Government that every man is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Our forefathers, when they wrote the Constitution and adopted the Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence, wanted the strong arm of the government, with all of its power, not to be used brutally to club down the citizenry of the Nation. Therefore, they wrote into the Constitution ample provisions that will protect the individual charged with crime, but at the same time will enable the Government to perform its functions.

Mr. President, those provisions written into the Constitution have now been interpreted by the courts far beyond what the language of the Constitution justifies and far beyond what the writers of the Constitution had in mind when that document was written.

Yes, let us pass gun laws.

Let us firm up the provisions of the laws dealing with crimes. But, Mr. President, the first avenue to move into is to quit coddling those who defy our Government. Yielding to them must be stopped. Yielding is the worst sin that we can possibly commit. When we yield, we merely give encouragement to further defiance of Government.

I never believed I would see the day when the lawless are in command and the innocent must be subservient to the demands of the lawless. If it were within my power, the first thing I would do would be to demonstrate that the U.S. Government will quit coddling those who deliberately perpetrate disorders, and will quit coddling those who are convinced that the Government will do nothing about their transgressions.

The central office is the executive branch of the Government. The creation of commissions to make studies will do nothing to solve the problem. Study after study has been made; and some of the studies have deliberately exculpated the wrongdoers.

The No. 1 place to begin is in the executive branch of the Government, next in the executive branch of each State, and then in the offices of the trustees who have charge of our universities. They should stand up and say, "We will not yield. We will not surrender our buildings; we will remain in command of them."

I commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] upon the introduction of his bills. However, although laws well may be of help, there must first of all be a reformation of the consciences and of the thinking of the people, and that can begin only by setting the example in Washington and throughout the offices of those in authority.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am joining today in cosponsoring legislation to provide for mandatory Federal registration of all firearms—pistols, rifles, and shotguns.

If we are ever to bring a halt to the gun madness which has seized this country, we must have an effective nationwide system of gun registration. Banning mail-order sales, which was provided for in the administration bill introduced last year, which I cosponsored, is not enough. And a ban on such sales which excludes long guns—which is what the bill passed by the House and Senate this year does—is so weak as to be virtually a deception. Registration is the key. We must have it, and we must have it now.

There is no other civilized, industrialized nation in the world which is as lax as this country in regulating the acquisition and possession of firearms. Virtually all of them require firearms registration as a minimal measure is protecting the public safety; many have far more severe restrictions.

We must get over the childish notion that possession and use of a gun is either a testimonial of our manliness or a guarantee of our freedom. As the tragic events of the past several years have shown guns are the agents by which free democratic institutions are destroyed, not preserved. What good is a free ballot worth, when a bullet can cancel out its effect in a single second?

Registration is a sane and sensible answer. No one would argue that he has a "right" to possess an unregistered automobile. What "right" can there be to possess an unregistered gun?

It is time for America to get a grip on itself. It is time for the Congress to grow up, to shrug off the noisy protests of the gun lobby and listen to the rising murmurs of the great mass of the American people, and to pass this gun registration bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, no one has been a stronger supporter of decent gun legislation than the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Without his help, we would not have gotten as far

as we have gotten. I wish we had more help of this kind. The Senator has a clear view of what the matter is all about and he has very ably expressed it. I wish to thank the Senator publicly for his help, and that clarity with which he has expressed himself on this matter.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his kind words. We would not have any gun legislation at all, even the mildly innocuous measure we finally succeeded in passing in the Senate a few weeks ago, if it had not been for the Senator from Connecticut. Actually it is his bill I am cosponsoring, which provides for registration. Again, I wish to congratulate the Senator for the leadership he has shown in this regard.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

CONGRESS OF INDIANS NOT SUPPORTING POOR MARCH

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, much has been made of the inclusion of American Indians in the poor march in Washington. Actually the plight of the American Indian is by and large one of the foremost examples of what can happen when a segment of the population becomes substantially dependent upon the Government for its sustenance. I think those who are demanding to be dangled in the lap of Government should take a good look at the guarantees the U.S. Government has offered to the American Indians and how the Government has not lived up to those agreements. They will see that Government has neither the will nor the ability to take care of individual wants and needs.

What I wish to point out is that the Indians have some very real grievances. They are in the nature of broken treaties and misadministration of programs designed to assist the Indians. I know something about this problem, since there are more Indians in my State of Arizona than in any other. Presently I serve on the Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and we are very much aware of these problems and are seeking satisfactory solutions to them. The late beloved Senator from New York, Mr. Kennedy, was chairman of that subcommittee, and I know that he shared a deep concern for these difficulties.

It should be noted that the National Congress of American Indians, one of the most outstanding organizations interested in the affairs of Indians, has voiced its opposition to the poor march in Washington and has courageously pointed out that without definite realistic and achievable goals there can be little hope of success. The NCAI has wisely called for a restatement of the long-range collective goals of the Indians, presented in an orderly and proper way to the various branches of Government.

Mr. President, it is high time that we took more notice of, and thereby encouraged, those who recognize the proper and effective way of presenting petitions to Congress. We cannot have progress unless we have order. If we are to "selectively disobey" those laws which we do not like, then we should put a plainer label on our action and call it by its proper name of "anarchy" or "nihilism."

Mr. President, I commend the action of the NCAI in its plans to be responsible and reasonable in presenting the case for the Indians to the Congress and ask that a statement issued by the NCAI on June 3, and a list of the supporters of that statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the National Congress of American Indians, June 3, 1968]

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS CALLS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

President Wendell Chino of the National Congress of American Indians has called an emergency session of the NCAI Executive Committee June 6–8, 1968, at the Albuquerque Indian School, Albuquerque, New Mexico to formulate position papers on various social and economic issues now being aired by the Indian participants in the Poor Peoples Campaign in Washington, D.C.

According to John Belindo, Executive Director of NCAI, the real issues of unemployment, education, housing, and hunting and fishing rights now being raised in Washington are being clouded by the emotional appeals and accusations of some of the individual Marchers. To offset the arguments being posed by this group, the NCAI wishes to present its ideas and recommendations—in the form of a long-term program of economic development—to various Departments of the Government.

Because of the size and diversity of its membership—some 105 major American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Villages—the NCAI feels that it represents the collective interests of the Indian Community more so than any other organization and must therefore, pursue policies which are oriented to answer the wants of the majority on occasions where such wants may be at cross purposes with the desire of individual segments.

In a statement on the Poor Peoples Campaign issued May 31, the NCAI refused to give official endorsement of the March because of the lack of any unanimous conviction among its membership that the March as it is presently conceived can produce satisfactory results before the thresholds of frustration of its participants have been exceeded.

According to the statememnt, "There is no defined criteria as to what a satisfactory program would be, hence, what achieved goals will terminate the March. Even if Congress knew exactly what legislative measures the marchers deem necessary, and if Congress were completely cooperative and sympathetically inclined to pass this legislation, it is doubtful that the mechanics of legislative procedure would grind out a program that would produce visible results in a short enough time period to satisfy the Marchers."

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS—TRIBAL LIST

ALASKA

Alaska Federation of Natives.
Alaska Native Brotherhood.
Cook Inlet Native Association.
Metlakatla Indian Community.

ARIZONA

Colorado River Tribe.
Fort Yuma.
Gila River Pima-Maricopa.
Hualapai.
Papago.
Salt River Pima-Maricopa.
San Carlos Apache.
White Mountain Apache.
Yavapai-Camp Verde.

CALIFORNIA

Covelo Indian Community.
Fort Mojave.
Hoopa Valley.
Round Valley.

COLORADO

Southern Ute.
Ute Mountain.

IDAHO

Coeur d'Alene.
Kalispel.
Kootenai Tribe.
Nez Perce.
Shoshone-Bannock.

MICHIGAN

Keweenaw Bay Indian Community.

MINNESOTA

Grand Portage Chippewa.
Minnesota Chippewa.
Red Lake Chippewa.

MONTANA

Blackfeet.
Chippewa Cree Tribe.
Confederated Salish & Kootenai.
Crow.
Fort Belknap Community Council.
Fort Peck.
Northern Cheyenne.

NEBRASKA

Omaha.
Winnebago.

NEVADA

Duckwater Shoshone.
Fort McDermitt Paiute.
Pyramid Lake Paiute.
Western Shoshone-Paiute.
Walker River Paiute.

NEW MEXICO

All Indian Pueblo Council: Acoma Pueblo, Cochiti Pueblo, Isleta Pueblo, Jemez Pueblo, Laguna Pueblo, Nambe Pueblo, Picuris Pueblo, Pojoaque Puelbo, Sandia Pueblo, San Felipe Pueblo, San Ildefonso Pueblo, San Juan Pueblo, Santa Ana Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santo Domingo Peublo, Taos Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, Zia Pueblo, Zuni Pueblo.
Mescalero Apache.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fort Totten Sioux.
Standing Rock Sioux.
Three Affiliated Tribes.

OKLAHOMA

Absentee Delaware.
Cheyenne & Arapaho.
Cherokee Nation.
Chickasaw.
Choctaw.
Creek Tribe.
Miami Tribe.
Osage.
Otoe-Missouri.
Quapaw.
Sac & Fox.

OREGON

Klamath
Umatilla Tribe.
Warm Springs.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Cheyenne River Sioux.
Crow Creek Sioux.
Flandreau Sioux.
Lower Brule Sioux.
Oglala Sioux.
Rosebud Sioux.
Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux.
Yankton Sioux.

WASHINGTON

Chehalis.
Cowlitz.
Kalispel
Lummi.
Makah.
Muckleshoot.
Nisqually Community Council.
Port Madison.
Quinault.
Snohomish.

Spokane.
Squaxin Island.
Swinomish.
Tulalip.
Yakima.

WISCONSIN

Forest County Potawatomi
Lac Courte Oreilles.
Lac du Flambeau Chippewa.
Oneida.
St. Croix Chippewa.
Stockbridge-Munsee.
Winnebago.

UTAH

Uintah & Ouray.
Ute.

POLITICAL ASSASSINATIONS AND GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Amitai Etzioni, a professor of sociology at Columbia University, has written an extremely interesting article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post in the Outlook section.

Professor Etzioni theorized that the five political assassinations in the last 5 years mean that there will be still more assassinations and attempted assassinations of American political leaders in the next several years.

Professor Etzioni pointed out that—

> Studies of patterns of violence indicate that once an outbreak occurs it tends to repeat itself at other places and times at an accelerating pace until the wave runs its course.

This expert sociologist writes that there is only one thing which can be done immediately to arrest this trend, and that is: "Congressional approval of comprehensive gun control legislation."

In support of this statement Professor Etzioni writes:

> Most experts on the subject agree that while political assassinations could not be completely eliminated, their number could be greatly reduced if this country had firearms' restrictions similar to those in Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Israel, and most other democracies.

Professor Etzioni points out that most assassins obtain their weapons shortly before they use them, when they are already in an agitated state of mind—this applies to 81 percent of all killings.

Thus we see why there are almost no political assassinations and far fewer homicides in other countries, since we know that so many other countries require a permit to own a gun and in addition, require a cooling off period before purchasing a firearm.

It is time for this Congress to wake-up and enact some strict and truly meaningful firearms control in addition to the modest measure recently passed by Congress so that we might curb this dreadful tendency toward political assassination and homicides in general.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Etzioni's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLITICAL ASSASSINS ARE NOT FINISHED

(By Amital Etzioni, professor of sociology at Columbia University)

There will be more assassinations, and attempted assassinations, of American political leaders in the next several years. Studies of the patterns of violence indicate that on an outbreak occurs, it tends to repeat itself at other places and times at an accelerating pace until the wave runs it course.

This holds for slum riots, which have been increasing rapidly ever since Watts, and for student rebellions, whose rate has been escalating since Berkeley. It also holds for political assassinations, beginning with the murder of John F. Kennedy in 1963.

While attention has been focused on the assassinations of two of the greatest white and black Americans of this generation, John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr., other political leaders of very different persuasions and stature have also been killed, reinforcing the pattern. These include Malcolm X and George Lincoln Rockwell of the American Nazi Party.

THE REAL TRIGGER

Unfortunately, there is no way known to social science to stop this wave. There has been much talk of the sick society, of the need to reduce violence in general, to overcome hate, to unite the country. While all these goals are, of course, worthy, the tragic truth must be faced: political assassinations are linked only indirectly to the general state of the Nation.

They are usually done by mentally unstable individuals who, while they are egged on by a national climate that fosters hate and violence, are more directly triggered by earlier killings that set the pattern. (As they mull over them, they rehearse their own acts.)

It must also be noted that the many causes of aggression and tensions in our lives cannot be readily eliminated. Such measures as full justice for black Americans, peace in Vietnam, a reconciliation between youth and the older generation will probably be realized only gradually.

THE UBIQUITOUS GUN

There is one thing that could be done much more rapidly: congressional approval of comprehensive gun-control legislation. Most experts on the subject agree that while political assassinations could not be completely eliminated, their number could be greatly reduced if this country had firearms restrictions similar to those in Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Israel and most other democracies.

First of all, most assassins obtain their weapons only shortly before they use them, when they are already in an agitated state of mind. (Eighty-one per cent of all killings may be classed as impulsive and not premeditated). One reason why there are almost no political killings and far fewer homicides in general in the other democracies (0.11 per 100,000 in Sweden and 0.05 in Britain as compared to 2.7 in the United States) is that they require a "cooling off" period if a gun can be bought at all. That is, a person has to get a permit before he can buy a gun, explain why he needs it and, if approved, wait a few days before he obtains it.

ALTERNATIVE INEFFICIENT

It is true, of course, that even a sharp reduction in the number of firearms in the United States would not stop all assassinations; Molotov cocktails and knives would still be available. But such weapons are much more difficult to wield, rarely cause multiple fatalities, often wound rather than kill and can be warded off by one or two bodyguards.

So effective gun curbs are needed, yet none of the more than 60 bills introduced since John F. Kennedy's assassination has reached the floor. (The gun control clause in the bill finally passed last week simply prohibits mail order sales of hand guns and other over-the-counter sale to minors, insane persons and convicted felons.)

A MIGHTY MINORITY

A Harris survey in October found that 71 per cent of Americans wanted tight Federal control of firearms sales. The White House and much of the press support this position. It is opposed, however, by one of the most powerful lobbies in American history, spearheaded by the National Rifle Association and backed by many gun collectors, sportsmen and superpatriots.

The supporters of gun legislation have so far moved "incrementally," that is, suggesting a few small steps at a time, apparently in the hope of not provoking the gun lobby. What is needed, however, is a comprehensive gun permit measure aimed at reducing sharply the number of firearms in private hands.

It may be said that it is politically naive to hope for such a result, but only when the level of arms held privately in the United States reaches a level similar to that of the other democracies will our homicides rate drop to theirs and political assassinations be as rare here as they are in Western Europe.

PICKETS IN FRONT OF SENATOR BYRD'S HOME, OPPOSITION TO INCREASED OIL IMPORTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a transcript of questions which were asked me during a TV interview which was filmed on June 4, 1968, and with my answers thereto.

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

TEXT OF SENATOR BYRD'S TELEVISION INTERVIEW JUNE 4, 1968

Q. Senator Byrd, would you explain what happened when the poor people from West Virginia demonstrated in front of your home a few days ago?

A. Well, not all of the persons who demonstrated were from West Virginia, not all of them were poor people. They were discourteous to my wife, and I do not mean to imply that all of them participated in this discourtesy, but she tried to explain to them that I was at the office and that I would be glad to meet with them at the office and that they should go to the office.

After all a man's home is for his privacy and that of his family and it is certainly not a fitting place to discuss Senatorial business with a group of 150–200 people.

My wife offered even to set up an appointment for the group but they did not want this. They were rude to the point of being insolent. They yelled and shouted, and in my judgment this kind of conduct is disgraceful. It can get them nowhere and I believe that the poor people of West Virginia would be ashamed of this kind of conduct.

Q: What was the nature of their demands?

A: Well, for the most part their demands were vague and spurious and utterly irrelevant to the problems of poor people.

For example, one of the demands was that I stop my opposition to home rule for the District of Columbia. Now what does this have to do with the poor people of West Virginia?

And another demand was that I initiate legislation to prevent the wealth from leaving West Virginia and Appalachia. Well, this is utterly fantastic. The Congress couldn't do this if it wanted to do it. What would we do with our coal? Would we sell it to ourselves? Would we stop exporting coal to foreign countries? Would we stop selling it along the eastern seaboard and close down the mines?

In my judgment, the persons or the group that formulated these petitions that were addressed to me certainly lacked knowledge, or entirely disregarded the knowledge, of the true facts concerning my public record. It appears to be an attempt to make the poor people of West Virginia think that I am

their enemy and they know better than this. They know that I have been their friend. My record will prove that I am a friend of the poor people and I intend to continue being their friend.

Q: What effect do these demonstrations have on you and what effect do you think they'll have on the Congress?

A: Well I do not intend to be intimidated by those who attempt to threaten and abuse me. I intend to continue to do as I have done in the past and that is to be fair and just and to reach my decisions based on the facts rather than on fear.

When it gets to the point in this country where public officials are afraid to speak and act and exercise their own good judgment and when legislation becomes the product of mob demands rather than the product of orderly legislative processes, then our Republic is going to fall, and I do not intend to be an accomplice to its destruction.

Q: Senator Byrd, will you explain why you oppose the Interior Department's proposal to allow greater imports of fuel oil from abroad as a means of combating air pollution?

A: Well, in the first place it will hurt West Virginia because it will give foreign oil an opportunity to make further cuts into the markets for coal.

It will also injure the domestic oil industry. I also oppose it because research in connection with the problems of air pollution by sulphur oxides and their relation to human health is not complete. The mining industry, which would be hurt, is itself conducting research into these problems and I think we should conduct more research.

In the opinion of many experts some of the so-called air pollution regulations and standards that have been set are unrealistic. I think in the first place we ought to conduct research to show that indeed these sulphur oxides are harmful to human health and then the research ought to point the way to solve the problem.

JOINT MEMORIALS PASSED BY 1968 SPECIAL SESSION OF NEW MEXICO STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following Senate joint memorials passed by the 1968 special session of the New Mexico State Legislature:

Senate Joint Memorial 1, requesting the President of the United States to proclaim certain portions of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad a national monument.

Senate Joint Memorial 2, pertaining to Federal participation in welfare payments to nonresidents.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

A joint memorial requesting the President of the United States to proclaim certain portions of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad a national monument

Whereas, the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company has made application to the Interstate Commerce Commission to abandon its narrow gauge line between Alamosa, Colorado and Durango, Colorado; and

Whereas, in the event of such abandonment of this line and discontinuance of its operation, there will pass forever from the American scene the last tangible link between Southern Colorado and Northern New Mexico of a great historical era served by the men of strength and character who built, fired and braked this little train since the turn of the century; and

Whereas, this famous line of narrow-gauge Rocky Mountain railroad is an object of great scientific interest to industrial archaeology and to the economic historians of this nation, as well as to the citizens of this country, both young and old, in that it is one of the few remaining operational, narrow-gauge, coal-fired steam railroads extant in this country, and in that it played an indispensable role in the economic development of Northern New Mexico and Southern Colorado; and

Whereas, this historic railroad traverses some of the most staggeringly beautiful country in the United States, largely inaccessible to motorists, its narrow tracks laboriously climbing over the awesome 10,000 foot-high Cumbres Pass and winding down through the enchanting country of the Chama and the Jicarilla-Apache Indians finally terminating in historic old Durango; and

Whereas, its preservation and continued operation on a seasonal or otherwise limited basis as a scientific, historic and recreational attraction would be a most fitting and appropriate national monument, accuring to the lasting benefit of generations of yet unborn Americans;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that the President of the United States be respectfully requested to declare by public proclamation that portion of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad running from Alamosa, Colorado through Cumbres Pass, the Chama Country to Durango, Colorado as a National Monument of the United States of America to be preserved and operated on a limited basis for the benefit of the American People; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this memorial be sent to the President and to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, and to each member of the New Mexico and Colorado Congressional Delegations.

Signed and Sealed at The Capitol, in the City of Santa Fe.

E. LEE FRANCIS,
New Mexico Senate.
BRUCE KING,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

A joint memorial pertaining to Federal participation in welfare payments to nonresidents

Whereas, the Federal Social Security Act since its enactment in 1935 has permitted the various states to impose reasonable residence requirements for eligibility to the various public assistance programs whose costs are partly paid by federal funds; and

Whereas, the Federal Social Security Act so provides at the present time with New Mexico having consistently required a reasonable continued residence as an eligibility factor for permanent public assistance payments; and

Whereas, a federal court in California and in federal courts in many other states in the nation have declared the unconstitutionality of such residence requirements alleging that they contravene the "equal protection of the law" guarantee of the Federal Constitution and that they unduly restrict the freedom of Americans to travel at will within the country; and

Whereas, if this new judicial theory is upheld by the United States Supreme Court, state costs of public assistance in New Mexico will be tremendously and permanently increased;

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to amend the Federal Social Security Act at once so as to provide full federal financing of public assistance payments made to recipients who do not meet the length of residence requirements presently permitted by federal statute and contained in the welfare laws of this state and applicable statutes in other states, such federal financing to continue in each case only until the existing length of residence requirements have been met by each recipient;

Be it further Resolved that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from New Mexico in the Congress of the United States.

Signed and sealed at The Capitol, in the City of Santa Fe.

E. LEE FRANCIS,
President, New Mexico Senate.
BRUCE KING,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION BY KANSAS BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the strength and the stability of the Kansas economy is in no small measure the result of the wisdom and integrity of the Kansas bankers.

Their knowledge of our local business needs enables them to provide the complete range of banking facilities to the citizens of Kansas. But their understanding of national monetary and fiscal requirements is in like manner complete and responsible. As testimony to this fact, I refer to a resolution of the Kansas Bankers Association which was unanimously adopted on May 16, 1968, at their annual convention in Kansas City, Kans.

This resolution calls for a reduction in the Federal budget by at least $6 to $8 billion and an increase in income taxes as much as 10 percent surcharge as requested by the President. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, recent events have illuminated a worldwide diminution of confidence in the dollar as an exchange currency; and such a lack of confidence imperils the stability of the international monetary system; and

Whereas, speculative attacks on the Free World's gold supply have necessitated establishment of a two-price market for gold which will function as a temporarily effective deterrent to dangerous speculation; and

Whereas, we agree with the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that the Free World is confronted with a financial crisis unless this nation takes prompt and effective steps to cut back the huge federal deficit and to increase taxes;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That members of the Kansas Bankers Association, both individually and in concert, do call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to reduce the federal budget by at least $6 to $8 billion and increase incomes taxes at least as much at the 10 per cent surcharge requested by the President; and to make a concerted effort to balance the budget.

And be it further resolved, That officers of this association be directed to communicate this policy to the President and the Congress; and that all members of this Association, in their individual capacities, are urged to do the same.

(Certified to be a true copy of a resolution adopted unanimously on May 16, 1968, by the Kansas Bankers Association in annual convention at Kansas City, Kans.)

CARL A. BOWMAN,
Executive Secretary,
Kansas Bankers Association.

"HAVE OUR RIGHTS BEEN ABUSED?—A KENNAN VIEW"—ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Colonial Williamsburg celebrates each year, from May to July, a Prelude to Independence Period, which commemorates the activity in Virginia which led to the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. This year's address was delivered by George F. Kennan, diplomat, historian, educator, and Pulitzer Prize winning author. Mr. Kennan devoted his address to an examination of some things that are going on in this country which now disturb him.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address, entitled "Have Our Rights Been Abused? A Kennan View," which was published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 9, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HAVE OUR RIGHTS BEEN ABUSED?—A KENNAN VIEW

One would so like to be able to feel that the political principles laid down here 192 years ago were still the secure anchor of our civilization—that we could still confidently use them as points of reference and orientation in the treatment of our great contemporary problems—that the attachment of our people to them was still firm and unshakeable.

And yet, when one let one's thoughts roam beyond these pleasant and beautiful precincts—to the great troubled America of 1968 that lies outside, the contrast between this early model and the reality of American life today is so tremendous that one is oppressed by all sort of doubts and questions. One is constrained to raise, in particular, the painful question as to whether the principles by which these men lived, and which they embodied in the Virginia Bill of Rights and Constitution, were really ones of universal validity, as they hoped, or whether these principles presupposed, for their effectiveness, the acceptance of a very specific cultural and ethical and even religious heritage—and not just the detached intellectual acceptance of it, as one might accept a new and strange thought, but a species of actual membership in it, of being a part of it, by virtue of birth and breeding, by the spirit and the discipline of the home.

We of subsequent American generations have obviously proceeded on the basis of the first of these propositions. We have assumed that these principles were ones of an inmate universal validity—that they required no special cultural or religious inheritance to become truly effective as guides for the political conduct of a society. We have shown no hesitation, over these intervening years, in throwing our country open to the immigration of great masses of people reared in quite different climates of political and ethical principle. We have done this in the confidence that our traditions were so sound, so universal in their validity, and the institutions flowing from them of such strength, that we could easily afford this liberality. The spirit of the Virginia Bill of Rights was expected to spread through some inherent power of its own to all who set foot on these shores and proceeded to make their home here, regardless of whether these people had any share in the cultural and philosophic soil out of which these traditions and institutions had grown.

MIGHT BE A LIMIT

And it is not, incidentally, just in relation to the development of our society as a whole that we have been guided by this lighthearted faith in the assimilative powers of our national tradition. It has often struck me that we have manifested the same confidence in our attitude to the development of our major cities. It has seemingly never occurred to us that these great urban areas, the nerve centers of our civilization, the gathering and distributing points of our cultural and administrative and economic strength, might also be limited in their capacity for the assimilation of people to whom their traditions and arrangements of self-government were strange.

Without a qualm we permitted, in the early decades of this century, the entire residential patterns and community structure of our great cities to be disrupted and disintegrated, the central districts to be blighted and to be drained of people of education and influence and responsibility—all of this as a result primarily of the sudden switch to the private automobile as the prevailing mode of transportation; and then, with an equal absence of qualm, we permitted these blighted central districts to be colonized by huge masses of impoverished and poorly-educated people from remote rural environments—people largely devoid of understanding for the institutions of urban self-government by which they were now supposed to be living—and people for whom, in the districts to which they were being permitted to move, there were obviously no adequate prospects of employment and no adequate residential, educational or cultural facilities. Never, but literally never—down to the present day, never—does it seem to have occurred to us that perhaps there were limits to the absorbent capacity of our great urban communities, and that perhaps it was the business of governmental authority to see that these limits were not over-stepped.

Please do not misunderstand me. In mentioning this extravagant faith we have shown in the assimilative qualities of our political tradition, I am not meaning to draw any value judgments. I know of no absolutes in the quality of human beings anywhere. I do not believe in the inferiority or the superiority of any racial or ethnic or national group anywhere in the world. But people can be different,without being inferior; and differences can be important; and it is this that we, I think, tend to ignore.

OVER-WORKING SUCCESS

I do not mean to disparage or depreciate the progress actually made over the decades in the way of assimilation of our tradition by people to whom it was not native. On the contrary, what has been accomplished in this respect, it seems to me to have been little short of miraculous. And in many instances, I know, the spirit of the Virginia Bill of Rights and Constitution has been better understood, more highly valued, and more reverently cultivated, by persons born outside the English-speaking world than it has by many whose ancestors were among the heirs to the British cultural and political tradition. But one of our national failings, it seems to me, is a tendency to overwork success of any kind; and in this instance, too, to say that we have accomplished much does not preclude the possibility that we have attempted to accomplish too much.

I am well aware, of course, that if there has been a serious dilution of the ideological inspiration that flowed from this colonial capital nearly two hundred years ago, it has been a dilution that has taken place partly within the souls and minds of those of us who belong to the old-American element. We have taken the enduring power of this inspiration for granted with regard to ourselves as well as to others. We have shown little recognition of the need for preserving and cultivating it even in the rules and habits of our own lives; in the cultivation of religious faith; in the rearing of our children; in the structuring of our communities. If these ideals have been betrayed, the betrayal is certainly one that has taken place partly within ourselves.

My point, therefore, is neither that there has been no assimilation at all, nor that the weakening of understanding for the founding principles of our society is something that has come only by the reckless admission of unassimilated elements to our midst. My point is simply that we have played fast and loose generally with our national tradition, taking very little care to see that its philosophic and ethical foundations were adequately communicated to the millions of strangers admitted to our body politic, taking equally little pains to see that these foundations retained their vitality in our own habits and outlooks. And the result is that we have today a society that has come a long way indeed—an alarmingly long way—from what those Virginia forefathers thought they were creating in the way of a body politic when they drafted their memorable documents, a society in which the endurance and validity of the things they cared for is now very gravely jeopardized.

THE DISORDERS

You all know what I have in mind when I use these strong words.

I doubt that there can be any of us present whose senses have not been repeatedly sickened over these recent months by the spectacle of angry, disorderly people: milling about, screaming, shouting other people down, brawling with the police or with equally violent opponents, obstructing other people in their normal pursuits—and all this ostensibly in the effort to achieve one objective or another not by the devices of persuasion, not through the orderly processes of appointed authority and procedure, but through the devices of intimidation and blackmail? It will be clear to all of us that this style of political action, far from having anything to do with that "firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue" which the Virginia Bill of Rights demanded, is in the most direct and flagrant conflict with the whole spirit of that document. It represents a frame of mind that can lead, if the entire previous experience of mankind is to be credited, only to demagoguery and dictatorship. I'm thinking here of the antecedents of the Russian Revolution, which over the years, I've had occasion to study.

The predilection for this style of political action, while by no means restricted to these two groups alone, has been particularly marked, as we all know, in two sectors of our society where we can least afford to tolerate a lack of respect and understanding for our traditions: namely, in the urban Negro communities whose collaboration is going to be essential if our great cities are to retain their vitality, and among the student population of our great urban universities—among people, that is, on whose intellectual and civic capacities our national future is going to depend in the most intimate way. The damage done just in these two sectors of our society alone, and not just the physical damage but even more the social and spiritual disorientation that invariably attends mass disorders of every sort, has already attained extremely serious dimensions. Along with all this, and not unconnected with it, there has gone a persistent and continuing growth in a crime rate that is already appallingly high and, more disturbing still, a recent increase in the private purchase of firearms, made possible by the incredible laxity of existing legislation,—a development that has the most

sinister implications for the state of mind now beginning to develop among great numbers of our fellow citizens.

AUTHORITY FEEBLE

Now, all this is bad enough in itself. But its gravity has been multiplied, as I see it, by the hesitancy, the feebleness, and the ineffectiveness of many of the responses on the part of established authority. One is forced to the conclusion that the confusions of mind which these disorders reflect are ones from which not even those people are immune whose responsibility it is to see that the dignity and good order of our public life are maintained.

Now, obviously, we are faced today with two urgent tasks. The first is to bring this situation under control. Surely only the most fatuous optimist could believe that we have already done that. Which of our cities is safe from a repetition, over this coming summer, of the scenes that have disgraced the streets of a number of them over the course of the past year? Surely, if there has been any excess here, it has been an excess of tolerance towards such things as arson, looting, sniping and the malicious harassment of police and firemen endeavoring to perform their duty. Such things cannot be justified by any cause or any grievance. They are not conducive to the alleviation of any cause or any grievance. They carry with them a great and real danger of provoking forms of counterlawlessness even more ugly and menacing than themselves. They are contagious in the sense that they conduce to the undermining of confidence in orderly procedure, and to the deterioration of standards of political action across the country.

In no other country in the world would they have been treated with the lenience that has been shown in our great cities. In the face of the provocation given, I find the charges of police brutality simply ludicrous. Whoever deliberately obstructs the exercise of public authority and then resists arrest, is not only provoking violence but necessitating it; and he should know what to expect.

STUDENT REBELLIONS

The same is true of the resort to violence and obstruction by students on university campuses. Every university administration has no doubt its deficiencies. It would be surprising if the administration of Columbia University, in particular, had been without them. But no such deficiencies could conceivably justify what took place on that campus a few weeks ago.

What gives rise to concern is not that the administration of the university ultimately invoked the help of the police to restore its control over its own buildings—it would have been remiss in its duty had it failed to do so. What gives rise to concern is that the measure was not taken more promptly; that a considerable portion of the faculty chose to support these student rioters, and their trouble-making friends from outside, in illegal and indefensible actions; and that even now, a month after the first of the disorders, the leaders of all this lawlessness and indecency should still be clamoring for continued enrollment and recognition as students.

Universities are there for purposes of education. They are not supposed to be exercises in political democracy. The term "democracy" refers to the procedures of government and defines the relationship between the individual citizen and those who hold the ultimate power of disposal over his person and his property; it has no proper applicability to the administration of the educational process.

Universities cannot fulfill their true educational function other than in an atmosphere of respect for the authority of both teacher and institution. It would be better that they be closed entirely than that they attempt to function under conditions in which that respect is absent.

The American student of this day and age has the finest educational facilities ever offered to any students at any time and at any place in world history. For the actual costs of what is offered to him at these places he does not, on the average, pay even the half. The rest is given him by that very American society—that American "Establishment," if you will—for which the student-activist professes such contempt. It is the student who is under obligation to the university and its sponsors, not vice versa. Higher education is not an absolute right, nor is the enjoyment of it devoid of responsibilities. In an age when there are far more applicants for enrollment in our leading institutions than these institutions can handle, there is no reason why anyone should be tolerated as a student on one of these campuses who is not prepared to give the university his respect and whose presence and activity there are disruptive of the educational progress of other students.

LONG WAY TO GO

In each case, then—in that of the big-city ghettoes and that of the college campus—things have gotten seriously out of hand, and we have a long way to go just to prove to a number of our fellow-citizens that violence and disorder are not the means by which causes can be effectively furthered, and objectives achieved, in this country. I can well imagine that in each case there might have to be more unpleasantness rather than less, before this point can be successfully made. If so, I would regret it as much as anyone; but I would see no alternative, because I cannot conceive of useful changes being brought about otherwise than in an atmosphere of decency and decorum and by the established processes of rational discussion and representative government.

But even when respect for the good order of our life is restored, we will still have before us the greater part of our task, which is the correction of the various evils and injustices and failure of understanding in which this misguided behavior has its origins. The fact that violence is not the way to correct these conditions does not mean that they are not serious, that they do not run deep, or that they do not cry out for correction. On the contrary, they do. Ours is indeed a partially sick society; and I yield to none of these extremists in my sense of the need for immediate diagnosis and treatment. Not only that, but I consider that the task of curing these evils is a far more difficult one than most of us have realized, and that it is going to tax our energies and resources to the very limit. Yet even in the analysis of the causes, and in the identification of the requirements for their removal it seems to me that we have not even scratched the surface. The public discussion of these matters remains, for the most part, superficial, tentative, enmeshed in outworn shibboleths and stereotypes.

In the case of the radical students it is plain that we have to do, here, not really with those rapidly-changing complaints and demands—some justifiable, some silly—with which they come at us but with some deep emotional discomfort, approaching at times a mass hysteria, the roots of which reach far back into the environment of home and school: Into the disintegrated family, the bored over-affluent parents, the timid secularism of parental and school authority, the television set, the overcrowded school room, and the false freedom of the teen-age automobile. To correct these conditions will indeed require a revolution—a revolution in the social and intellectual and spiritual environment of American childhood and early youth—but a thoughtful and orderly and constructive sort of a revolution—not the kind they picture.

And similarly, in the case of the Negro: What good will it do to raise the living standard of those Negroes already present in our great cities if millions more are waiting to crowd in behind them and to take advantage in this way of any marginal opportunities, however miserable, that may be opened up by the improvement in the condition of the others? Is there any answer to this problem that does not include some means, either one of economic incentive or of direct administrative control, for preventing the migration of new poverty into these great urban areas just as fast as the old poverty can be remedied? And is it realistic to suppose that the American Negro is going to find his dignity and his comfort of body and mind by the effort to participate and to compete as an individual in a political and social system he neither understands nor respects and for which he is ill-prepared? Will it not be necessary to permit him to have, as a number of his leaders are now demanding, a local political community of his own, through which he can express himself collectively and in which he can find identity and gain dignity?

INHERITED PROBLEM

And finally, I would question the usefulness of any public discussion of this problem of the American Negro that departs, as has so much of what we have heard in the recent past, from the wholesale imputation of guilt or innocence to great masses of people. This is a problem with deep historical roots. It was not created by the generation of Americans now alive; it was only inherited by them. There have been many people of good will on both sides, even in our lifetime, who have never failed to make the effort to improve things within the limits of their own modest possibilities. Let us not make it worse than it is. Perhaps I speak for some of these when I say that I am a little tired of being told how endlessly guilty I am with relation to this situation. It seems to me that the first requirement of a useful discussion would be the recognition of the truly tragic nature of the problem—a characteristic from which both Negroes and non-Negroes suffer alike.

These, my friends, are only a few examples of the reflections that lead me to feel that our problems are of enormous profundity and that a hopeful attack on them will require a national effort—an effort of understanding as well as of action—on a scale far greater than anything we have yet contemplated.

And it is this, the magnitude and urgency of the tasks that we face in the ordering of our domestic life, that brings me now to the burden of the thought I wish primarily to state to you today. It is simply this: That a nation in such a state of internal disarray—a nation faced with domestic tasks of such gravity and magnitude—cannot afford the luxury of extravagant excursions, whether of altruism or of military adventure, into the world beyond its borders. It has no choice but to prune its external involvements to the bone, to cure itself of all dreams of being more to others than it is to itself, and to adjust the objectives of its foreign policy to a realistic assessment of its own capabilities.

OUR WORLD ROLE

Now let me elaborate.

I do not want to talk about Vietnam. Of course, it is little short of fantastic that a country facing such domestic problems as we now face, and one that stands virtually on the brink of a major international financial humiliation, should be continuing to pour its substance to the tune of a full fourth of its budget and more than a half a million of its young men, into a military adventure on the other side of the world, in an area to which its vital interests are only remotely related. But that is an old argument. This is not the time to renew it. A further escalation of this conflict has, I hope, now become

politically unthinkable; and negotiations looking to its ultimate liquidation are now in progress. I cannot regard these negotiations with any great measure of optimism. The procedures we are following are not the best ones I would have thought most promising in the interests of an early liquidation of the conflict. But the negotiations are being conducted by men of great experience and ability, in whom I have the highest personal confidence. I would not like to say anything here that would complicate their tasks. I will only say that the successful liquidation of this involvement is a prerequisite to any successful national policy over the coming four years, whether at home or abroad.

When this liquidation is finally effected, and when we are able to turn our full attention to other parts of the world and to take stock of what has been happening to our world position during the period of our preoccupation with Southeast Asia, we will be dismayed, I think, to find how much Vietnam has cost us in terms of the confidence and respect of world opinion.

MILITARIST CHARGES

Our political adversaries have naturally been only too happy to take advantage of a situation that played so beautifully into the hands of their favored propaganda charges against us. The fact is that we are going to find a distressingly large part of the world public either inclined to the belief that we are some species of blood-thirsty militarists and imperialists or at least shaken in a prior impression that we were not. In these circumstances, almost any very active policy on our part, whether we conceive it as one of altruism or as an assertion of power, will be almost bound to be misinterpreted. To certain forms of hostility and suspicion and skepticism about one's motives, in international and personal life there is only one dignified and effective response: withdrawal, abstention and a dignified silence. Only by long periods of restraint and detachment toward the affairs of other countries and continents, will it be possible for us to correct the misinterpretations concerning the spirit and purposes of our nation to which the Vietnam involvement has given rise.

And this forebearance will have to be supported by the quality of our effort here at home. Whoever has looked closely at international affairs knows that the way in which nations really commend themselves to the respect and confidence of others is not primarily through their words or even primarily through their external actions, but rather through the tone and quality of their domestic life. It is not only between individuals that the power of example is greater than the power of precept. This is also true among nations. And until we in this country have restored the quality of our domestic life to a level where we can exhibit it to the rest of the world without shame or apology, we will get very far in advancing our prestige either by talking at people in other countries, or by dispensing aid and technical advice to them, or by force of arms. There is a crying disparity between the elaborateness of our present efforts to influence other peoples by our physical presence and our activities of one sort or another in their midst, and the abundant evidence of our failures here at home.

What sort of guides to industrialization are we who have not learned how to industrialize ourselves without depleting our resources and despoiling the natural beauty and healthfulness of our country?

What sort of guides are we to urban development who cannot prevent the deterioration of life in our great cities?

What sort of educators are we who cannot win and retain the confidence and respect of our own students? A prerequisite of our coming to terms successfully with our international environment is that we should first come to terms with ourselves.

LABELS WON'T WORK

I do not mean to overdo this thought. We will only be confusing ourselves if we try to define our foreign policy of this coming period by relating it to such shopworn and outdated terms as "isolationism." Obviously, our present situation has little similarity to that which we enjoyed in the last century. Even in a post-Vietnam world, there will be a number of problems and responsibilities to which we shall have to give most serious attention.

There is, for example, the problem of Europe, and particularly Germany. The special responsibilities we have assumed with relation to these areas, and the intimate nature of our interests there, oblige us to take a continuing interest in the unfolding of events in that part of the world.

Beyond that we have the two great latent crises of the Middle East and the southern part of Africa. One of these is an urgent crisis, the other a slow one; but both are tragic ones, without visible solution today, and both are full of danger. Here, our task will be not to attempt to solve the respective problems at once, for no outside force can do that; and it will not be to take sides in these bitter conflicts, because they are not our quarrels and we do not have the answers in our pocket, but to shape our conduct in such a way as to help prevent both of them from becoming threats to world peace.

We shall also be confronted, once the Vietnam involvement is over, with the task of shaping some sort of a stable relationship to mainland China. Here, too, great patience, detachment and forebearance will obviously be necessary. Chinese feelings towards us are violent, neurotic and ill-informed in a degree for which it is hard to find a parallel in recent diplomatic history. These feelings are not going to be corrected in a single day, or even a single year. And even when and if the general atmosphere is improved, we are still going to have to contend with those ingrained characteristics of official Chinese mentality—the xenophobia, the exaggerated pretensions, the anxious preoccupation with the externals of prestige—that have complicated China's relations with the West even in happier times.

NUCLEAR PROBLEM

Finally, there is the great and terrible danger presented by the present cultivation of nuclear weapons by at least five powers, and the rapid proliferation of the ability to cultivate them into still other hands. There is the question whether the present relative balance of power in weapons of this nature is not being undermined by new technological developments and uncertainties; and there is the wider question, which now presents itself on the basis of twenty-five years of experience, as to whether the basing of our defense posture on weapons of this nature has really added to our security, or detracted from it.

With these, and other, questions, we shall have to occupy ourselves, and in the most serious way, even in a post-Vietnam world.

But none of this precludes us from carrying out in the coming period an extensive reorientation of our national policy: away from the ambitious dreams and extravagant efforts of recent years, and in the direction of a new determination and concentration of effort in the ordering of our domestic affairs. The world has changed very greatly over what it was 20 years ago. Neither the hopes nor the fears that have inspired our policy over the intervening years have full validity today. Communism is not what it was in 1948, nor is western Europe, nor are we. At many points, in Europe and elsewhere, where we have become accustomed to regarding our own presence and attention as essential to stability, others can now do without us. Not all of them are going to find it as pleasant as they thought they would when Yankee really goes home; but Yankee, as I see it, has no choice; and many of them may gain from the denial of America's favors a repect for what America has to offer which the extravagant extension of those favors was never able to produce.

AN M.D. DISCUSSES THE COST OF MEDICAL CARE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial dealing with the cost of medical care, and published in the American Medical Association News of June 3, 1968.

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

AN M.D. DISCUSSES THE COST OF MEDICAL CARE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—George E. Shambaugh Jr., MD, of Chicago, has written the following article and had it printed for distribution to his patients as they come to his office. He entitled it, "The Cost of Medical Care and What You and I Can Do About It."

(Dr. Shambaugh is senior surgeon, Otologic Professional Associates; professor of Otolaryngology at Northwestern U.; chief editor of *Archives of Otolaryngology*, and president of the American Otological Society.)

All of us are concerned, and a little bewildered, by the rapid rise in the cost of medical care; a rise, we are told, that will continue. At the same time we hear complaints that the *quality* of medical service may not be as good as formerly, and those of us who have had to be hospitalized know that nursing service is certainly less adequate in spite of the exceedingly high cost of a hospital bed.

It seems appropriate to explain to our patients some of the reasons for the rising costs of medical care, and what your doctors . . . are doing to try to keep these costs down while constantly improving the quality of medical service. There is something that you, the patient, can do, too, to keep these costs down.

If we go back to the Depression Years when the new Wesley Memorial Hospital opened its doors on Pearl Harbor Day, we find that a two bed room cost the patient $6 a day, and there seemed to be an abundance of good nursing care. In that year (1941) the doctors in this office helped to develop the first successful operation for restoring hearing in progressive deafness, the fenestration operation for otosclerosis. By using an operating microscope for this operation they made it a dependable method successful in 80% of cases for permanently restoring useful hearing in patients suffering from otosclerosis. In 1940, the charge by your doctors in this office for a complete initial history and examination, including hearing tests, was $25. The minimum charge for a fenestration operation by the senior doctor was $500, but this operation also cost the patient eight days in the hospital and three or four weeks away from work.

Today, 28 years later, we charge *exactly the same* $25 for our complete initial history and examination including hearing tests. *But*, we have added two additional tests to this examination, the speech reception and discrimination test, we have better (and far more expensive) sound proof testing rooms, while the salaries of our nurses who take the history and audiometrists who do the hearing tests have increased by 200% or 400%. *All of these increased costs of operation have been absorbed by the doctors at no additional cost to the patient.*

Today, 28 years later, we have a better operation to restore normal or near-normal hearing in patients with otosclerosis: the stapes operation. The minimum charge for

this better operation by the same senior doctor, including the first year of post operative care, is $525. But this improved method requires only three days instead of eight in the hospital and an average of one week instead of three or four away from work, so that actually the total cost to the patient with otosclerosis is *less* today to have his hearing restored through surgery than in 1940.

Then why are the costs of medical care rising so fast that we are reading and hearing about "a crisis ahead in medical care," as in the Feb. 26 *U.S. News & World Report*, page 56?

One reason is the rapid advance of scientific medicine with the addition of new, valuable, but expensive diagnostic tests. An example is the new method of x-raying the inner ear and hearing nerve called polytomography. This requires an apparatus imported from Europe, costing $75,000, plus $25,000 to install. Because of its expense it is not yet available in hospitals or clinics, one of the very few in America being in Chicago. With it we are now able to diagnose tumors of the hearing nerve as small as a pea, whereas before we could not make the diagnosis until such a tumor had become as large as a small lemon and had reached the brain. Today by polytomography we can see defects or fixation of parts of the ossicular chain that carries sound from the ear drum to the hearing nerve, and such defects can be repaired. We are able now, with polytome x-ray studies to diagnose the early beginnings of otosclerosis *even before the hearing begins to fail*, and we have a method for retarding or arresting the progressive loss of hearing. The problem is that only six examinations a day can be made by the polytome x-ray apparatus, and the least that can be charged for this study to pay for its operation and to amortize the cost of the apparatus and installation is $60. This is quite expensive. But the *benefits* for the patient in diagnosing life-threatening tumors and hearing losses that can be prevented or cured, far outweigh the cost of the examination.

A second reason for the rising costs of medical care, and actually the greatest reason according to all studies that have been made, is the rising cost of hospitalization. A two-bed room that cost $6 a day in 1940 costs an average of $40 a day today. The reason? Hospitals, too, have had to provide expensive equipment and apparatus and professional personnel to operate them, in the operating room, the recovery room, and the intensive care units. The hospitals have been caught in a squeeze between inadequate help and rising salaries of non-professional and professional workers, so that patient bed care is less adequate but far more expensive today than 28 years ago. Hospitals are non-profit charitable institutions and have no other way to absorb these rising costs than to pass them on to the patients.

Medicare and Medicaid, as the doctors knew they would, are costing three or four times as much as the government planners expected. One reason is that the patient, with all his bills paid for him, lacks any incentive to leave the hospital as soon as he is able to. We saw this in the V.A. hospitals where a fenestration operation required an average of eight weeks of hospitalization, compared to eight days in a private hospital. Another reason is that patients want to be hospitalized for x-rays and other diagnostic tests which their insurance will not pay for on an outpatient basis. The decline and fall of Britain as a world power, according to *U.S. News & World Report* for Feb. 12, 1968, p. 64, has been due in part to the politically popular but economically disastrous provision of *all* health services free to *everyone*. Too easily the voters forget that *they* always pay the bill, and the bill when the government takes over is *always* larger to support the huge administrative bureaucracy with red tape and inefficiency. We can only hope that Medicare will never be extended to everyone, for this would not only threaten the *quality* of medical care but it would be costly beyond imagination.

Now a few words about the quality of medical care. The great advances in scientific knowledge of the ear began in Europe, but now are coming from America. We believe that the private practice of medicine in our country has encouraged the development of better methods and new ideas, whereas state-controlled medicine as in England very much discourages and impedes new developments. . . .

In the early days of the fenestration operation, when microsurgery was just beginning to develop, there were very few doctors trained and equipped to do these operations to restore hearing. We were keenly aware of our badly overcrowded schedule so that patients had to wait a long time for an appointment, and too often had to wait a long time in our "waiting room"—a good name! It was not easy and it required time to find and train enough doctors to be able to give the kind of "instant" care and attention that we would want for ourselves when we are ill. We believe that we are finally and slowly approaching this ideal. . . . Meanwhile, every one of our costs of operation has risen steadily, some more than others; rent, cost of electronic testing equipment, salaries of nurses and other office employees. Even stamps to mail out monthly statements cost twice what they did a few years ago! Reluctantly, we have had to make a modest increase in our charge for an office visit. If the "creeping inflation" of recent years continues, we shall, very reluctantly, have to make further small increases. We are proud of the fact that our fees as doctors have increased *far less* than our costs of operating our office, and we intend to continue to "hold the line" on our charges for first visit diagnostic examination and for surgery as much and as long as we possibly can.

The rising costs of medical care have been considered by a National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower, and will be considered by a congressional committee. An attempt may be made by the government to blame the increase upon doctor's fees, rather than to blame their own miscalculated plans. If this should happen, we hope you will contact your congressman and point out the actual facts.

Our small contribution to keeping down the costs of medical care include our policy to send the patient to the hospital the evening before surgery *only after all diagnostic tests* have first been made, and allowing him to go home from the hospital *at the earliest possible moment*. By utilizing local anesthesia for most of our operations, convalescence is more rapid, and the risk to the patient is minimized.

You, as the patient, can make *your* small contribution to keeping down the costs of medical care, by planning to go home from the hospital as soon as the doctor says you are ready, even when Medicare or other insurance is paying for part or all of your bills, and in not asking to be hospitalized for diagnostic tests that can be done just as well as an outpatient.

GALLUP POLL ON METHODS OF CURBING VIOLENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 2 days ago George Gallup released the results of a special nationwide survey which was conducted last Wednesday.

The major purpose of the poll was to determine what the people of this country feel should be done to prevent violence.

Many steps were recommended by those polled, but more than anything else, stricter gun laws were called for.

Mr. Gallup also reports that, in his latest survey on the subject of registration of firearms, 85 percent of those polled favored such a registration statute. Thirty years ago a Gallup poll resulted in an almost identical report. At that time it was 84 percent of the adults polled that favored such a proposal.

The fourth most commonly mentioned recommendation in last week's poll was to remove programs of violence from TV. In 1964, I released a report pointing out the great amount of violence on television to which our children are exposed, and I recommended its elimination.

It is perfectly clear that the results of last week's poll, together with the poll conducted 30 years ago, demonstrate conclusively that the American people favor a strict firearms registration act, such as the one I have introduced today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the results of this Gallup poll be printed in the RECORD.

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

GALLUP POLL: REGISTRATION OF ALL GUNS IS FAVORED

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., June 8.—A special nationwide survey conducted Wednesday, the day Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was shot, shows the public calling for the registration of all firearms as the best way to curb violence in our society.

These two questions were asked first: *"What do you think are the causes of violent behavior in this Nation?"*—and *"What steps do you think should be taken to prevent such violence in the future?"*

In terms of causes, the public chiefly blames our complex society; the fact that the country has waited too long to tackle the basic causes of racial, ethnic and religious prejudice; poor discipline in the home; a lack of respect for authority among youth; a disregard for God and religion.

Here are the steps proposed as ways to help prevent violence in the future:

1. Stricter gun laws (laws to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, the mentally disturbed, minors).
2. Stricter law enforcement (including more police, less leniency on part of courts).
3. Greater security for candidates (including appropriate changes in presidential campaigning).
4. Remove programs of violence from TV.
5. Improve parental control (including courses for parents on how to rear children)
6. Encourage a greater awareness of the importance of ethical behavior (including courses in schools).
7. Improve environmental conditions such as jobs, education, and so forth.

On May 1, 1938, 30 years ago, the Gallup Poll reported that 84 per cent of all adults favored a law requiring all owners of pistols and revolvers to register with the government. In the latest survey (1967), 85 percent would still back such a law.

Congress has just passed broad anti-crime legislation, including controls over interstate sale of handguns.

But the public, gunowners and non-owners alike, would go much farther than this bill. They favor a law requiring the registration of all guns, a law banning the sale of all guns through the mails, and strict restrictions on the use of guns by persons under 18 years of age.

SENATOR GEORGE AIKEN, THE OUTSPOKEN SAGE OF THE SENATE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Parade magazine of June 2, 1968, contains an

article entitled "The Outspoken Sage of the Senate." Of course, the article refers to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, GEORGE AIKEN.

Speaking as a junior Member of the Senate, I think one of the most positive arguments for our seniority system is Senator AIKEN. His voice in 40 years of public life and his sense of fairness give proof to the proposition that experience counts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as my own expression of respect for a highly respected U.S. Senator and a very great American.

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

SENATOR GEORGE AIKEN: THE OUTSPOKEN SAGE OF THE SENATE

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—To repair its reputation, the scandal-stained Senate recently drafted a code of ethics. In the showdown voting, however, the Senate's historic reluctance to reform itself prevailed, and the new code was vented with more loopholes than a medieval fortress. Yet the senators, one by one, paid solemn lip service to the pretended reforms. At last, gnarled, gnomish Sen. George Aiken rose, the customary twinkle gone from his eyes. "I will not be a party to the perpetrating of a fraud upon the American people," he declared, "by making them think that we are trying to purify ourselves when we are really making ourselves look worse."

He stood alone when the Senate finished recording the votes, 67 to 1. But his few clipped words had an impact that belies the final count. For under his mossy exterior, there is solid granite. "Any position Aiken takes," said Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield of the Senate's senior Republican, "automatically becomes respectable, just because it's held by George Aiken."

FORTY YEARS IN POLITICS

His character has withstood the ravages of 40 years of politics. In all this time, he has served Vermont as a state legislator, lieutenant governor, governor and senator. It is a testament to his integrity that the road in front of his farm at Putney, Vt., is still unpaved.

Many of his peers would like to ignore Aiken, but they have learned they cannot. His incisive views have served as an irritant to both parties over the years, and he has seldom failed to support a Democrat when he thought the opposition was right or lambast a Republican when he believed his own party was wrong.

Like few other members of Congress, he lives on his salary. His blue suits shine. His lank red tie is a trademark. He lives in a small $150-a-month apartment near his Senate office so he can walk to work. Until she died in 1966, Beatrice Aiken, his wife for 52 years, stayed home in Putney to help keep the expenses down, waiting for Aiken's frequent visits. Lonely without her, Aiken remarried in mid-1967. His bride is Lola Pierotti, who had been his administrative assistant for many years.

Like the sugar maples near his Vermont home, Aiken imparts his wisdom in slow drops. He sits back and listens intently to the exchange of ideas in the Senate. Then he cuts through the froth of words with his sharp Yankee philosophy.

Nor has his understanding been blurred by age. Although 75, Aiken has a clear, crisp insight into the problems of today. His views are usually blunt: Here are a few of them:

On *Today's Youth*—"We have always had hippies in one form or another. I don't think kids are much worse now than they used to be. They have better educations now, but there are many without opportunities. This is where the trouble starts. They wind up blaming the system, then they try to change the system."

On *Vietnam*—"I have maintained for many months that we made a huge military commitment in that part of the world simply because we did not have the wit, the imagination or the courage to devise a political strategy to suit a political problem."

On *Civil Rights*—"If I were to wake up some morning and find, before 10 o'clock, that everyone was the same race, creed and color, people would find some other causes for prejudice by noon." He added that the militants of both races "aren't looking for solutions: they just want action."

On *The Presidency*—"As I see it, it is far more important to elect a person of integrity and ability to the presidency—one who will conscientiously perform the duties of the office as described in the Constitution—than it is to elect one on the promise that he may agree with our particular viewpoint."

Aiken has been in the Senate since 1941, but he waited until this year to issue a statement on the state of the Union. "This is a privilege I have forgone in the past," he explained, "because usually I have felt that the Union's state was not as bad as its detractors would have it, nor so good as those in office wanted to make it out to be. But this year, the state of the Union is so clearly bad that for the first time in my 27 years as a Senator I feel compelled to stand on my privilege."

Then in terse, punchy sentences, he looked at America's place in the world and rendered his verdict. "We are entering an intensely political year," he said, "and I believe the deteriorated state of politics is very much at the root of the malaise of our times. In politics, as in television, media has triumphed over matter. A man's image has become so much more important than the substance of his thoughts and ideas that we have elevated a cult of personality far above any real debate of the issues. And in this respect, we are not far apart from our ideological enemies as we would like to think we are or as we should be."

ADVICE IGNORED

He proceeded to outline concisely what he thought was wrong with President Johnson's policies. Afterward, Aiken remarked, eyes twinkling but only in half-jest, to a friend: "If Mr. Johnson did what I told him, he'd be the best President in history."

Aiken never went to college and has never pretended that he holds the world's knowledge. Still, when he believes it is time to speak, he doesn't hesitate. "Some say you shouldn't prune except at the right time of the year," he philosophizes. "I generally do it when the saw is sharp."

The senator's rural background is always with him as he goes after the world's great issues. "Problems," he says, "are like the large rock in a farmer's field. He may hire a derrick to have it removed only to find two larger ones underneath. But, after all, problems are what make life worth living."

In previous Parade reports, I have advocated mandatory retirement for senators and congressmen at age 65. George Aiken would have to be exempted from any such rule. For although he is wrinkled and rumpled and tousled by the years, he is still a young man. As his bride confessed to Parade: "He is too healthy for me."

"HOW 20TH CENTURY CIVILIZATION COLLAPSED"—ARTICLE BY JOHN W. GARDNER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, John W. Gardner, recently resigned as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to become the chairman of the Urban Coalition, an organization of business, labor, civic, and civil rights leaders formed to press for solutions to the problems of the cities. Last week he addressed the 100th commencement of Cornell University. The Washington Post of Sunday, June 9, 1968, summarized or published excerpts from that address. It was entitled "How 20th Century Civilization Collapsed." It is, I feel, an accurate description of some of the problems which the Nation faces today, and of some of the various attempts to meet those problems, both successful and unsuccessful.

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

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

HOW 20TH CENTURY CIVILIZATION COLLAPSED

(By John W. Gardner)

I am going to take you on a 600-year tour of history, beginning some three centuries ago and stretching three centuries into the future. Such a tour might present some difficulties for a qualified historian, but it is a mere finger exercise for the practiced commencement speaker.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, increasing numbers of people began to believe that men could determine their own fate, shape their own institutions and gain command of the social forces that buffeted them.

Before then, from the beginning, men had believed that all the major features of their lives were determined by immorial custom or fate or the will of God. It was one of the great Copernican turns of history that brought man gradually, over two or three centuries, to the firm conviction that he could have a hand in shaping his institutions.

No one really knows all the ingredients that went into the change, but we can identify some major elements. One was the emergence, with the Scientific Revolution, of a way of thinking that sought objectively identifiable cause-and-effect relationships. People trained in that way of thinking about the physical world were bound to note that the social world, too, had it causes and effects. And with that discovery came, inevitably, the idea that one might manipulate the cause to alter the effect.

At the same time, people were less and less inclined to explain their daily lives and institutions in terms of God's will. And that trend has continued to this day. Less and less do men suppose, even those who believe devoutly in a Supreme Being, that God busies himself with day-to-day microadministration of the world.

While all of this was happening, new modes of transportation and communication were breaking down parochial attitudes all over the world. As men discovered that human institutions and customs varied enormously from one society to the next, it became increasingly difficult to think of one's own institutions as unalterable, increasingly easy to conceive of a society in which men consciously shaped their institutions and customs.

The result is that today any bright high school student can discourse on social forces and institutional change. A few centuries ago, even for learned men, such matters were "given," ordained, not subject to analysis, fixed in the great design of things.

BURDEN ON SOCIAL STRUCTURES

Up to a point, the new views were immensely exhilarating. In the writing of our Founding Fathers, for example, one encounters a mood approaching exaltation as they proceed to shape a new nation.

But more recently, another consequence has become apparent. The new views place an enormous—in some instances an unbearable—burden on the social structures that

man has evolved over the centuries. Those structures have become the sole target and receptacle for all man's hope and hostility. He has replaced his fervent prayer to God with a shrill cry of anger against his own institutions. I claim no special insight into the unknowable Deity, but He must be chuckling.

Men can tolerate extraordinary hardship if they think it is an unalterable part of life's travail. But an administered frustration—unsanctioned by religion or custom or deeply rooted values—is more than the spirit can bear. So increasingly men rage at their institutions. All kinds of men rage at all kinds of *institutions*, here and around the world. Most of them have no clear vision of the kind of world they want to build; they only know that they don't want the kind of world they have.

So much for the past and present.

I told you I would take you three centuries into the future. I am able to do this thanks to a Cornell scientist who recently discovered how man may step off the time dimension and visit the past or future at will. You may be surprised you haven't heard about this, but he doesn't want to publicize his findings until he has won a few more horse races.

At any rate, he gave me a few pills and, since I'm not interested in horse races, I decided to find out what the future holds in the struggle between man and his institutions. I cannot guarantee the results. I do not offer what follows as a prediction. Perhaps the pill just gave me bad dreams.

EVERYTHING TUMBLES DOWN

The first thing I learned is that in the last third of the 20th century, the rage to demolish succeeded beyond the fondest dreams of the dismantlers. They brought everything tumbling down. Since the hostility to institutions was a product of modern minds, the demolition was most thorough in the most advanced nations.

You will be pleased to know that unlike the fall of Rome, this decline was not followed by hundreds of years of darkness. In fact, there followed less than a century of chaos and disorder.

In the latter part of the 21st century the rebuilding began. Since chaos is always followed by authoritarianism, this was a period of iron rule worldwide—a world society rigidly organized and controlled. I don't think I shall tell you what language was spoken.

But tyrannies tend to grow lax, even under futuristic methods of thought control. By the end of the 22d century, the sternly disciplined institutions of the world society had grown relatively tolerant and the old human impulse to be free had begun to reassert itself.

In the new, more permissive atmosphere, men were again allowed to study history—which had been under a ban for two centuries. The effect was electric. To those austere and antiseptic minds, conditioned to the requirements of a technically advanced authoritanism, the rediscovery of man's history was intoxicating. It generated an intellectual excitement that dominated the whole 23d century. Scholars were entranced by the variety of human experience, shocked by the violence and barbarism, saddened by the stupidities and exalted by the achievements of their forebears.

And as they searched that history, excitedly, sadly, lovingly, they returned increasingly to the 20th century as a moment of curious and critical importance in the long pageant.

WHY DID IT HAPPEN?

All the evidence available to them indicated that the preceding centuries had seen a vast and impressive movement in the direction of institutions that were responsive to the will of men. There were setbacks, to be sure, and trouble and hypocrisy and failures—but over the years the trend was unmistakeable.

Why then, in the late 20th century, did men turn on their institutions and destroy them in a fit of impatience?

As one 23rd century scholar put it. "Until we answer that question we shall never be sure that we are not preparing the same fate for ourselves."

As they studied the history of the 20th century, they discovered that human expectations had risen sharply in the middle years of the century. They observed that men came to demand more and more of their institutions—and with greater intransigence. And they noted that the demands for instant performance led to instant disillusionment, for while aspirations leaped ahead, human institutions remained sluggish—less sluggish, to be sure, than at any previous time in history, but still inadequately responsive to human need.

Twenty-third century scholars finally concluded that the tension between released aspirations and sluggish human institutions would always be potentially hazardous, and that the whole cycle could repeat itself. But they disagreed as to the implications.

One school of thought said the big mistake had been to let aspirations loose in the first place. Human aspirations, they said, should be kept under tight control.

The opposing school of thought argued that human aspirations were a dynamic force that held enormous potential for good. They insisted that the main problem was to make human institutions less sluggish. The only error of the mid-20th century, they, said, was to release aspirations without designing institutions responsive enough to satisfy those aspirations.

After years of debate, the two schools of thought began to come together and a common doctrine began to emerge.

The first thing they agreed on was that human aspirations were capable of contributing enormously to the dynamism of the society and therefore should not be tightly bottled up. But they also agreed that there must be procedural bounds within which the aspirations could express themselves.

Some were quick to point out that in the mid-20th century such procedural bounds did exist, and functioned quite well, permitting extraordinary scope and variety of dissent, until the last third of the century, when the bounds were increasingly rejected and the dissolution of the society began. Back of the rejection was the impatient hostility that late 20th century man felt toward his institutions.

The second thing 23d century scholars came to agree upon was that if society is going to release aspirations for institutional change—which is precisely what many 20th century societies deliberately did—then it had better be sure its institutions are capable of such change. In this respect they found the 20th century sadly deficient.

Most institutions were designed to obstruct change rather than facilitate it. And that is not really surprising. The institutions were, after all, designed by human beings, and most men most of the time do not want the institutions *in which they themselves have a vested interest* to change. Professors were often cited as an interesting example of this tendency, because they clearly favored innovation in other parts of the society but steadfastly refused to make universities into flexible, adaptive, self-renewing institutions.

There were, of course, a good many people in the 20th century who *did* want change—but they were curiously indifferent to the task of redesigning their institutions so that change could be readily accomplished. Many of them were moral zealots who expended their total energy in headlong combat between themselves, whom they believed to be very, very good, and specified others whom they believed to be very, very bad; and the object of the combat was to do in the baddies, even if it meant doing in oneself. This led to endless hostilities, especially when those marked for assault had equally strong convictions about their *own* moral superiority. It was particularly difficult when the two groups spoke a different language or were separated by an ocean or 30 years in age.

There were other reformers who were considerably more discriminating and saw that to achieve their ends they must change human institutions. But even these often misconceived the fundamental talks.

Each such reformer came to his task with a little bundle of desired changes. The society is intolerable, he would assert, because it has these specifiable defects: a, b, c . . . and so on. The implication was that if appropriate reforms a′, b′, and c′ were carried through and the defects corrected, the society would be wholly satisfactory and the work of the reformer done.

That, as 23d century scholars plainly saw, was a primitive way of viewing social change. The true task, they saw, was to design a society (and institutions) capable of continuous change, continuous renewal, continuous responsiveness. They understood that this was entirely feasible; indeed, they noted that the 20th century had hit upon a number of partial solutions to the problem of designing self-renewing institutions but had never pursued the task with adequate vigor. I might add parenthetically that I, myself, wrote a book on this subject back in the 20th century. It was entitled "Self-Renewal." I won't review its findings here, because I wouldn't want to spoil your enjoyment of the book.

NO RESPONSE TO CHALLENGE

Because of failure to design institutions capable of continuous renewal, 20th century societies showed astonishing sclerotic streaks. Even in the United States, which was then the most adaptable of all, the departments of the Federal Government were in grave need of renewal; state government was in most places an old attic full of outworn relics; local government was a waxworks of stiffly preserved anachronisms; the system of taxation was a tangle of dysfunctional measures; the courts were crippled by archaic organizational arrangements; the unions, the professions, the universities, the corporations each had spun its own impenetrable web of vested interests.

Such a society could not respond to challenge. And it did not.

But as one 23d century scholar put it, "The reformers couldn't have been less interested in the basic adaptability of the society that posed tough and complex tasks of institutional redesign that bored them to death. They preferred the joys of combat, of adversary relationships, of villain hunting. As for the rest of the society, it was dozing off in front of the television set."

The 23d century scholars made another exceptionally interesting observation. They pointed out that 20th century institutions were caught in a savage crossfire between uncritical lovers and unloving critics. On the one side, those who loved their institutions tended to smother them in an embrace of death, loving their rigidities more than their promise, shielding them from life-giving criticism. On the other side, there arose a breed of critics without love, skilled in demolition but untutored in the arts by which human institutions are nurtured and strengthened and made to flourish.

Between the two, the institutions perished.

The 23d century scholars understood that where human institutions were concerned, love without criticism brings stagnation and criticism without love brings destruction. And they emphasized that the swifter the pace of change, the more lovingly men had to care for and criticize their institutions to keep them intact through the turbulent passages.

SO THEY REDESIGNED

In short, men must be discriminating appraisers of their society, knowing cooly and precisely what it is about society that thwarts or limits them and therefore needs modification. And so must they be discriminating protectors of their institutions, preserving those features that nourish and strengthen them and make them more free. To fit themselves for such tasks, they must be sufficiently serious to study their institutions, sufficiently dedicated to become expert in the art of modifying them.

Having arrived at these judgments, 23d century leaders proceeded to redesign their own society for continuous renewal.

As I told you earlier, I cannot guarantee the glimpse of the future given me by my friend the Cornell scientist. Come to think of it, he hasn't been winning his horse races consistently.

So perhaps it's not too late to alter history's course.

TRANSPORTATION CHIEF RIDES A COMMUTER TRAIN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the transfer of the Urban Transit Administration from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Department of Transportation is now a fact.

Obviously, this is an appropriate time to begin a fresh approach to urban transit problems. As I have studied the various reports, statements, and releases on urban transit published by the UTA over the past few years, I have often been concerned by the "theoretician" approach taken to many of our very urgent transportation problems. This concern deepened when I became aware of the fact that the majority of the staff at the Urban Transit Administration has had little or no experience in operating urban transit systems.

For that reason I was particularly impressed when I learned that Transportation Secretary Boyd visited Philadelphia recently to ride commuter trains, subways, and trolleys. I am told that the Secretary plans similar trips to other cities.

Now that he has been given the responsibility for urban transportation, there is no time like the present for him and the staff at the Urban Transit Administration to become acquainted with the day-to-day problems of operating transit systems through actual experience. It is hardly fair for people who have never been aboard a subway car to make important decisions concerning subways.

I think Secretary Boyd in taking this field trip has made a small step in the right direction. I would hope he and others in the Urban Transit Administration would visit cities such as Colorado Springs and Pueblo, both of which have transit difficulties at the moment, so that they could also become acquainted with operating procedures in medium-sized cities. He would be most welcome there, as well as in Denver, which has a privately operated transit system.

I believe, as I have said repeatedly in the past, that it is time to end the talk and start the action in the field of urban transit. One way to make the action more realistic is to be sure that our Federal Government people who deal in transportation know exactly what they are talking about. I commend the Secretary for showing them the way to get such information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in the May 16, 1968, Philadelphia Bulletin, describing Mr. Boyd's experiences as a commuter, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TRANSPORTATION CHIEF RIDES PAOLI LOCAL AS A COMMUTER

(By Eugene L. Meyer)

U.S. Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd, with newspaper underarm, took to the rails this morning and commuted from Paoli to center city via train, subway and, trolley car.

During the hour-and-20-minute trek, he buried his head in the newspaper, chatted with the trainmen and fellow passengers and did some paperwork.

The paperwork was some boning up on Philadelphia's mass transit network. Boyd coupled the paperwork with a ride on some of the equipment that makes it tick, day after day.

PAOLI LOCAL

He decided to take the rides because his agency will have the responsibility for federally-funded urban mass-transit programs after July 1. He's already been to Baltimore to take a ride. Other U.S. cities on his list are New York and Boston. He'll also go to Montreal to see how the Canadians commute.

Boyd, with his wife, Flavil; Deputy Under Secretary Paul Sitton; his special assistant, Jack Burby, and four other aides boarded the Paoli local at Paoli at 8.15.

When Trainman William Crawford collected his 55-cent fare, Boyd introduced himself.

Crawford smiled and remarked: "Would you believe there are two Democrats on this train? You and me."

As the train approached Villanova, Boyd commented that it had been a comfortable ride.

At Villanova, Boyd and his party got off the train and rode in two U.S. Coast Guard automobiles to the Villanova station of the Red Arrow's Philadelphia and Western Line.

A train came along at 8:49 and they climbed aboard. Boyd noted that the car was "more comfortable than the train."

At the 69th st. terminal, Boyd and company got off and caught the Market Street Subway to 30th st. He said he was impressed with the ventilation system in the subway cars.

SWITCHES TO TROLLEY

At 30th st., Boyd switched to a subway-surface trolley car.

Boyd's trip was completed, and he was met by Edmund N. Bacon, executive director of the City Planning Commission, for a briefing on transit facilities here.

Bacon briefed Boyd on Philadelphia's renewal of the center city, including Market Street East and City Hall West Plaza.

At a press conference in the Municipal Services Building, Boyd gave his impression of Philadelphia transit lines.

"They operate on time, fares seem reasonable and frequency seems quite good," he said.

"It did occur to me at my ripe old age of 45, that some of the equipment could call me 'son.' I doubt seriously that the public would object to some new equipment."

Before departing for New York on the Department of Transportation's high-speed test train, Boyd was taken on a tour of center city by Public Property Commissioner William A. Costello and City Transit Chief Edson L. Tennyson.

A RETURN TO SANITY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of the leading newspapers of my State, the Orlando Sentinel, published some cogent commentary on the lawless aspects of our society which culminated in the tragic assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. The Sentinel's words are especially appropriate in that on the same day that Senator Kennedy was killed a young Marine lieutenant from Orlando was slain in an equally senseless and wanton attack which took place in a Georgetown hamburger stand. The marine, Lt. William G. King, was only 21 years old. Senator Kennedy was only 42 years old. Both men were struck down at a time when their lives and careers were just ripening.

I commend the Orlando Sentinel editorial to the attention of Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "We Must Return to Our Senses," which was published in the Orlando Sentinel of June 6, be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a brief editorial entitled "Gun Laws," published in the same edition of the Orlando Sentinel, also be printed in the RECORD.

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

WE MUST RETURN TO OUR SENSES

Painfully, and at extravagant cost, America is paying the price for coddling law breakers.

The tragedy that unfolded during the early morning hours Wednesday in the kitchen of a Los Angeles hotel apparently took root in the brain of an insane man, but it was nourished by a year after year erosion of respect for law in this country.

Senator Robert Kennedy and his family are the immediate victims, but all of us are equally punished.

House Speaker John W. McCormack, from the Kennedy family's home state, said it best, we think, of all those who tried to fix the cause for the type of crime that occurred so shockingly in Los Angeles.

"Those who enforce the laws," said Speaker McCormack, "are finding themselves the defendants—instead of the lawbreakers and the defiers of authority."

"We've got to support the police officer," Mr. McCormack pleaded. "We've got to bring back the respect for the man who wears the uniform."

America is facing a wholesale onslaught against authority.

Those who would weaken this nation of laws have had unwitting support from some in high places and from courts, who, in their zeal to right certain wrongs, have hastened assault on the very fabric of America.

Tradition is dead; change is "in."

Authority is there to be challenged if not subverted or even overthrown, and by force if necessary.

The policeman is a fuzz; the criminal is indulged.

One takes what he wants; he obeys the laws of his choice.

Murder is an everyday happening; assassination of public figures threatens to become commonplace.

Such are the fruits of this strange cult that ensnarls us. It is sparked by conspirators and is fed by the well meaning but easily duped—those who are troubled by an unpopular war, those who feel they are the victims of social injustice, those who are so immature that they know not what they want.

True, it is difficult, perhaps even impos-

sible, to protect against the isolated nut in a crowd. But who is to say that the mad man is not goaded into his insane act by all these examples of lawlessness and disrespect for authority around him.

Crime breeds more crime. Anarchy will bring ruin. We have had enough of both.

GUN LAWS

All the gun laws that Congress can write will not prevent criminals from killing and robbing.

Strong law enforcement, however, will make it more difficult for the criminal, and a gun control law should be part of the arsenal that police may use to protect this country's peaceable citizens.

We should require registration of all guns. Possession of an unregistered hand gun or rifle should be a felony.

HERBLOCK'S HATCHET SWINGS AGAIN

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it should be called to the attention of the Senate that the master of the poison pen, Herbert L. Block, of the Washington Post, keeps inventing new ways to slander the character of honest men. He cares not where his hatchet falls, so long as it seems to serve the end he seeks. He stoops to practically any means, fair or not, seeking to crush opposition to his viewpoint.

The latest example of Herblock's handiwork appears in the Washington Post on the same day that headlines blazon the death of our friend and colleague, Robert F. Kennedy. Since I cannot insert these shabby examples in the RECORD as they appeared in the Post, I should at least try to describe what was done, so that Herblock's methods may be exposed.

The cartoon that appeared in the first edition depicts a fat, bald man holding a huge pistol with "gun lobby" plastered across his vest. It carries a poster with the words of Senator Kennedy quoted:

A bill to stop mail-order traffic in firearms "would save hundreds of lives in this country and spare thousands of families all across this land the grief and heartbreak that may come from the loss of a husband, a son, a brother or a friend. It is time that we wipe this stain of violence from our land."

And another list headed:

Vote to kill Senator Ted Kennedy's Proposal To Ban Interstate Mail-Order Sales of All Guns, May 16, 1968.

Under that title the first edition cartoon lists the following Senators in two columns alphabetically:

Allott (Colo.), Anderson (N.M.), Baker (Tenn.), Bartlett (Alaska), Bayh (Ind.) Bennett (Utah), Boggs (Del.), Cannon (Nev.), Carlson (Kan.), Church (Idaho), Cotton, (N.H.), Curtis (Neb.), Dirksen (Ill.), Dominick (Colo.), Eastland (Miss.), Fannin (Ariz), Hansen (Wyo.), Hatfield (Ore), Hickenlooper (Iowa), Hollings (S.C.), Hruska (Neb.), Jordan (Idaho), Miller (Iowa), Morse (Ore.), Moss (Utah), Mundt (S.D.), Murphy (Calif.), Scott (Pa.), Thurmond (S.C.), Tower (Tex.), Young (N.D.).

This particular edition is the mail edition and is listed by the Audit Bureau of Circulation as approximately 16,000 papers being primarily the "mail" edition going out across the Nation.

The final edition carries the same cartoon except that the list of Senators has now been broken down by party and suddenly another 25 Democratic Senators appear on the list as follows:

Democrats: *Anderson (N.M.), *Bartlett (Alaska), *Bayh (Ind.), Bible (Nev.), Burdick (N.D.), Byrd (Va.), Hart (Mich.), Hayden (Ariz.), Hill (Ala.), Holland (Fla.), Jackson (Wash.), Jordan (N.C.), Long (La.), Mansfield (Mont.), McClellan (Ark.), McGee (Wyo.), *Morse (Ore.), *Cannon (Nev.), *Church (Idaho), *Eastland (Miss.), Ellender (La.), Ervin (N.C.), Gruening (Alaska), McGovern (S.D.), Metcalf (Mont.), Muskie (Maine), Nelson (Wis.), Proxmire (Wis.), Russell (Ga.), Sparkman (Ala.), Stennis (Miss.), Talmadge (Ga.), *Moss (Utah), *Hollings (S.C.).

Republicans: *Allott (Colo.), *Baker (Tenn.), *Bennett (Utah), *Boggs (Del.), *Carlson (Kan.), *Cotton (N.H.), *Curtis (Neb.), *Dirksen (Ill.), *Dominick (Colo.), *Fannin (Ariz.), *Hansen (Wyo.), *Hickenlooper (Iowa), *Hruska (Neb.), *Jordan (Idaho), *Miller (Iowa), Mundt (S.D.), *Murphy (Calif.), *Scott (Pa.), *Thurmond (S.C.), *Tower (Tex.), *Young (N.D.), *Hatfield (Ore.).

Those with asterisks by their names are ones which appeared in the first-edition list.

Now what are the implications of this?

First of all, running next to a lead editorial entitled "The Shooting of Senator Kennedy," as it does, the cartoon is at the very least in bad taste.

Second, heading the list of Senators with the words "Vote To Kill" is so unjust and inflammatory as to be unbelievable.

Third, what possible reason can prompt a paper to run a complete list of Republican Senators in one edition and omit the complete list that includes another 25 Democratic Senators until it was apparently inserted in the final edition of 59,000 distributed mostly on newsstands and in the street?

Some horrible questions arise from this action:

Does Mr. Block intend to convey the idea across the Nation that more Republicans voted to kill Senator Kennedy than Democrats? I almost choke on the very words, but the implication is clearly resident in the manner in which this affair has been handled.

Does Mr. Block intend to convey that all Senators who voted down Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY'S amendment voted to kill Senator Kennedy? That is too horrible to imagine. This list contains the names of our cherished majority and minority leaders. It contains the name of Democratic Senators who had been closely associated with Senator Robert F. Kennedy over the years and were close personal friends. Such an idea is absolutely abhorrent and repulsive.

I cannot find words to express my dismay and disgust at such irresponsibility displayed on the editorial pages of one of our supposedly leading papers. This issue of the Post contains, I would guess from information given me by the paper, approximately half a million papers. How many carried each list I do not know, but this is obviously an act intended to poison the minds of men so as to achieve a long-established goal of the paper.

Mr. President, I do not quarrel with a newspaper having a point of view and expressing it. Espousal of ideas and causes freely in America is basically one of the great strengths of our Republic. But this kind of action puts a blot and stain upon the record of responsible journalism and I cannot see how it could be defended as the legitimate exercise of a free press.

No matter how one may stand on gun-control legislation, this irresponsible frothing at the mouth by TV commentators, editorialists, and public officials does not contribute to a reasonable solution to whatever problem may exist. This public clamor for gun legislation is a monstrous nonsequitor to the events in Los Angeles. To ride this tremendous emotional wave, recklessly tossing off terms like "mail-order murder," is worse than irresponsible, because such actions carry the false implication that if a stronger bill is passed it will put an end to such problems. In fact, no legislative proposal that has yet been put forth would have, of itself, prevented the murder of Robert F. Kennedy. I intend to say more about this at another time.

It is incumbent upon men everywhere to recognize such underhandedness and expose it to the light of public opinion. Those who stoop to libel and slander, differ from the assassin only in the weapon they choose. With the one it is the tongue or pen, with the other a gun—the hatemonger is worse than the killer, for the last one kills only the body, the other murders reputation, peace, and order.

TAXPAYERS' MONEY—LET US SPEND IT WISELY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the years 1964 through 1968, more money was spent on national defense than was collected in individual taxes, by far the largest source of Federal revenue. In other words, every cent paid in income taxes was used for war and defense. This does not include the interest paid on the national debt, which is caused primarily by expenditures for past wars. In 1967, this amounted to more than $12.5 billion; more than $13.5 billion in 1968; and will exceed $14.4 billion next year. Also, this does not include expenditures for veterans' benefits and services, which cost taxpayers approximately $7 billion a year.

A nation's budget is a good indication of what a society values. Americans value their freedom above all else and are willing to pay for it. However, if taxpayers are informed that all of their personal income taxes are earmarked for national defense purposes, they should certainly insist on policies designed to seek peace and to avoid involvement in civil war in countries such as South Vietnam, which is of no strategic or economic importance to the defense of the United States—never was and never will be. They might also encourage their leaders to abandon the concept that the United States has a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world.

National priorities are reflected in the things on which our tax dollars are spent. Let us take a second look as to just what is important to us. Certainly, a nation that has spent as we have a huge total of more than $308 billion on fighting an undeclared war and for national defense within the past 5 years, and more than $122 billion on foreign aid in the last

two decades, certainly we Americans should surely spend at least $10 billion a year to eradicate poverty and hunger and want here at home.

THE POLITICAL DYNAMICS OF PROTEST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROOKE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, politics of protest has become a sign of these troubled times. And particularly in recent months it has become a dramatic feature of the contemporary academic scene.

The growing protest movement on our college and university campuses is too loud to be ignored and is still too new and unsystematic to be fully understood. But because the movement is so important, because its possible consequences are of such significance, it is essential that all of us—politicians, parents, academic administrators and faculty members, and the students themselves—make a most serious attempt to understand this movement.

Because this understanding is so vital, I invite the attention of Senators, and of the public as well, to a major speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] at the commencement exercises of Boston University on May 19, 1968. Senator BROOKE's analysis of the causes and possible consequences of the politics of protest in the academic community is always cogent and often brilliant.

Senator BROOKE properly notes that which is good and encouraging about the new interest and dynamic concern which characterize the student population of the 1960's. He also, however, accurately points to the potential dangers inherent in the more militant forms of student protests. In this connection he observes:

> Intemperate politics is almost always ineffective politics and that protest used cavalierly is a doubled-edged weapon which can damage its wielder as much or more than those at whom it is directed.

Senator BROOKE emphasizes this theme not because he rejects all the goals which the students seek, as do so many critics of the student protest movement. Rather, he urges temperance, because out of his deep understanding of the American political process he recognizes that unrestrained and irresponsible protest will generate its own backlash which will curb not only that which is bad and irrelevant among the goals sought by the student protesters but also that which is good and significant.

The Senator's views are effectively stated in one powerful paragraph which I endorse as my own:

> Briefly stated but deeply felt, my own views are that the right to protest is the right to persuade, not the right to paralyze; that the authoritarianism of protest is no better than the authoritarianism of repression; and that the disruption of great universities is a disservice to a free society.

I ask unanimous consent that the commencement address, entitled "The Political Dynamics of Protest," delivered by Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE at Boston University, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE POLITICAL DYNAMICS OF PROTEST

(Commencement address by Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE at Boston University, Boston, Mass.)

I am pleased and honored that you invited me to be with you today. This great university means much to me. It has been and is an intimate part of my life, as well as yours, and I have looked forward to being with you for many weeks.

Perhaps you have heard of the reporter whose editor told him never to state anything as a fact that he could not verify personally. The reporter's next story was about an important social event and read: "A Woman giving the name of Mrs. James Jones, who is reported to be one of the society leaders of the city, is said to have given what purported to be a party yesterday to a number of alleged ladies. The hostess claims to be the wife of a reputed attorney."

The reporter was a faithful employee, but I guess the editor realized well enough that it is possible to carry a good thing too far. That is no less true in politics than it is in journalism. I would like to raise with you today some of the issues posed by what I consider to be a case in point, the politics of protest which have become such a prominent feature of the contemporary academic scene.

The students of the nineteen-sixties have wrought great change in the reality and the image of American campus life. The silent generation of the last decade has given way to the vocal generation. But the differences between today's student activism and the behavior of previous college students are more than audible. The new style in campus practices has raised with special force a number of critical issues which had been quietly building under the placid surface of academic life for some time. This new style has, of course, formed part of a larger trend in our national history; it has been both cause and effect of the "new politics" which social commentators have described as the forerunner of a budding revolution in American institutions.

It is tempting to link the recent patterns of student behavior in this country with the resurgence of student activism in Paris, Warsaw, and in other cities abroad. Students in many countries, capitalist and communist alike, are displaying a new adamance in pressing for changes in the universities and the societies in which they live.

The objectives of these protests vary widely Many are obviously meritorious—demands for more relevant curricula, for more responsive channels of communication among administration, faculty, and students, for greater personal freedom, for students to govern their private lives, for admissions standards that promise greater opportunity to the more disadvantaged students in society, for greater university involvement in service to the community at large.

Many people have speculated about the causes of these trends. Some have seen the succession of disorders on campus as an outgrowth of a passionate disaffection with the war in Vietnam. Others suggest that the children of affluence who now inhabit most campuses, youngsters who have known little deprivation themselves, are insensitive to the need for order and the value of individual achievement. Still other critics wonder whether the problem lies in the fact that today's college generation has come to maturity without the psychological toughening of great crisis like the Second World War and the Depression. One also hears arguments stressing the impersonal quality of the modern "multiversity", a giant institution which, by growing less responsive to the needs of students as individuals, evokes frustrated responses on the part of students as a group. All these hypotheses are touched with plausibility, although none captures more than a particle of the whole truth.

Whatever the causes of today's student unrest, I am more interested in what the results of that unrest will be. In the universities, as in the rest of society, we need to ask: Are we witnessing the start of a downward spiral of social dissension which will end in self-destruction? Or can we direct the energies now being mobilized on campus into channels that transform our universities and our nation into better and more viable institutions? We would be naive to believe that a favorable answer to this question is pre-ordained. All who care about this university and others, all who appreciate the crucial interdependence of our schools and our society as a whole, all of us are going to have to devote our best efforts to seeing that the right directions are pursued and the right means used in our quest for change.

My own experience with students at B.U. and elsewhere gives me a degree of optimism about the role you and your peers will play in this continuing task. A quarter-century ago Robert Hutchins told the graduating class of the University of Chicago that "The most distressing aspect of the world into which you are going is its indifference to the basic issues, which now, as always, are moral issues." That complaint is still too true today, but I don't think it can be levelled at the generation now emerging from our universities. If you have the stamina to sustain your concern, the wisdom to guide your zeal, the outlook is promising indeed.

The shifts in student behavior have served to focus public attention on the distinctive functions of colleges and universities in our society. Amid the noise and distraction of the current scene it has grown more imperative than ever that we clearly conceive and stoutly protect the academic mission. If we are going to succeed in this necessary and permanent task, the many groups involved—students, faculty, and administrators in the universities, parents, politicians, and others in the general public—are going to have to move beyond the shouting stage and begin a serious, reasoned discussion of the central questions bearing on their mutual relationships.

Now that knowledge and the pursuit of knowledge have become big business, they are increasingly affected, as a lawyer would say, with "a public interest". Now that the identification and achievement of public purposes are increasingly dependent on the manpower and unique capabilities developed by the academic community, the public stake in a healthy system of higher education has grown enormously. Now that the costly burdens of maintaining this system have come to be shared by the public treasury, those directly dependent on the academic institutions have acquired a novel and very mixed bag of problems, including both a need to insure their own independence and a need to elicit continued and growing public support.

The new facts of academic life in America impose new responsibilities on all the parties involved. No one has a pat formula to resolve the dilemmas they raise. To the extent that the confrontations now taking place on many campuses are directed to these large and complex questions, they should be welcomed. An aroused student body can press the public and the academic community itself to deal concretely with these issues.

Today I would like to offer some personal thoughts on a few of the implications which impress me in the altered relationships of academe and society. I speak not as a preacher, but as a pragmatist; not as an annoyed elder, but as an involved official; not as a hostile outsider, but as a friendly beneficiary of American higher education. In all these

capacities I am deeply disturbed at the lengths to which some of them have had. Protests and demonstrations can be effective attention-getting devices. They can convey legitimate demands and highlight just grievances in a particularly potent fashion. Unfortunately, we are learning that they can also become vehicles for unworthy purposes, or can be applied with such crude and overbearing techniques that they can actually defeat the worthiest of ends. As Sir Walter Moberly once put it, "An honest intention to fight the Lord's battles is no guarantee against mistaken objectives or illegitimate methods of warfare."

It may date me terribly to cite the Greeks rather than the Existentialists, but I cannot help wondering how some student leaders could be so totally oblivious to the concept of the "golden mean." As a practicing politician, perhaps I am more aware than most that intemperate politics are almost always ineffective politics. To carry an argument to the point where those whom one is petitioning can only respond by appearing to cave in to force or pressure is, in my experience, a sure recipe for failure. Some of the more outrageous student uprisings of recent days seem to me to have gone well beyond the bounds of sensible political action. A number of these incidents have not sought to raise questions but to proclaim answers. The tendency has been not only to demand a role in the collective decision-making of the university at large, but to assert the right to pre-empt key decisions which properly belong to others. This has been true especially with respect to the rights of other students and faculty to carry on the normal processes of university study and teaching.

In my judgment the political result of these kinds of demonstrations, even more than in the case of civil rights protests in the wider society, has been to create the danger of a backlash that could do grave harm to the universities and to the country. The recklessness with which some student leaders have acted is not only unbecoming; it could well breed the most sinister type of reaction against intellectuals and the academic community generally. It can only feed the latent anti-intellectualism which Richard Hofstadter and others have found to be a continuing element in American life and politics.

I would argue that a good many of the present outbursts on campus proceed from a complete misreading of the experience of other protest movements, especially those in the civil rights field. The shrewdest and most influential leaders of civil rights demonstrations have always recognized the delicacy of protest as a political instrument. They have been acutely aware that, if used cavalierly, it is a double-edged weapon which can damage its wielder as much or more than those at whom it is directed. For this reason these men have consistently taken pains to tailor their use of this technique to specific, selected ends whose justice was indisputable. The sit-ins and the freedom rides of some years ago, the historic march on Washington in 1963, the Poor People's campaign now getting under way in the nation's capital, all these undertakings were planned with these principles in mind.

But where protest becomes the rule rather than the exception, its political value is dulled. When many campuses are torn by repeated, calculated disorders, potential sympathy for the particular complaints of individual protesters tends to collapse under the swelling antipathy of a majority who want an end to disruption. Thus, the likelihood grows that the protesters will not only fail in the first instance, but will weaken the utility of the protest mechanism for future application.

This possibility, which I believe is approaching reality in some respects, was well understood by Martin Luther King. The dynamics of campus protest and reaction are parallel to those in society as a whole. If an excess of ardor on the part of protesters discredits the process, orderly protest as well as disorderly protest may be tarred with contempt. If protest hereby becomes futile, social tensions will lose a vital outlet, social cleavages will widen, social animosities will intensify. As this process continues, the angry and the frustrated, whatever the justice of their discontent, will be prone to employ ever more violent means to register their feelings.

But once such a sad sequence has begun that will not be the end of it. It was the genius of Martin Luther King to perceive that, if such a trend persisted, the outcome could only be fatal to the cause of freedom and progress in our country. For it is wholly predictable that the upshot of this kind of development would be a victory for authoritarianism, with society resorting to increasingly stringent measures to preserve order.

Someone once said, and I fear that it may be true, that where the choice for society becomes one between freedom and order, it is freedom that will perish. That thesis has been confirmed in the history of too many other nations for America to dismiss it lightly. I would not for a moment compare the United States to the European states of the nineteen-twenties and thirties, where social fragmentation provoked the fierce oppression of right-wing reaction. There is no group of any consequence in America which espouses a philosophy fairly comparable to the authoritarian doctrines which came to prevail in parts of Europe. The United States is not on the verge, or even remotely in sight of, a possible fascist reaction.

My concern is both more modest and more real. To the extent that the disruption on college campuses becomes a part of wider disruption in our national life, the requirements of social order may come to dominate public debate and attention in this country. And, to put it candidly, I don't believe we can afford to be distracted in this manner from the greater and more urgent human tasks which lie ahead. Order is the first responsibility of government, but it is not the only responsibility, and I think it would be tragic if, at a moment when the interests and capacities of this nation have begun to focus on the lingering social inequities which plague us, we should be drawn into an expensive preoccupation with the problem of public order.

From my vantage point in the Senate it appears to me that far more is at stake in these episodes than the immediate prerogatives of individual protestors or administrators, or the general impressions which other groups hold of them. In the public mind and in the minds of many government officials, campus protests appear as part of a more general pattern of social disintegration. Because of this, they tend to confirm the rising inclinations of many citizens and officials to insist on strong punitive measures to meet such protests.

For example, the recent outbursts at Columbia and elsewhere, though actually irrelevant, have psychologically reinforced the efforts of those who are now waging a campaign for congressional approval of harsh law enforcement legislation, legislation which would reverse a number of the most humane and essential decisions in the history of the Supreme Court. To many of those alarmed by the incidents of recent years, Berkeley and Columbia seem intimately related to Watts and Detroit as symbols of the creeping chaos which threatens society. Leaders of campus demonstrations ought to recognize this effect of their actions. If they do, I doubt that they will consider it a happy result of their endeavors, for it strengthens political forces which seek quite divergent ends from their own. And I, for one, believe this factor deserves some weight in determining what form and content of campus demonstrations are prudent and politically constructive.

When protest as a political technique is abused, it only provides fresh fodder for those who wish an excuse for inaction. They can, and, believe me, they do harp on the theme that to respond affirmatively to the demands of rowdy or disruptive protestors is to reward intimidation, even if they admit that the demands have merit. Few things are better designed to make it difficult for anyone in authority to respond to protests in a conciliatory way than to expose them to charges that doing so is an act of cowardice. Neither college administrators nor public officials are going to relish having their manhood and courage impugned.

Apart from the influence of campus protests on the general political climate of the land, I sense other implications that bear quite directly on the relationships between universities and government. As I have already mentioned, those connections have become closely intertwined in the years since the Second World War. By and large the rising financial assistance by government to the academic community and the increased involvement of academics in matters of public policy have been fortunate and fruitful developments. The federal government, both through its research support and through its direct assistance programs, has become a principal source of necessary funds to colleges and universities. Virtually no center of learning in America could continue to operate effectively if federal support were abruptly withdrawn.

Lately, however, research and development appropriations have leveled off somewhat and some trouble spots have appeared in what was previously a smooth relationship. Considerable resentment has appeared in Congress and elsewhere toward those members of the academic community who have benefitted from public support and who now are so vocal in attacking public policies and public institutions. It is an attitude compounded of many things, resentment at the comparative affluence of modern academics, hostility toward the presumed meddling by scholars in subjects outside their fields of expertise, annoyance that universities do not appear more grateful for the privileged position they occupy in our society. Added to these nettles one now finds growing distress in and out of Congress with what is said to be the antisocial action of colleges and universities in turning out teeming crowds of vociferous protesters, of would-be revolutionaries.

A few years ago one might have smiled at these exaggerated sentiments and dismissed them out of hand. But today one has to contend with the unhappy prospect that they will combine with other pressures to force a cutback in federal support for higher education. If this were actually to happen, I believe the nation would suffer severely. For example, over 65% of the total budget of MIT comes from federal funds. I have noticed in my work on the Senate Space Committee that a comparably high fraction of the Caltech budget comes from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. If the warm and constructive ties between government and academe went sour, the effects on these and other major research centers would be disastrous.

However much one may condemn the notion of this kind of legislative reprisal, however much one may denounce it as an infringement of academic freedom, the danger is a real one. You all know that the House of Representatives has passed a prohibition on the use of federally-financed loans and scholarships for students involved in a "serious obstruction" of college activity. Other symptoms of rising congressional venom on this score are not yet visible, but they exist. In one of my committees this week we had a strenuous argument concerning a proposal

to withhold federal funds from any university which bars military recruiters from its campus. And in a related development only nine members of the Senate voted against an amendment which, by denying federal jobs to rioters, seeks to make the civil service another instrument for punishing those who take part in future disorders. If you find it difficult to see the connection between these seemingly disparate events, I wish you could hear for yourselves the way riots, campus disturbances, the crime problem, and other issues mingle in the conversation of many of my colleagues. We are observing what could become a damaging reaction to disorderly behavior in many fields, including academic life, and the opportunities for political retaliation are numerous.

I am not at all suggesting that events are likely to move in this direction. We are not in eminent danger of an exorbitant reduction in federal funds for higher education. I am only anxious to underline the way in which complex issues interact to affect public policy in this field. Campus protests are not about to cause a severance of these relationships. But indirectly and subtly, they contribute to an environment in which Congress is likely to be less rather than more generous in nourishing the institutions of learning in this country.

On questions such as these no one has the final word. Free men are obliged to make their own judgments on them. Each of us must reach his own faith and proclaim it, not as a binding guide to others but as a commitment of himself. So I do not presume to tell student protesters what they should or should not do. I ask only that they consider the larger political context in which they act and judge for themselves whether their determined efforts to achieve local goals are important enough to jeopardize the other values at stake.

Briefly stated but deeply felt, my own views are that the right to protest is the right to persuade, not the right to paralyze; that the authoritarianism of protest is no better than the authoritarianism of repression; and that the disruption of great universities is a disservice to a free society.

I believe that these principles are in fact shared by the great majority of American college students. I also believe that, even among the minority of student activists who have gone beyond the bounds of peaceful protest, these principles will gain rather than lose strength from the troubled events of recent months. The coercive encounters of these days can and must give way to the cooperative endeavors of tomorrow. Faculty and administration will have to join hands with students in an active collaboration to meet the serious challenges which have arisen to threaten the university. The earnest dialogue now underway on many campuses is a hopeful sign. Administrations whose indifference or conservatism tended to provoke student unrest must now respond constructively to the legitimate grievances voiced by some protesters. Those administrations whose sympathetic and prompt responses to justifiable criticism have maintained harmony and progress provide a model for others to follow. Just as the persistent efforts of students and faculty have been a spur to the campaign for peace in Southeast Asia, so, too, their perserverance can work a resolution in American higher education, a revolution that emphasizes not force, but freedom, not selfish design, but social purpose.

My ambitions for this generation are high and soaring. I greatly admire your candor and your freshness, your personal integrity and your collective talent. I hope that you will continue to do what you do best: Help make the world un-safe for hypocrisy.

GOLD-PLATED SHELL GAME

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, often we have been discussing the international monetary problems and what to do about them here in this Chamber. Just last Thursday an interesting fact came to my attention which I think should have a bearing on our discussions and make us more aware of the ease with which supposed facts can be manipulated to give an erroneous impression.

The International Monetary Fund is one of the most cloudy operations existing today. Very few of us have any understanding of how it operates and those of us who have tried to become knowledgeable on international monetary policy, or to keep up with the current status, find that often things are not what they seem.

For instance, although the IMF holdings of member currencies is listed at almost $18 billion, the Wall Street Journal quotes insiders as saying that the amount available for lending is probably closer to about $3 billion. That is a difference of $15 billion and indicates that the IMF is in a much different financial state than one would conclude from the published reports.

In the same story we have a reported instance of double dealing in accounting. The IMF keeps $800 million in gold with the U.S. Treasury as payment for interest earning short term Treasury securities. The IMF can recoup this gold at the time the investments are terminated, that is, the gold is obligated, it is not free and clear. Yet we find that this gold is listed by the U.S. Treasury as part of its gold stock of $10.4 billion.

Mr. President, if anyone goes to a bank and lists as an asset some property which is mortgaged 100 percent, and does not report the mortgage, I should think he could be prosecuted for fraud if he attempted to get a loan on the strength of such an accounting.

Here we are, the Senate of the United States of America, asked to deal with tax matters, international monetary policies, pending revenue and spending problems, and the Treasury of the United States plays a gold-plated shell game in reporting the gold stocks of the United States.

Mr. President, when such matters come to light, I am not surprised that confidence in the dollar appears to be in doubt. My confidence in the candor of the Treasury and of this administration is very doubtful also. I imagine the people feel the same way. I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

IMF LIFTS SOME GOLD DEPOSITED WITH UNITED STATES, REFLECTING AID GOING TO FRANCE AND ENGLAND

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—The International Monetary Fund reclaimed some gold it had deposited in the U.S. Treasury stock, it was learned, underscoring the strains posed by the massive aid the IMF is providing for the currencies of France and England.

While the $17 million in gold withdrawn from the Treasury early this week is small, the action focuses attention on the "cosmetic" nature of the special deposits the IMF has been making for several years; these allow the same gold to be shown in the statistics of both the U.S. and the 107-country IMF.

Most importantly, monetary observers suggest, the willingness of the IMF to adversely affect the U.S. gold statistics shows that it's more worried now about the stability of currencies other than the dollar, and that it's entering a period of squeeze on its own readily available cash.

Although IMF holdings of members' currencies total almost $18 billion, insiders say, the amount of currencies considered suitable for lending probably isn't valued at much more than $3 billion, and the readily usable funds the IMF could borrow from several big countries would buttress this by only another $2 billion or so.

Basically, the IMF lends currencies to countries having a balance-of-payments deficit, which occurs where more money leaves a country than is returned by foreigners in all dealings.

The gold withdrawal, which is expected to show up within a few days as a shrinkage in the U.S. gold stock, was prompted by the IMF's need to spend $182 million of its gold to buy foreign currencies which France drew on Tuesday; the remainder of the $745 million French drawing was available from the IMF's existing stock of currencies of member nations.

The IMF is also said to be withdrawing $3 million of the $44.4 million in gold it has deposited in the British official stock. The deposts in the U.S. and Britain were started in 1966. They were aimed at offsetting the drain caused by small countries buying gold from these two key monetary nations in order to make mandatory payments of gold to the IMF in connection with increases in their quotas, or subscriptions.

The IMF's deposits in the U.S. Treasury totaled $246.9 million as of last Friday. In addition, the IMF since the late 1950s has kept $800 million of its gold with the U.S. Treasury as payment for interest-earning short-term Treasury securities; legally, the IMF can recoup this gold whenever the investments are terminated. The IMF gold deposits and investment allow the Treasury to report a gold stock of about $10.4 billion instead of only the $9.3 billion that the U.S. owns outright.

The original understanding reached in 1965 was that gold deposits would be pulled out only when the fund needed the precious metal in "normal" circumstances. It was agreed last fall that the devaluation of the British pound wasn't normal; therefore, the British drawing of $1.4 billion in various currencies, which was arranged on a "stand-by" basis then and which Britain yesterday said it plans to carry out, was to be implemented without withdrawing any gold deposits, a U.S official said.

Nevertheless, some changes in the British drawing arrangements will have to be made, strategists said. This is because $231 million of French francs was to be part of the package, but the doubts cast on the strength of the franc by the French disorders works against their use. The difference will have to be made up by extra amounts of currencies from other nations. Because U.S. payments deficits have put too many dollars in foreign hands already, it's expected that the U.S. share of $250 million will be raised little, if at all.

The "rejuggling" of the contents of the British drawing, an authority said, means that it won't be forthcoming at least until sometime next week. A prerequisite meeting of the "Group of Ten" key industrial countries that are directly providing part of the funds to be lent by the IMF isn't scheduled to take place until next Tuesday, he explained. The Group of Ten consists of the U.S., Britain, France, Canada, Sweden, Japan, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Belgium.

AGENCY'S PROCEDURE

On the ground that the French drawing was a more or less "normal" operation, it's understood, the IMF decided to implement the previously confidential understanding that when necessary in such instances it

would sell identical percentages of gold from its own stock-on-hand ($2.73 billion at the end of April) and from its deposits in the U.S. and U.K. The IMF probably won't resort to gold sales in financing routine drawings of modest amounts by small countries, an expert said, but presumably would sell more gold if such small drawings led to a large cumulative drain.

With the French and British drawings totaling some $2.1 billion, which an analyst said would clearly be a record for any month, strategists are hoping the IMF won't have to cope with any more big demands in the near future. The bulk of the currencies it has on hand are those of big countries having payments-deficit problems, such as the U.S. and the U.K., or of smaller or poorer countries ranging from Afghanistan to Zambia, whose currencies aren't well-established in foreign exchange markets.

While precise figures aren't available, it's authoritatively estimated that the IMF's stock of other currencies with a history of regular successful use in drawings is valued at about $2 billion, and that it has on hand perhaps $1 billion of currencies that sometimes have been useful. Beyond these direct holdings, countries other than the U.S. and U.K. in the Group of Ten are committed to lend the IMF about $2 billion in various currencies on request. Lest the IMF run too low on usable currencies to meet their drawing demands, it's understood, smaller nations have pressed the institution to make the gold sales to acquire more currencies.

"LONDON GOLD POOL"

In another development, the Treasury issued a report showing that several participants in the old "London Gold Pool" bought gold from the U.S. during the first quarter of this year. Prior to the pool's abandonment March 17, the U.S. and six other nations provided gold through it to hold the private market price close to the fixed price of $35 an ounce at which the Treasury deals in gold with other governments.

Previous reports that the other participants were compensating for their pool losses by buying Treasury gold had been vigorously denied by the various governments; an aide yesterday observed, however, that whether some of the purchases were for that purpose or motivated by other reasons depends on "the way you look at it."

Of the six foreign pool participants, only West Germany was notably absent from the list, which showed these net sales to the other five in the first quarter: Italy, $184 million of gold; the Netherlands, $48.5 million; Belgium, $25 million; Switzerland, $25 million, and the U.K., $899.6 million. The U.K. total is in line with previous reports on the gold sent to London as the U.S. share of the operation, but the report left open the possibility that some went separately to the British government. The transactions with the U.K., it said, "include settlements for gold pool operations."

NO AMERICAN SHOULD GO HUNGRY OR UNDERNOURISHED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is a shocking fact that poor Americans are four times as likely to die before the age of 35 as the average citizen. The effects of poverty begin before birth. Poor women receive prenatal care less often than others. In maternity wards in public hospitals 45 percent of the women have had no prenatal care whatever. This increases by threefold the likelihood of their giving birth prematurely. Mental retardation occurs 10 times more often in very small premature babies than in those born at full term. Negro women in Mississippi and some other States die in childbirth six times as often as white women. In some urban ghettoes in the North one child in 10 dies in infancy. In more affluent communities and in rural America in the Midwest and West infant mortality is very much less. Ten million Americans, mostly children, suffer from chronic hunger or malnutrition. Also, those born in deep poverty too often are the victims of dietary deficiencies that affect development of the brain. By the time these children reach the ages of five or six and attend public schools where they may receive one hot meal a day, the damage is done and is irreversible.

The health gap between the rich and poor is a continuing national disaster. This is an unconscionable situation and must not be permitted in the richest Nation in the world. Every effort must be made by the Congress before adjournment this year to provide all Americans, regardless of their economic status, with an adequate and balanced diet. Otherwise, in tolerating the situation we condemn millions of Americans and thousands of babies born each year to a lifetime of second-class citizenship.

NEW POTENTIAL TO ELIMINATE HUNGER

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, all of us deeply resent needless waste of human life. Recent studies of hunger and malnutrition in the United States have very dramatically touched that cord of resentment. We are so struck because we find this happening in our country which has the highest agricultural productivity, the most advanced marketing structure, and the finest research in the field of nutrition of any nation in the world.

One scientific breakthrough that contributes to our potential to eliminate hunger is fish protein concentrate. A recent Chicago Tribune article tells the story of the struggle to obtain FDA approval for use of fish flour as a dietary supplement in this country. Senator Paul Douglas was greatly instrumental in that struggle. Due in large part to his efforts we now have an important new tool with which to fight human suffering.

I ask unanimous consent that the article telling the story of VioBin, the Illinois firm that has contributed such important leadership to the mass production of fish flour, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 2, 1968]

FISH FLOUR SEEN AS CURE FOR WORLD FAMINE

(By Richard Orr)

(First of two articles describing how protein-rich food from the sea may help solve the world hunger problem.)

MONTICELLO, ILL., June 1.—From a laboratory in a small, unimposing building in this central Illinois town comes a protein-rich seafood product that holds promise for helping solve the vast and complex problem of world hunger.

The product is a fine, light tan powder, tasteless and odorless, that is made by grinding up whole fish—head, viscera, scales, and all. It's called fish protein concentrate, but is more commonly known as fish flour or FPC.

The laboratory is in the plant of VioBin corporation, a privately owned food additive and pharmaceutical firm. Owner, president, and director of research is Ezra Levin, 75, a biochemist who lives in nearby Champaign, Ill.

GROWING TOO FAST

Levin notes that the world population is growing faster than its ability to feed itself adequately. Two-thirds of the world's people inhabit the under-developed countries of Africa, Latin America, and Asia, where hunger and malnutrition are widespread even now.

In the next 15 years, demographers predict, one billion more people will have been added to the world population, four-fifths of them in the regions that already are short of food. By the year 2000, today's population will have doubled to 6 billion.

Levin contends that agriculture alone cannot solve the problem. The world, he says, must turn to the sea, where an abundance of marine life can supply a wealth of nutrition to supplement the protein-deficient diets of hundreds of millions of hungry people.

Fish flour is rich in protein and cheap to produce. VioBin has been producing it for 12 years, and in that time has sold or dispensed free more than 50,000 tons to hospitals, health research centers, and universities for experiment, particularly in the hunger areas.

It was a little more than a year ago that the food and drug administration approved use of FPC for human consumption in the United States. Last December, FPC won approval from a committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

And it was only a month ago that the Agency for International Development granted its first commercial contract for the production of FPC for the food-for-freedom program. The agency ordered $900,000 worth of fish flour from Alpine Marine Protein Industries, Inc., New Bedford, Mass., a company formerly owned by VioBin and now licensed to produce FPC.

OPENS UP THE SEA

"This is the beginning of a much broader development," said Levin. "It opens up the sea to its great potential for feeding the hungry."

The FDA had withheld its approval for six years, first on aesthetic grounds, and later because it said it was not satisfied with the chemical methods used to produce the product. Although FDA approval was not necessary to market FPC for human consumption abroad, other nations were reluctant to build processing plants until the product was approved for use in the United States.

TURNS OUT 6,000 POUNDS DAILY

Also approved by the FDA was a different process for producing FPC, developed by the department of the interior's bureau of commercial fisheries. In March, 1967, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall announced the government would build a one-million-dollar pilot plant for the manufacture of fish flour in the Pacific northwest, but construction there has not yet started.

VioBin is producing FPC in its plant here, which turns out 6,000 pounds daily, and through its Massachusetts licensee, which has a capacity of 40,000 pounds every day. Three more plants are planned which will be licensed by VioBin.

Fish flour is not used for human consumption by itself. A small quantity of the concentrate is added to wheat flour or to the processed products of other cereals—such as corn or rice—that go into various foods like bread, cookies, macaroni, noodles, soups, pastries, and confections.

Because its protein content is as high as 80 per cent [double that of milk], 5 to 10 per cent FPC added to any cereal gives a protein quality of the total mixture equal to meat or milk, Levin said.

Fish flour is produced by VioBin in a two-stage process. First, the whole fish is ground

up and the oil and water removed by solvent extraction. Then the dried, defatted product is run through another process with alcohol to deodorize it.

Thus far, FDA approval of fish flour for human consumption is limited to its manufacture from hake, a member of the cod family, or hake-like fish. But Levin says the concentrate can be manufactured from any animal life that lives in the sea.

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 3, 1968]

FISH FLOUR IS "FOR THE BIRDS," SOME EXPERTS ASSERT

(By Richard Orr)

(Second of two articles describing how protein-rich food from the sea may help solve the world hunger problem.)

Monticello, Ill., June 2—Not every expert on the subject agrees with Ezra Levin that the answer to the world famine is to be found finally in the sea. There are those who do not agree that agriculture, with all its scientific innovations and techniques, must eventually fail in its ultimate role of serving hungry millions.

But few can claim more dedication to the problem. And certainly few, if any, are more enthusiastic in their devotion to the idea that in the abundance of fish protein lies the eventual solution to the hunger and malnutrition that afflicts two-thirds of the world's population in the under-developed countries of Africa, Latin America, and Asia.

Levin is president and research director of BioVin corporation, a food additive and pharmaceutical firm here. His dedication and enthusiasm are based on 15 years of research and development of a process to manufacture fish protein concentrate, more commonly known as fish flour or FPC.

HOPE LIES IN THE SEA

"I believe the only hope for feeding the world wide famine is in the sea," he said. "The nutritional element primarily lacking in the diet of the malnourished is animal protein, whether meat, fish, eggs, or milk."

After a year-long study of the world food problem, President Johnson's science advisory committee issued a report, which said: "Taken as a whole, the seas contain a tremendous potential for world feeding. Only a few dozen of the 20,000 to 25,000 species of fish are used directly or indirectly as food by man.

"The potential, however, is but the beginning. In order to achieve even a part of this potential, large expenditures of money on boats and equipment to catch and process the fish will be required and this will entail time as well as money."

TWO PROBLEMS REMAIN

"The problem of whether acceptable fish are available off the coast of certain developing countries remains, as does the acceptability of fish in some of these cultures. . . ."

Johnson more than a year ago ordered Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to proceed "on an urgent basis" with the development of methods of converting fish protein into a usable source of food for humans. The bureau of commercial fisheries has an approved process, but as yet no plant, for making fish flour.

DEVELOP AN IDEA

Levin has both an approved process and a small plant, as well as a larger licensed plant, which already are in production. Three other licenses are planning construction of plants.

"Our objective is not to own plants, but to develop an idea," he said. "The price of FPC protein, at less than one-half the price of milk protein, is factual and realistic.

"Fifteen years of research and development have made the utilization of the sea for food, live stock feed, industrials, and chemicals an immediate reality. A plant to produce FPC for human and animal use that would be amortized in five years can be erected anywhere in the world where fish are available."

SAUCE FROM SQUID

Levin led a reporter to his laboratory where he poured a dark brown liquid from a vial into a cup, added hot water, and said, "Taste it, it's good." It was good, with a taste similar to strong beef bouillon.

"That's a source we're making experimentally out of squid," Levin explained. "FPC made from squid is good quality protein, not quite as good as fish itself, but better than soybeans and other types of good vegetable protein."

A glass jar contained a sample of dry fish powder made from krill, a species of small shrimp which feed on tiny plants called phytoplankton and which in turn are eaten by whales and other fish.

"Krill can be used for human food, and there are 100 million tons of it available annually," said Levin. "Russian reports indicate that 5 to 10 metric tons of krill can be caught with an ordinary industrial trawl in 30 minutes to an hour.

"Five hundred million tons of fish are available each year to make FPC. This represents a quantity that would fill the needs of the total protein requirement of all the people inhabiting our earth at the end of the century, when there will be 6 billion of us."

Levin believes that fish can provide the food for the "have not" nations so they can survive economically and politically.

He said that not only food, but animal feed, chemicals, industrial products for sale in the world markets, will lift their standards of living, give them foreign exchange, and provide them with dignity and independence.

"If the 'have' nations could help the developing countries produce more food and prevent starvation, we would have the common denominator to bring the world together for a common purpose in a common crisis," Levin said.

COMMENDATION OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to speak a word of thanks to J. Edgar Hoover and the men and women of the FBI. The capture of James Earl Ray, suspected slayer of Martin Luther King, last Saturday brought to a close one of the greatest manhunts in the country.

We all know this man Ray was captured in London, England. He was there only en transit, for he was continually on the move in an effort to avoid the relentless pursuit of the FBI. But no matter how often he moved, how frequently he changed his name, he was never able to shake these highly trained and dedicated men.

They received tremendous assistance from Canadian law enforcement authorities. Thousands upon thousands of passport applications were thoroughly inspected and analyzed for some clue as to the location and the course of flight that might have been taken. A tedious painstaking task; a task seemingly impossible; but nevertheless diligently pursued by many dedicated agents.

All these efforts were not in vain. They culminated in the apprehension of the man who was sought.

I hope the capture of Ray will be a lesson to two classes of people. First, I hope all who might ever consider committing an assassination will realize that law enforcement agencies throughout the free world will do everything possible to bring about their capture. Second, I hope these selfish critics who have accused Mr. Hoover and the FBI of giving less than their best where crimes against civil rights activities are concerned will once and for all realize that their unfounded charges, are preposterous and entirely out of order.

STATUS OF HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that the International Year for Human Rights 1968 observance would provide the needed effort for action by this Nation on the human rights conventions.

So far, this has clearly not been recognized. To date, only the Supplementary Convention on Slavery has gained Senate approval. We must break the stalemate involving the Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Freedom of Association, and Political Rights of Women.

Our participation in the small group of the United Nations members that have failed to ratify any of these human rights treaties has become an increasing diplomatic embarrassment. The friends of America cannot understand it. Our enemies certainly exploit it. Our continuing failure to ratify any human rights conventions represents a costly anachronism which we should eliminate as quickly as possible.

An updated statistical table revealing the status of the human rights conventions is herewith presented for examination and I ask that it be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

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

WHAT ACTION OR INACTION BY UNITED STATES ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Convention	Date adopted by U.N.	Total ratification by U.N. members	Submitted to U.S. Senate by President	Ratified in U.S. Senate
Genocide	1948	71	Yes (1949)	No.
Freedom of Association	1948	74	Yes (1949)	No.
Slavery Supplement	1956	70	Yes (1963)	Yes (Nov. 2, 1967).
Political Rights of Women	1952	54	Yes (1963)	No.
Forced Labor	1957	78	Yes (1963)	No.
Employment Discrimination	1958	59	No	No.
Equal Remuneration	1951	54	No	No.
Discrimination in Education	1960	36	No	No.
Racial Discrimination	1965	14	No	No.

IS THE NEW VIETCONG PROGRAM REALLY NEW?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last September the so-called National Liberation Front of South Vietnam—NLFSV—published a new and ostensibly more moderate program. Among other things, it promised general elections, direct and secret ballots, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech, press, assembly, and organization. To implement this program, it called for the setting up of a government of national union.

The program was hailed at the time as an evidence that more moderate elements might now be in control of the Vietcong and that these elements might be disposed to enter into a compromise arrangement with the South Vietnamese Government. To this day, one sees periodic references in newspaper articles to the supposed moderation of the National Liberation Front program.

By way of dealing with such over-the-rainbow speculation, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an analysis of the new NLF program written by Mr. Daniel Teodoru, a graduate student at Brooklyn College.

In an effort to find out if there was anything really new in the NLF's so-called new program, Mr. Teodoru submitted it to a paragraph by paragraph comparison with the program put out by the Vietnam Fatherland Front—VNFF—under Ho Chi Minh in 1955.

The result of this comparative analysis is nothing short of startling.

Despite minor differences, the two programs set themselves virtually the same political objectives. Not merely this, but in some cases entire sentences were repeated virtually verbatim.

The program promulgated by Ho Chi Minh's fatherland front in 1955 sought to rally the broadest possible support for the reunification of Vietnam. This essentially political approach was made necessary, as Mr. Teodoru points out, after Moscow vetoed General Giap's plans to invade the South.

The manifesto did not talk about communism. It did not even talk about imperialism. In words carefully chosen for their moderation, the manifesto said:

> In the conception of *broad unity* launched by President Ho Chi Minh, the Fatherland Front will rally all the national democratic and peace loving forces in the country. It will frustrate all the maneuvers aimed at sabotaging peace, at dividing our country. It will build up a peaceful Vietnam unified, independent, democratic, prosperous and strong.

Because it is stalemated militarily today, the National Liberation Front has reached the same conclusion that Ho Chi Minh originally reached in 1955—that victory, if it is to be achieved, will have to be achieved primarily through political means.

The new NLF program has therefore been tailored as a model of moderation—to use its words—"with a view to further broadening the bloc of great national unity."

As Mr. Teodoru rightly points out:

> The new program can only be considered new in that, unlike the NLF's 1961 program, it fully exhibits Hanoi's control over the NLF—even down to the wording of the text.

Let me give you only one example from Mr. Teodoru's comparative tabulation of the text of the Vietnam fatherland front program of 1955 and the text of the new NLF program for 1967.

In the 1955 program the section on "proposed government" said:

> A National Assembly to be elected by free, general elections . . . Electoral procedure to be based on universal suffrage equal, direct and secret ballot.

The parallel section of the NLF's new 1967 program is worded in these virtually identical terms:

> To hold free general elections to elect the National Assembly in a really democratic way in accordance with the principle of universal, equal direct suffrage and secret ballot.

Let there be no mistake about the so-called new program of the NLF. It is not really new. It is simply the old Ho Chi Minh "democratic" boobytrap, slightly restyled to fit changed circumstances.

Mr. President, I hope that Senators will find the time to study Mr. Teodoru's comparative analysis, and I therefore ask the unanimous consent to insert it into the RECORD at this point.

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

ON THE "NEW" PROGRAMME OF THE NLF

("Any realistic appraisal of the present possibilities for peace must take into consideration the whole sweep of events in Vietnam since the end of the Second World War."—ROBERT SHAPLEN.)

(By Daniel E. Teodoru)

On September 2, 1955 Ho Chi Minh declared, "We are ready to unite with whoever from North to South approves of peace, unity, independence and democracy regardless of with whom they collaborated in the past." On September 10, 1955 the Vietnam Fatherland Front (VNFF) came into existence to serve that very purpose. Its task, according to its Manifesto, was, "In the conception of *broad unity* launched by President Ho Chi Minh, the Fatherland Front will rally all the national democratic and peace loving forces in the country. It will frustrate all the maneuvers aimed at sabotaging peace, at dividing our country. It will build up a peaceful Viet Nam unified, independent, democratic, prosperous and strong." [1] It also claimed that, "its members belong to different social strata and represent the most diverse political tendencies."

This program came at a time when, after Moscow had vetoed General Vo Nguyen Giap's plans to invade the South for refusing to hold nation-wide elections to unify Vietnam as allegedly promised at Geneva in 1954,[2] the Lao Dong Party realized that it would have to resort to political means in order to take over the south. Hanoi had also realized that the cause of anti-colonialism could not serve to rally the people against the Diem regime. Indeed, even Ho Chi Minh had to admit that, "After all, Diem is a patriot after his own fashion." [3] This is why Hanoi dissolved the the Vietnam Association for National Unity (Lien-Viet Front) which was geared towards "unity" to fight "colonialism" and created the Vietnam Fatherland Front (VNFF) geared toward "unity" to fight for "reunification" of Vietnam. But the war-weary and suspicious Southerners had neither any great love for the Northerners nor any great desire to go to war for reunification.[4]

Realizing this, in December 1960, Hanoi created the bogus National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (NLFSV) which was claimed to be "totally southern in character" and fighting only for *Southern* "independence and democracy." It played down reunification and concentrated on exploiting the "evils of the My-Diem dictatorship" in Saigon. With the demise of Diem in 1963 and the subsequent involvement of the United States in 1965, the NLFSV had first (in 1963) lost its basic cause (anti-Diemism) and subsequently (in 1965) lost what looked like near victory. Today stalemated militarily and convinced of its inability to win by force, the NLFSV has, as Hanoi had in 1955, realized that victory can only come through political means. Observing that its "violence program" [5] is not bringing about victory the NLFSV has concentrated on promoting the same kind of "broad unity" that the VNFF program sought in order to obtain victory politically rather than militarily. As the preface to the so-called "new" program states, "At this juncture . . . the NLFSV has worked out this Political Program *with a view to further broadening the bloc of great national union* and stimulating the entire people to rush forward." [6]

The program was designed to draw in all the dissident non-communist factions. Obviously, the timing of its appearance—one month before the Presidential elections—was designed to fully exploit the controversies of the period and to offer a political alternative to the losers of the election just as the VNFF program—also appearing one month before the people of South Vietnam were to choose between Diem and Bao Dai—was aimed at providing an alternative to the inevitable winner, Diem.

Despite the glaring similarity between the 1955 VNFF and the 1967 NLFSV programs, both in terms of timing and manifest intents, many otherwise mature Vietnam journalists and scholars claim to find something "new" in the so-called "New" NLFSV program. However, a comparison of the two documents on their major propositions shows an amazing similarity, even down to the wording. Parts quoted from both texts below, when examined against their historical backgrounds, I hope will clearly show that there is nothing new about the new NLFSV program and that it is rather a demonstration of Hanoi's rigidity and inability to escape its methods of the past. The new program can only be considered new in that, unlike the NLF's 1961 program, it fully exhibits Hanoi's control of the NLFSV—even down to the wording of the text.

---

[1] Vietnam Fatherland Front. Resolutions, Manifesto, Program and Statutes. Hanoi: Foreign Language Press, 1956.

[2] Brian Crozier, "Southeast Asia and Communist Subversion," in S. Ray (ed.) "Vietnam: Seen From East and West." New York: F. A. Praeger, 1966.

[3] Jean Lacouture, "Vietnam: Between Two Truces." New York: Random House, 1966.

[4] Philippe Devillers, "The Struggle for the Unification of Vietnam," *China Quarterly*, October–December 1962.

[5] Douglas Pike, "How Strong is the NLF?", *The Reporter*, Feb. 24, 1966.

[6] "Political Program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation," *Vietnam Courrier*, September 7, 1967.

PROGRAM OF THE VNFF, 1955	PROGRAM OF TH NLFSV, 1967
Proposed government and legislature	
A National Assembly to be elected by free, general elections . . . Electoral procedure to be based on universal suffrage equal, direct and secret ballot . . . (National Assembly) to be the supreme lawmaking body of the State. It will work out a new Constitution for the whole country. Parliamentary privileges of all members of the National Assembly, including the opposition, to be effectively guaranteed . . . The formation of a coalition government to be aimed at reinforcing the unity between political parties, social classes, the various nationalities and religions in Vietnam.	To hold the free general elections to elect the National Assembly in a really democratic way in accordance with the principle of universal, equal direct suffrage and secret ballot. This National Assembly will be the State body with the highest authority in South Vietnam; it will work out a democratic constitution . . . to guarantee the immunity of the deputies to the National Assembly . . . To set up a national union democratic government incuding the most representative persons among the various social strata, nationalities, religious communities, patriotic parties, patriotic personalities and forces, which have contributed to the cause of national liberation.
Civil liberties	
The Vietnamese people to have the right of freedom of religious beliefs, of speech, press, assembly, organization (political and other), residence, movement, correspondence, etc.	To proclaim and enforce broad democratic freedoms: freedom of speech, freedom of the press and publication, freedom of assembly, trade unions freedom, freedom of association, freedom to form political parties, freedom of creed, freedom of demonstration . . . freedom of residence and lodging, secrecy of corespondence, freedom of movement.
National economy	
To repair the ravages of war and improve the life of the people, the national economy to be restored . . . in order gradually to raise Vietnam from an economically backward country to an advanced industrial country, prosperious and strong. . . . Private industry and commerce to be protected. . . . Restoration and development of private industrial and commercial enterprises useful to the State economy and the people's livelihood to be encouraged.	To build an independent and self-supporting economy. To rapidly heal the wounds of war, to restore and develop the economy so as to make the people rich and the country powerful. . . To protect the right to enforce freedom of enterprises to the benefit of national construction and the people's welfare.
Land reform	
Land reform to be carried out through purchases by the State at a fair and reasonable price, of land belonging to landlords who hold above a certain amount.	The State will negotiate the purchase of land from landlords who possess land upward of a certain amount.
Foreign relations	
Diplomatic relations to be established and maintained with any country in the world on the basis of the five following principles: mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-aggression, and non-interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, peaceful coexistence. Non-adherence to any military bloc.	To establish diplomatic relations with all countries regardless of their social and political system on the principles of mutual respect for each other's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, without infringement upon each other's territory, without interference in each other's internal affairs, equality, mutual benefits and peaceful coexistence . . . to join no military alliance.

In a recent article Hoc Tap, the official journal of the Lao Dong (Vietnam Communist Party) boasted of the Party's victories since the creation of the Indo-Chinese Communist Party in 1930. (Interestingly, it also listed the NLFSV as the product of its handicraft.) Its major tactic for victory was that it, "cleverly took advantage of the regional and temporary contradictions of the enemy to sow division among them . . . it united with anyone who could be united and won over."[7] Such flexibility is exhibited in the "New" program of the NLFSV. Those of us who naively take it at face value have no excuse. Hanoi has openly warned us of its deceptive willingness to momentarily unite with anyone whenever advantageous toward its end—Communization of all Vietnam.

[7] "Let Us Step Up the Theory of Formulating Task of the Party," *Hoc Tap*, September 1966.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATIONS ACT, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15856) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. 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. ANDERSON. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks that I hope will help keep the space program in a proper and favorable perspective.

The essence of the space program is probing into the unknown. When man probes the unknown, he often comes up with findings of value.

Until the U.S. space program got underway, the moon, the stars, and the planets were largely unknown, except for what we had learned from earth-based telescopes and theoretical speculation. It was important for us to investigate these other bodies in outer space. Information about our solar system, our own environment, is something we simply should and must have; not just to satisfy scientific curiosity; not just to keep a researcher busy in a university laboratory, but because the degeneration of life on another planet or the possibility of yet-unborn life on another can be of vital importance to us here on earth. The composition of the moon, its history and its geologic processes, can tell us much about our own past and future.

In a mood of apprehension following sputnik, but also with a spirit of enthusiasm among those who understood what space exploration could mean, Congress launched our space program 10 years ago. We are all familiar with the spectacular accomplishments achieved since then.

Let me briefly describe two lesser known but very significant byproducts of our space program in the field of medicine—byproducts which could help us find the cure to cancer. One leads to early detection; the other indicates a much improved method of cancer therapy. And I might add that while I shall dwell on only these two, there are many other medical byproducts of our space program.

When the United States was receiving the first close-up pictures of the Moon and the planet Mars from its Ranger and Mariner spacecraft, NASA scientists were already at work on a means of improving the quality of these photographs. It developed that computerized processing of the video signals could produce much sharper and clearer images. The tremendous possibilities for other applications—for example, X-ray photographs—were immediately apparent. The National Institutes of Health was so impressed that they are arranging to support further development of

this breakthrough at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, Calif. Already, I am told, some lung X-ray photographs that showed no cancer after normal processing methods have indeed detected cancers under the enhancement process developed in the space program.

I turn now to the other exciting discovery in this field. NASA has orbited a satellite known as Biosatellite. It carried certain experiments concerned with the combined effect of radiation and weightlessness on certain plants and various forms of living tissues. Biologists are greatly interested in the results from the experiments aboard Biosatellite II, which was orbited in the period of September 7 to 9, 1967. The experiments show that in some cases radiation has a greater effect on organisms that are affected by gravity. The greatest effects of radiation in weightlessness were observed in rapidly growing tissues. Scientists tell us that the primary example of rapidly growing tissue in human beings is the cancer cell. The reason that radiation dosage is therapeutic is that it affects the cancer more than it does the surrounding tissue. If future flights of the NASA Biosatellite determine that human cells react the way the relatively simple experiments on Biosatellite II did, the conclusions will be fairly obvious. If weightlesseness can be simulated here on earth—and doctors believe it can be—effective use of the increased radiation effect could be made in the treatment of cancer.

NASA itself has been reluctant to claim such therapeutic values from its Biosatellite experiments. More research must be done. But let me quote from the March 11, 1968, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, which, in an article entitled "Biosatellite Data Suggest New Mode of Radiation Therapy," said, in part:

Weightlessness in the spacecraft appeared to enhance the effects of an on-board radiation source from 10% to 400%.

"We already know that various extracellular influences, such as hyperbaria, modify the radiation sensitivity of certain cells," commented Shields Warren, M.D., of Boston. "Should weightlessness prove of importance, we will seriously have to consider cheap and practical ways to achieve this effect."

Dr. Warren went on to say that there are earthbound methods of simulating weightlessness, such as the giant centrifuge or the clinostat.

Mr. President, I have cited these two remarkable advances in medical sciences for only one reason. I could cite countless more—about the hope of microminiaturization, about the promise offered by electronic sensors so small they can be injected into a person's bloodstream, about many other discoveries made in the space program both in manned and unmanned space flights. My reason for bringing these to the attention of the Senate is to endeavor to show that the space program for which we are asked to appropriate sizable sums of money is not just a trip to the moon. It is a carefully thought-out program to advance the frontiers of science, to investigate the unknown much as Columbus did, to expand the walls of the tiny little room mankind lives in. It is, in the final analysis, man's attempt to learn more about himself and his environment. This program should not be impeded; it should not be shelved. I would remind my colleagues that when Faraday appeared before the British Parliament to explain his discoveries in the field of electricity, the Members of Parliament asked him what his research would produce, specifically. He said, "I cannot say, but some day you will tax it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 11, 1968, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, to which I previously referred, be printed in the RECORD.

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

BIOSATELLITE DATA SUGGEST NEW MODE OF RADIATION THERAPY

Early last fall a United States spacecraft made 30 trips around earth with a passenger list more diverse than any Mother Goose ever collected. Preliminary results from Biosatellite II now indicate the potpourri of travelers contributed mightily to biological science.

More of a surprise is the possibility, yet unconfirmed, that the trip revealed a new mode of radiation therapy.

Weightlessness in the spacecraft appeared to enhance the effects of an on-board radiation source from 10% to 400%, a recent Washington conference was told.

The increased radiation effect was most evident in "young, rapidly-dividing cells, or in active reproductive cells," according to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Among the most effected of Biosatellite II's passengers were developing flour beetles and vinegar gnat (fruit fly) larvae.

"We already know that various extracellular influences, such as hyperbaria, modify the radiation sensitivity of certain cells," commented Shields Warren, MD, of Boston. "Should weightlessness prove of importance, we will seriously have to consider cheap and practical ways to achieve this effect."

There are earth-bound methods for achieving weightlessness, added Dr. Warren, director of laboratories at New England Deaconess Hospital. The giant centrifuge long has been used in motion sickness research. The clinostat apparently achieves a weightless effect on laboratory samples.

Russian scientists recently orbited cultures of both normal and malignant human cells. "We are eager to hear if they found any differences in the radiation effect," said Dr. Warren, who is also professor emeritus of pathology, Harvard Medical School. Contrary to the effect of hyperbaria, the impact of weightlessness may not be as selective.

Further experiments must rule out other space flight factors—including vibration, acceleration, and shock—to confirm weightlessness's synergism with radiation. Ground simulations of Biosatellite II's flight begin this month at the Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif.

Even now "these data are hard to brush off," said Kenneth V. Thimann, Ph. D. University of California biologist. "I would currently regard the potentiating effect as an empirical fact." Dr. Thimann, who is also provost of California's Crown College at Santa Cruz, chaired the recent Biosatellite II symposium. It was co-sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences Space Science Board and NASA.

There were 13 experiments aboard the space capsule, which was orbited Sept. 7–9, 1967. Only seven were exposed to the gamma rays on the on-board source of Strontium 85. These included preparations of latent-virus carrying lysogenic bacteria, neurospora, parasite wasps, vinegar gnats, flour beetles, and the blue wildflower, *Tradescantia*.

Shielded from radiation during flight were samples of amoeba, frog eggs, wheat seedlings, and pepper plant.

All experiments were conducted in-flight by automation. The Sr 85 was "unveiled" after lift-off and sealed 42 hours later, just before the descending satellite re-entered earth's atmosphere. An Air Force plane plucked the parachuting capsule out of the sky over the ocean off Australia.

Among radiation effects reported were increased gene and chromosome damage to both adult vinegar gnats and their offspring. Recessive lethal mutations occurred in 5.1% of irradiated flight cells, compared to 3.3% of those exposed to the same dose on the ground, a Rice University scientist said. One stress-sensitive mutation, shortened wings, was at least three times more frequent in the orbited sperm cells, noted Luolin S. Browning, Ph. D.

Double the control groups number of lethal mutations in developing flour beetles, who received 1,350 roentgens before flight and another 950 R in orbit, were observed in a University of California experiment. About 45% of the beetles irradiated while weightless developed a wing abnormality, compared to 30% of ground controls receiving a similar dose, reported John V. Slater, Ph. D., and colleagues.

In contrast, weightlessness did not produce increased mutations in *Tradescantia*, said Arnold H. Sparrow, Ph. D. But increased cell death, pollen abortion, and other effects did appear post-flight in the Brookhaven National Laboratory specimens.

Other irradiated material, such as the neurospora, showed no evidence of enhanced damage under weightlessness.

The scientists have asked NASA to add an additional mission to the biosatellite program to confirm current data.

At least four other biolsatellites will be launched in the effort to learn more about the effects of prolonged space travel. Most ambitious of the projected flights is a 30-day mission, which will carry non-human primates, monitored for changes in metabolism, cardiovascular and brain function, and bone density.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we have before us today H.R. 15856, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1969 for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes. Mr. President, at this time I would like to thank the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] for her many contributions to the work of the committee during our consideration of this authorization request.

This is the 11th annual budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Administration requested an authorization of $4,370,400,000, an amount almost $500 million below that authorized by the Congress for the current fiscal year. A large part of this reduced request is accounted for by the maturity of the Apollo program and the fact that it has passed its funding peak. Nevertheless, the committee, in reviewing the request, has been most cognizant of the need to carefully scrutinize every program for its necessity, for its contri-

bution to the national space effort, and for its reasonableness in order to recommend the minimum amount necessary and thereby be consistent with the need for fiscal austerity. In view of the fact that a majority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs are not new but rather are well into the hardware and flight stages, it becomes extremely difficult to make large reductions without seriously impairing programs in which the Nation has already invested substantial sums of money and from which a return on investment is about to be realized. There is also the necessity to make modest provision for programs which will be important to the Nation in the future because in my view science and technology will continue to assume an increasingly important role in the Nation's future well-being. Therefore, even in these times of financial stringency, I believe it is important to undertake those developments which will not only assure preeminence of this Nation in space but will also contribute to the national wealth of science and technology. It is these considerations that underlie the recommendations in this bill and also the considerations which have made it extremely difficult for the committee to make certain choices which had to be made out of fiscal considerations.

This bill contains $3,475,400 for NASA's research and development programs, an amount $201.8 million less than requested; $39.6 million for the construction of facilities program, a reduction of $5.4 million from the budget request; and finally, $635,560,000 for administrative operations, a cut of $12.64 million. In summary, the total of these three appropriations categories of $4,150,560,000 represents a reduction of $219,840,000 from the NASA budget request of $4,370,400,000. Based upon the considerations which I just mentioned the committee has effected reductions in every research and development program to a greater or lesser degree.

As I also noted, this action is most difficult because of the advanced stage of many of the programs and because of our reluctance to cut those advanced research and technology programs which we believe are building our technical strength for the future. In the construction of facilities program your committee is recommending approval of only those projects for which it deemed a pressing need existed to initiate construction activity this year. Accordingly, the committee is recommending deferral of two projects totaling $3.4 million which, in its judgment, could be delayed without seriously impairing the programs they were designed to support. In addition, a $2-million cut was made in advanced facility planning funds. The administrative operations—AO—reduction of $12.64 million for fiscal year 1969 was taken against the background of a $31 million overall reduction made in this appropriation category during fiscal year 1968 as a result of congressional action last year. During fiscal year 1968 substantial reductions were made in the supporting items of expense and it was also necessary to effect a net reduction of approximately 1,300 permanent positions for NASA personnel. It is this situation which gave us quite some concern in recommending further reductions since about 68 percent of this category is represented by personnel salaries and since extensive reductions in what are essentially fixed changes at the centers have been made previously. Accordingly, any substantial reduction in NASA's fiscal year 1969 AO budget request would of necessity result in a large reduction in NASA personnel. Proceeding one step further, it became apparent that large numbers of personnel cannot be taken from the Kennedy Space Center, the Manned Spacecraft Center, or the Goddard Space Flight Center because of the large-scale Apollo flight operations scheduled for fiscal year 1969. Undoubtedly, then, any substantial cut in administrative operations would have to be assessed against the NASA research centers which are the foundations of NASA and are building the base for our future in aeronautics and space.

REVIEW OF PAST YEAR

You will recall that in January 1967, the program suffered a major setback in the Apollo 204 spacecraft fire at the Kennedy Space Center which cost the lives of three astronauts and required a complete reexamination of the spacecraft and many other aspects of the space program. Today I believe there is substantial evidence that the program has great technical strength as shown by its ability to recover from this tragic event and regain momentum, and also by the many significant accomplishments of the past year, a few of which I will briefly mention.

On August 1, 1967, NASA completed the Lunar Orbiter program with its fifth successful flight of a five-flight program. This has enabled NASA scientists to make a detailed photographic map of the moon. A complementary lunar program, Surveyor, might be said to have had an equally good record because of the complexity of the mission assigned to this spacecraft. The Surveyor program, involving the landing of an unmanned spacecraft on the lunar surface, taking and transmitting television pictures to the earth, excavating soil samples and sampling the chemical composition of the lunar soil, was completed in January of 1968, with a success record of five out of seven flights.

In the planetary area, the Mariner V spacecraft, launched June 14, 1967, made a successful encounter with the planet Venus on October 19, 1967, and returned additional data on that planet.

In the earth orbital environment the third advanced technology satellite returned the first continuous weather pictures of the earth in color in November 1967.

In the field of aeronautics where NASA has a fine history of performance in fundamental research, a new world speed record was set by the X–15 aircraft.

A moment ago I referred to the technical strength developed in NASA. I believe this is evidenced by the first flight of the Saturn V launch vehicle in an "all up" systems test on November 9, 1967. This was the first flight of the S–1C first stage; it was the first flight of the S–II second stage; and it was an almost perfect flight in every respect including the performance and recovery of the Apollo spacecraft which was launched at that time. This was followed on January 22, 1968, with the first flight of the lunar module on a Saturn 1B launch vehicle. Although there was an instrumentation malfunction which did not permit engine exercise as originally planned, it has been the judgment of NASA engineers that the total systems performance of this spacecraft was the best on its first flight of any which NASA had launched.

On April 4, 1968, the second Saturn V was launched for a second unmanned vehicle qualification flight similar to that of the November flight. During this flight engine malfunctions were experienced in the second and third stages and yet the system responded in such a way that the vehicle achieved orbit and would not have presented any danger to an astronaut crew if they had been aboard.

I suggest that this is a fine demonstration of the systems which have been developed in this program. Further, the instrumentation for the flight and the performance data obtained provide a basis for NASA technical personnel to analyze the malfunctions, determine the necessary corrective action, initiate that action, and be in a position to recommend to the Administrator that the next flight of this vehicle can be manned.

In carrying out its responsibility for supporting other organizations NASA launched three communications satellites for the Communications Satellite Corporation and three weather satellites for the Environmental Science Services Administration in 1967. In this regard I would like to point out that communications satellites and the weather satellites represent two of the earliest, and perhaps most successful and meaningful to the layman, applications of space technology to improve the conduct of our day-to-day business.

Finally, I believe that the extensive review of the design of the Apollo spacecraft and of the program management undertaken as a result of the Apollo 204 fire has had the effect of converting this unfortunate experience into the building of a much safer and better spacecraft, and also assuring a more effective program overall.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary showing the NASA authorization request, the action of the House in passing H.R. 15856, and the actions of your committee as set forth in H.R. 15856, as amended.

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

SUMMARY OF ACTION OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES ON S. 2918

	Budget request	House action	Senate committee action
Research and development:			
Apollo	$2,038,800,000	$2,025,000,000	$2,025,000,000
Apollo applications	439,600,000	253,200,000	350,000,000
Advanced missions	5,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Physics and astronomy	141,900,000	138,150,000	136,900,000
Lunar and planetary exploration	107,300,000	102,400,000	92,300,000
Bioscience	48,500,000	33,300,000	39,300,000
Space applications	11,2200,000	112,200,000	98,700,000
Launch vehicle procurement	128,300,000	115,700,000	117,700,000
Sustaining university program	10,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000
Space vehicle systems	35,300,000	35,300,000	31,800,000
Electronic systems	39,400,000	39,400,000	35,500,000
Human factor sytems	21,700,000	21,700,000	19,700,000
Basic research	22,000,000	22,000,000	21,000,000
Space power and electric propulsion systems	44,800,000	42,300,000	42,300,000
Nuclear rockets	60,000,000	11,700,000	55,000,000
Chemical propulsion	36,700,000	36,700,000	30,200,000
Aeronautical vehicles	76,900,000	77,900,000	74,900,000
Research and development—Continued			
Tracking and data acquisition	$304,800,000	$299,800,000	$289,800,000
Technology utilization	4,000,000	4,000,000	3,800,000
Total	3,677,200,000	3,383,250,000	3,475,400,000
Construction of facilities:			
Ames Research Center	386,000	386,000	386,000
John F. Kennedy Space Center	13,909,000	13,909,000	12,109,000
Manned Spacecraft Center	3,100,000	3,100,000	1,500,000
Michoud Assembly Facility	400,000	400,000	400,000
Wallops Station	500,000	500,000	500,000
Various locations	23,705,000	23,705,000	23,705,000
Facility planning and design	3,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000
Total	45,000,000	45,000,000	39,600,000
Administrative operations	648,200,000	603,173,000	635,560,000
Grand total	4,370,400,000	4,031,423,000	4,150,560,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, your committee is recommending $3,475,400,000 for research and development, $39.6 million for the construction of facilities, and $635,560,000 for administrative operations. These amounts, totaling $4,150,560,000, represent an amount $119,137,000 above the House action on H.R. 15856 and an amount $219,840,000 below the NASA request.

The recommended amount of $3,475,400,000 for research and development is $201.8 million below the NASA request and $92,150,000 above the amount approved by the House. Of the $3,475,400,000 for research and development, $2,377,500,000 is recommended for manned space flight activities, the major amount of which—$2,025,000,000—is for the Apollo program. This amount has been reduced $13.8 million by the House and by your committee and as herein recommended, is approximately $500,000,000 less than the fiscal year 1968 operating plan. As I have already stated, the Apollo program has been very carefully examined by NASA in the months following the Apollo 204 fire. As a result, contractual adjustments were made to bring the many elements of the program into balance with the new flight schedules which had to be established for Apollo and also to reduce the funding requirements to the extent possible during fiscal year 1968. From its review your committee is convinced that the Apollo program request has been closely estimated by the agency and that it warrants the support of the Congress essentially as presented. However, to encourage the utmost in austerity your committee is recommending a $13.8 million cut.

A reduction of $89.6 million in the NASA request, to $350 million, is being recommended for the Apollo applications program which was recommended initially by your committee and accepted by the Senate last year. It is this program that will utilize the knowledge, the launch vehicles and space flight hardware, facilities, and the manned space flight techniques developed in the Apollo program to maintain the preeminence of this Nation in manned space flight. As a result of reductions made by the Congress in this program last year—principally due to the belief that the then current problems in the Apollo program should be resolved before moving forward—this program was reexamined, and schedules and mission plans completely reoriented to conduct the program at a lesser pace and yet maintain the basic capability to move forward. These changes established that Apollo applications flights would not be flown until after the lunar landing was achieved. Accordingly, it is the judgment of your committee that the program presented by NASA this year is well thought out and, most important, that the program is an essential ingredient to the future manned space flight capability of this Nation and consequently should be supported even during this period of fiscal austerity. In order to meet these objectives, your committee has cut $89.6 million from this program believing that the remaining amount is adequate to support a viable continuing manned space flight program although NASA may find it necessary to make selected adjustments within the program in order to remain within the recommended amount. The House has cut this program $186.4 million, $96.8 million more than the reduction made by your committee. It is the judgment of your committee that the House cut is most severe and that it would not permit NASA to proceed with any program like that which was presented. In fact, it would require a major reorientation and in your committee's belief this would not fulfill the objectives of assuring an ongoing capability for the Nation's manned space program.

In those programs of the Office of Space Science and Applications, your committee believes that the plans presented were basically sound and that NASA should be authorized to proceed; however, in accordance with the committee's expressed concern for austerity, reductions totaling $53.3 million were assessed against the five programs. The committee reserves to NASA the apportionment of each cut within each program. The lunar and planetary program within the space science group is recommended at $92.3 million, a reduction of $15 million below the NASA request and about $10 million below the House amount. The lunar and planetary exploration program area includes the successful completion in fiscal year 1968 of the Surveyor program, the lunar orbiter program and the Mariner-Venus program which I have already discussed. These completions are reflected in a budget request $33 million below the fiscal year 1968 level. In addition to continuing the Mariner-Mars 1969 flyby program previously approved, NASA is proposing a two-flight Mariner-Mars 1971 orbiter program and a two-flight Titan-Mars 1973 orbiter/lander program. These proposals result from congressional rejection of the more sophisticated, more expensive, and larger payload Mars-Voyager project presented in fiscal year 1968. The program which NASA is now presenting, in the judgment of your committee, is an orderly step-by-step approach to planetary exploration which can be accomplished much more economically and yet return the fundamental data about this planet which many scientists feel may have an important relationship to the understanding of phenomena taking place on the earth itself.

Your committee reluctantly imposed a $13.5 million cut against the space applications program in the interest of fiscal austerity. This amount is equivalent to the increase in supporting research and technology proposed for fiscal year 1969 above that planned for fiscal year 1968. This action by your committee should not be interpreted in any way as lack of support for this program which has produced highly successful spin-offs in communications and weather satellites. Rather, it was believed that the increase requested in supporting research and technology could be deferred without harm to the several development projects in this program which are fully supported.

A cut of $10.6 million was assessed against the launch vehicle procurement program which supports the space science and applications missions with the belief that planning efficiencies could absorb this reduction. Similarly, a $9.2 cut was made in the bioscience program.

Your committee is recommending $310,400,000 for the NASA programs in advanced research and technology. This is a cut of $26.4 million from the NASA request and an increase of $23.4 million above the House bill. The overall cut of $26.4 million is distributed over eight programs which are oriented toward advanced research involving scientific and technical effort rather than toward flight programs involving flight hardware which tends to dominate manned space flight, for example. It is these programs which your committee feels are vital to laying the groundwork to assure a continuing strength in space and aero-

nautics in the future and, in so doing, contribute significantly to increasing the technological base of the Nation as a whole.

The advanced research and technology program grouping includes a line item recommendation of $55 million for for the nuclear rockets program, $5 million less than requested. This is a program which has been underway for several years and has made great progress in its technology phase now nearing completion. In fact, the performance goals of reactor output and run duration have been successfully demonstrated and leave no doubt in the minds of the knowledgeable scientists and engineers that the technology is in hand to proceed with the development of a flight engine. This engine, in the 75,000-pound thrust category, would be used on the third stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle and, in addition to greatly enhancing the space propulsion capability of this vehicle, would have the added advantage of extending the useful life of the Saturn V vehicle itself. Possibly the most cogent point that could be made about the NERVA engine program is that it represents the only large thrust, high efficiency space propulsion system signifying a great stride forward in propulsion capability, which is under development in this Nation today. Only by following through with this development will the Nation be in a position to have the propulsion capability to do the things in space it may elect to do in the late 1970's. In this regard the NERVA engine development is characterized by a long leadtime which makes it necessary that the formal development be initiated this year.

In addition to the space nuclear propulsion capability this development will provide the Nation, this project presents a technical challenge and a focal point for scientific and engineering effort that will immeasurably contribute to the Nation's technological base. As this point I would like to include in the RECORD four points made by Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, in testifying in support of this program. I think they are most pertinent to the matter under discussion:

First, during the second decade of the space age we will undoubtedly find that there are important civil or military requirements for space vehicles and missions requiring nuclear propulsion or for which it will provide decisive advantages.

Second, as in other fields of advanced technology, the Nation should not shortsightedly cut off or constrain the development of new technology of great promise because specific requirements or applications cannot be clearly identified and justified in advance.

Third, it is very important that we move ahead with nuclear rocket engine development in fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 to give a clear signal that the United States does not intend to limit its development of large launch vehicle and payload capabilities to those of the Saturn V class space booster.

Fourth, it is important to proceed with the development of a nuclear rocket engine at this time to serve as a central focus for a continuing advance in the nuclear and other technologies involved. We may well find over the next half dozen years important benefits and applications in other fields coming out of the work on nuclear propulsion, so much of which is at the most advanced boundaries of our current knowledge and technology.

For the reasons I have outlined, I believe that the committee is most judicious in recommending $55 million for this program—after a cut of $5 million to assure the utmost efficiency in program management—which is in sharp contrast to the $11.7 million recommended by the House. The $11.7 million will not permit the test firing of technology program engines already constructed and will not even cover the costs of terminating the program, let alone support a continuation into the NERVA engine development phase. I have long been a supporter of atomic energy and the projects which have grown from this great discovery. I think there is ample evidence today of the great benefits this country has already derived from the use of nuclear energy, and I have every conviction that this source of energy will play a vital role in the space efforts of the future. During our hearings on the fiscal year 1969 NASA authorization request the committee devoted 3 days to this program, taking testimony from the most knowledgeable people with respect to the technical base for proceeding with the engine development and with the need for the propulsion services which it offers for the future. This testimony is in volume 3 of the committee hearings, which is before you, and I believe it fair to say that our witnesses were unanimous in their recommendation that the Nation undertake this development. Accordingly, I strongly urge your acceptance of the committee's recommendation of $55 million for the nuclear rockets program.

The last major program in research and development is that of tracking and data acquisition, for which your committee recommends $289,800,000, a reduction of $15 million from the NASA request. It is this funding which supports the flight operations for both manned and unmanned space flights, and with the initiation of the Apollo manned flights in the third quarter of this year, heavy operational demands will be placed upon the facilities and personnel funded by this program. Your committee is most appreciative of the significant role which this network plays in mission control and data return, and overall mission success. However, it does believe that its $15 million cut will assure the highest degree of efficiency, and yet not have a detrimental effect on the effectiveness of this program.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The administration requested $45 million for the NASA construction of facilities program, of which your committee is recommending $39.6 million, a reduction of $5.4 million. The House approved the request as submitted. The facilities request may be separated into two general categories. One, facilities modifications, alterations, and repairs to either enhance their effectiveness or to maintain them in a state of reasonable repair. This category represents about $22 million of the request and includes such things as replacement of a roof on a Government-owned plant which has outlived its expected useful life, replacement of the environmental control system for the Saturn V first stage test facility at the Michoud plant, and various modifications or rehabilitations to manufacturing, test, and launch complexes.

Within this category are two projects totaling $3.4 million which are related to the Apollo applications program. Your committee considers these items necessary, however, based upon the review of the Apollo applications program it is believed that these two items could be deferred this year. The second major category of facilities items is that of a $20 million request for advanced antenna systems to support flight spacecraft. $17 million is required to initiate construction of two 210-foot antennas for the deep space net to complement the one 210-foot antenna which is already in use and performing most successfully. The addition of these two antennas so located to provide, in conjunction with the existing one, support from three equidistant points about the earth will permit continuous tracking, mission control, and data acquisition of spacecraft to planetary distances and beyond. The construction of these two antennas must be initiated this year if they are to be available to support the Titan-Mars 1973 mission which your committee is recommending approval of under the lunar and planetary exploration program. Because of the limited launch windows for planetary flights, timing becomes a most critical factor in readiness to support the 1973 launch opportunity. The remaining amount is for a phased array antenna system to support the Sunblazer project, a small, relatively inexpensive spacecraft designed to study solar phenomena.

NASA requested $3 million for advanced planning and design work in support of facilities to be studied and requested in future years. Your committee believes that $1 million, equivalent to fiscal year 1968 operations, should be adequate to support the level of facilities programs currently being undertaken.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

Your committee is recommending $635,560,000 against a request of $648.2 million for administrative operations for fiscal year 1969. This is a reduction of $12.64 million from the NASA request and an increase of $32,387,000 above the House authorized amount. This appropriation category provides for personnel, travel, and other expenses associated with NASA program direction and administration, the conduct of in-house research programs and the operation of NASA installations, of which there are 11. Approximately 68 percent of the administrative operations budget is for salaries and related personnel expenses. The remainder supports the several NASA Centers with housekeeping, utility, computer, and other services and supplies. Of NASA's personnel complement of about 33,000, some 18,000 are scientists, engineers, and supporting technicians, 4,500 are administrative and management professional personnel, about 4,500 are technicians supporting the in-house research facilities, and the remainder are clerical and administrative support personnel. The very high percentage of scientific and engineering personnel reflects the research and development operation that is NASA, and it follows from this that large personnel cuts would have a

severe impact on research and development programs which, as I have previously noted, I personally believe are very important to the ongoing scientific and technical posture of the Nation.

I stress the foregoing because during fiscal year 1968 a $31 million reduction was made within administrative operations by NASA. This reduction was a direct result of congressional action which forced a complete reexamination of the personnel and other expenses which comprise the administrative operations appropriation category. Subsequently, NASA made a large reduction in the support expenses. Also as a result of that examination, NASA has held its fiscal year 1969 request for these expenses to almost this same level. Further, as a result of the administrative operations reduction in fiscal year 1968, personnel cuts were made and an actual reduction in force was effected when normal attrition such as resignations, transfers, and retirements did not reduce the personnel complement sufficiently to remain within available funds. Consequently, the fiscal year 1968 end-of-year permanent employment will be at least 1,300 below fiscal year 1967.

In reviewing the NASA personnel structure, it becomes clear that it is virtually impossible to effect reductions at the Kennedy Space Center, the Manned Spacecraft Center, and the Goddard Space Flight Center because of the shift of Apollo activities to flight operations and the heavy schedule established for fiscal year 1969 which will require a large and continuous NASA management and technical personnel commitment to staff these operations.

The committee's analysis, therefore, indicates that in order to make reductions in the administrative operations appropriations category, it must be made in personnel because salaries and personnel benefits make up such a large portion of the administrative operations budget. Further, in order to realize any great savings, large numbers of personnel must be immediately removed from the payroll. And finally, if such gross numbers of people are reduced in force it is quite clear that the heaviest impact will be at those NASA centers involved in advanced research and technology—those centers heavily engaged in in-house research which are building a base for future scientific and technical programs. It is against this background that your committee has judged the House cut of $45,027,000 as too harsh and one which is liable to do serious damage to the technical strength contained in the organization. On the other hand, as your committee has recommended reluctantly in many areas—reductions were made in practically every NASA proposal—we also are recommending a reduction, $12.64 million, to assure the utmost economy in this aspect of NASA's operations.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

The House, in passing H.R. 15856, approved three legislative amendments not included in the original NASA fiscal year 1969 budget request.

The first one, section 5, was an amendment which would prohibit the payment of salaries of any employee of NASA convicted of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot or group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned. Your committee took cognizance of the fact that the Senate had voted favorably for an amendment to S. 917 dealing with this subject and covering all Federal employees and, therefore, is recommending an amended version of section 5 of the bill which would be compatible with the policy already agreed to in the Senate action. This amendment, however, unlike the amendments of S. 917, which prohibits convicted individuals from being employed by the Federal Government for 5 years, applies only to funds authorized for the payment of salaries to employees of NASA for fiscal year 1969.

The House-passed bill also contained a provision in section 7 which would direct the Administrator of NASA to keep the House and Senate Space Committees fully and currently informed with respect to all NASA activities. This is the same amendment adopted by the House in fiscal year 1968 and which was subsequently rejected by your commmittee and by the Senate. Your committee believes that NASA has made a conscientious effort to keep the committee informed and consequently believes there is less reason for adopting such a provision this year than there was last year.

The third amendment in the House bill, section 8, would require the Administrator of NASA on all noncompetitive procurements in excess of $25,000 to obtain from each contractor or subcontractor a certification that the price specified in such contract or subcontract is no higher than the price of that item charged to any other purchaser similarly situated. From its review your committee decided that the complexities of the procurement situation necessitated in-depth examination before undertaking legislation in this area. Accordingly, your committee does not recommend adoption of the amendment at this time, although it is sympathetic in principle to the proposal.

In concluding, I would like to reiterate the scrutiny that your committee has given to the fiscal year 1969 request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We have reduced this request by $219,840,000 not because we did not believe these programs were well presented, but because we believed there was a need for fiscal austerity and that we should work toward that objective and still maintain a balanced and viable space program which would allow continuation and completion of current programs and further, and equally as important, permit the development of a base which would keep this Nation preeminent in space in the years ahead. I urge your support of this bill.

Mr. President, I want to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who has worked very hard on this bill, as well as on previous bills. We are very pleased to have her as a member of the committee.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman for the excellent manner in which he handled the NASA authorization bill, H.R. 15856. The chairman has thoroughly explained the contents of the bill, and I will not take the time of the Senate for further explanation. As the ranking minority member of the committee, however, I would like to make some general comments concerning our space program.

I believe most of my Senate colleagues are aware that I firmly support our space science and technology efforts and have done so since the early days of the program. I like to think that my faith in our space program stems from plain old-fashioned logic—based on the fact that our space efforts continue to demonstrate an enormous potential for unlimited good over a broad range of social, economic, and military needs.

Notwithstanding the relative infancy of space exploration, we have already achieved several beneficial and practical applications. We have in operation worldwide weather and communication satellites, and we have made inspiring insights into nature that are of direct relevance to human conditions here on earth.

Yet, there are those, such as some of our leading presidential candidates—of both political persuasions, I might add—who use rather questionable logic when discussing the space program. In one breath, they recommend severe cuts in the space budget, and in the next, they profess that, if elected, they would vigorously pursue solution to some of the same problems for which the space program may well have the greatest potential to effect solution.

If ever there was a Government-sponsored program that provides "something for everyone"—as the saying goes—it is the space program. So much so, that I believe the NASA authorization bill could properly be called a welfare program. Do you find this farfetched? Then let me take a few brief minutes to explain.

Let me first discuss the social and economic benefits of our space program.

I personally know that many of you have fought long and hard to obtain aid for regions affected by the weather—be it because of hurricanes or drought. To you then, I ask: Do the current achievements in space weather satellites mean only that you will be able to determine more precisely whether or not to carry your umbrella on a given day?

Of course not. Our weather satellites have already demonstrated that the loss of human life can be reduced by predicting the severity and direction of impending storms. But the real impact of continued research in this area, we are told by many of our most eminent scientists, is that through this technology we may well be able to control the weather, eliminate arid regions of the world, and thereby multiply our food supply many magnitudes.

With regard to our planetary exploration efforts, some critics of the space program unwittingly say that we explore the universe merely for the same reason mountain climbers climb mountains,

that is, "because they nave not been there before."

Nothing could be further from the truth. I support a vigorous planetary exploration program, not only because it contributes to our general knowledge of the universe, but because it will provide us with a deeper understanding of our own earth environment which can be applied to the control of natural phenomena.

Let me illustrate by mentioning two such problems—earthquakes and air pollution. I know several of our colleagues represent geographical areas where earthquakes or air pollution are menacing problems for their constituents.

In regard to earthquakes, the eminent Dr. Gordon F. MacDonald, vice chancellor of the University of California and a member of the President's Science Advisory Board, recently discussed before our committee the current speculative hypothesis as to the major cause of earthquakes. Dr. MacDonald relates planetary exploration and study of earthquakes this way—and I quote:

On earth we know of no way to test these hypotheses. Observations on the surface of Mars and the Moon would be highly relevant. * * * At present NASA is planning seismic observations on the moon in the Apollo program and a candidate instrument for the 1973 Mars rough lander. These experiments, if successful, would be the first steps toward using information about other members of the solar system in understanding our earth.

The relationship of air pollution on earth and planetary exploration was most succinctly described by Mr. Oran W. Nicks, Deputy Associate Administrator of NASA's Office of Space Science and Applications—and I quote:

Our planetary atmospheres scientists report that within the last 60 to 70 years the carbon dioxide content of the Earth's atmosphere has increased by at least 8% and seems to be continuing to rise. The reasons are not readily explainable but may be connected with our industrial growth. The consequences of even a small increase in carbon dioxide content will be a gradual increase in the average surface temperature. This kind of change in our atmosphere may overshadow present worries about the population explosion—our planet might become unfit for life before it becomes too crowded.

* * * * *

. . . carbon dioxide seems to be the most prominent gas in the atmospheres of both Mars and Venus. An understanding of why two of three terrestrial planets have atmospheres composed primarily of carbon dioxide could allow significant implications as to the future evolution of our Earth's environment.

Let us continue just a bit further with this "something for everyone" legislation, currently known as the NASA authorization bill.

It seems to me that during the few years that I have been a Member of this body I have listened to many an impassioned plea concerning the need for economic aid in such fields as agriculture, forestry, geology, oceanography, navigation, and traffic control. To those of you who have specific constituent interest in these fields I point out that NASA's programs of useful space applications are now at the brink of demonstrating the capability of making substantial benefits in each of these fields.

The technology is now being perfected to permit such practical and diverse benefits as location of mineral and oil deposits, surveying agriculture resources, determining the most promising fishing areas, and monitoring of iceberg and ice field movements.

Let me read just a few words of a recent report of a Committee of the National Academy of Sciences on the promise of space applications. I quote:

Our first general conclusion is that the potential economic benefits to our society from space systems are enormous. They may amount to billions of dollars per year to many diverse elements of our industry and commerce and thus to the public. In some areas, it is possible to predict these benefits with accuracy; in others, we can estimate within broad but conservative limits.

* * * Benefits from satellites may result because they provide a more economical way to accomplish a function or service already being performed. * * * In other areas, such as geodesy and meteorology, space technology can accomplish tasks that are essentially inconceivable by other means.

Lest we forget, the space program also makes a significant impact on our foreign policy and on our military defense position.

To those among you who believe we should encourage cooperation with the U.S.S.R. and reach further accords to limit the arms race, I ask: Could there have been any reasonable basis of agreement whatever to halt the test of nuclear devices in the atmosphere if it were not for our space technology which provides us with the ability to detect effects of high altitude nuclear testing?

My answer is unquestionably "no." As an indication of the necessity for such space detection devices, you may recall that the 1961–62 Soviet nuclear tests were carried out in direct violation of the international moratorium on atmospheric nuclear testing.

Now, I address myself to those of my colleagues who have been consistent and unwavering in their demands that the United States continue to maintain and perhaps increase its military defense vigilance. Could we provide this strong military defense you seek were it not for unmanned military satellite systems in the fields of communications, meteorology, navigation, surveillance, early warning, and the monitoring of nuclear tests which have proved far more effective than almost anyone anticipated a decade ago? And should we not continue to increase our knowledge in this vital technological areas?

The answer to these questions is, of course, obvious. But the significance of NASA's contribution to our military space programs was perhaps best expressed in the testimony of Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., DOD's Director of Defense Research and Engineering, when he appeared before our committee on March 26 of this year.

I quote:

* * * Further development of launch vehicles, rocket engines and applicable subsystems points toward increased military capability, utility and reliability. The work of NASA continued to contribute heavily to the necessary science and technology base.

Now I know that each of you will, and rightly so, vote funds for the space program as your conscience dictates. My only aim in discussing these matters has been to perhaps shed some additional light on what we can expect by continuing a viable space program. The space program is not an abstract, intangible activity; we are not merely conducting science for science sake.

I know that other proponents of the space program describe the prestige and national pride brought about by exceptional space feats. I have never been convinced that these factors alone are adequate justification for spending large sums of the taxpayers money.

On the contrary, there is every reasonable basis to expect that enormous practical benefits, affecting virtually every segment of society, will accrue from our current efforts in space science and technology. Historically, exploration and technology were perhaps the most significant factors in our country's tremendous growth and prosperity. And, in my view, exploration and technology may well be the principal factors in determining whether or not this country will even survive in the future.

Needless to say, I earnestly commend to my colleagues passage of the NASA authorization bill as reported out by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I urge Senators to support the bill reported by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. NASA's aeronautical and space programs have been cut substantially during the past year. The committee recommendation of $4.15 billion is about $950 million—almost a billion dollars—less than was requested last year and, in fact, it is less than any year since fiscal year 1963.

We are familiar with the many direct benefits of the aeronautical and space program—with the tremendous increase in scientific knowledge which it has provided, with the great new technology it has made available to our industry, with its direct applications of space technology to communications, weather, and navigation, with the application of aeronautical and space science technology to the solution of problems in other fields.

But, I would like to draw attention to the fact that this program makes tremendous intangible contributions to the United States as a nation—contributions whose values cannot be precisely measured or weighed, on which we cannot put a dollar sign, but in value so great as to be priceless. The contributions I want to call attention to are the contributions of the aeronautical and space programs to—

First. Education: It is generally acknowledged that the space program, more so than any prior Federal program, has stimulated the interest of our youths in the quest for scientific knowledge. As a result, school science curriculums have been modernized and strengthened at all levels and the highly trained and dedi-

cated people who emerge from these institutions will help keep this Nation out in the front ranks of science and technology. In addition, NASA has given strong, direct support to approximately 200 of the science-oriented universities and predoctoral training grants to more than 3,000 gifted young men and women.

Second. Better health and medicines for our population: Space program discoveries have resulted in the improvement of medical instruments and electronic instrumentation; this, in turn, offers opportunities to revolutionize the equipment of clinics, hospitals, and doctors' offices, and with computer-aided diagnosis, it is possible to have more nearly automated hospitals to help meet the shortages of both doctors and nurses and at the same time improve the quality of the individual patient's care. In addition, we can now foresee that the use of remote sensing devices in orbiting satellites can help in the abatement of diseases, detection of pollution sources, and the location of plant infestation.

Third. Greater security: Our civilian space effort has and continues to make a major contribution in space technology to prevent the likelihood of aggressive action in space by others and to increase our alertness of the dangers to our national security. This contribution has already made possible first, reliable communications satellites for use of military and diplomatic personnel; second, weather satellites providing instantaneous world weather data, third, navigation satellites used by ships and submarines for highly accurate location data; fourth, satellites furnishing data for much more accurate mapmaking; and, fifth, satellites involving the nuclear test ban treaty in the atmosphere and in space.

Fourth, a healthier free enterprise system: Scientific discovery is no longer accomplished by the sole inventor. It calls on all the resources of the Nation and the space program has demonstrated how industrial resources can be marshaled successfully. In addition, the competition required to use expanded scientific knowledge through advances in engineering and technology is a powerful stimulus to the modernizing of all industry.

Fifth. International cooperation: This country is taking every possible advantage of its preeminent position in space research to improve our relations with other nations. Currently, we have cooperative space efforts going with 70 other countries. This cooperation includes the incorporation of foreign scientific experiments on U.S. space missions, the U.S. launching of foreign spacecraft, the training of foreign scientists at U.S. space research centers, the exchange of scientific data, and the use of overseas territory for our worldwide tracking station net.

Sixth. Increased chances for world peace: We are now exchanging a limited amount of weather satellite data with the Soviet Union over a special wire line installed between the weather centers of the two countries. This is one of the few areas of active cooperation that we have been able to establish with the Soviet Union in the space realm. Last year we enacted the Outer Space Treaty which 89 countries endorsed with their signatures. More recently, 48 governments have signed an Astronaut-Rescue Treaty which required that all possible assistance must be given to astronauts in the event of accident, distress, or emergency landing and to insure the prompt return of both astronauts and spacecraft. Thus, we seem to be able to come to agreement more readily in space than here on earth and perhaps this may well be the means in which we can gain momentum for the search of world peace.

I want to emphasize that the national aeronautical and space program helps us to move forward in every one of these areas. No one can put a dollar sign on the contributions of the space program in these areas. If further cuts above and beyond those already made are imposed on the NASA programs, our ability to achieve our objectives in these areas will be far less and more distant of attainment.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. A few minutes ago I mentioned the very fine work the Senator from Maine has done on the committee. I should mention also that the Senator from Idaho is an extremely fine workman and has been very helpful to the committee, and I congratulate him.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I thank the chairman.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the partial text of some remarks I made at the Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce luncheon at Los Angeles on May 24, 1968.

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

LOOKING BEYOND THE MOON

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, before the Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce luncheon, Los Angeles, May 24, 1968)

Early this month the California Department of Industrial Relations reported that in the past year earnings of industrial workers in California increased by nearly five percent. By itself this would be an important gain in take-home pay. The Department points out, however, that the advance in wages was substantially wiped out by increasing prices. In fact, California workers' buying power did not advance one iota from the 1967 level.

These are the wages of inflation. They carry cruel implications for all of our citizens, for the factory workers, the agricultural laborer, the businessman, and, particularly, for all those dependent on fixed income—the retired and the aged.

At home and abroad our nation faces a financial crisis of proportions unseen for forty years. This price of gold has again soared above the forty dollar mark on the London Market. Our trade surplus has momentarily we hope, disappeared. Interest rates are at highs reminiscent of 1929. For the second year in a row, the federal deficit threatens to run over 20 billion dollars.

There is a disgraceful game being played in Washington today over how we are going to put an end to mismanagement of our public purse. The biggest mystery lies in the attitude of the Administration. The Senate has acted. We have passed a measure calling for a temporary one-year tax surcharge together with a mandatory spending reduction of 6 billion dollars. In conference with committee members in the House, these items have been sustained. Despite action at long last in the Congress there has been too little leadership, and too many harsh words from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

In an election year politicians don't like to cut non-essential spending. The federal grant that was a frill last year, in the politician's rhetoric, may suddenly be vital to the national interest with an election drawing near.

At the risk of violating a long-cherished rule of political survival, I have been telling Californians for some months now that in order to protect the American dollar, in order to prevent rampant inflation, we must face a period of austerity. We must cut federal spending and raise taxes.

Spending cuts are rarely popular. But neither is inflation, and it is going to come home to us with hurricane force if we delay meaningful restraints in spending, coupled with a little more revenue in the treasury.

Paper gains in income are meaningless unless they can be turned into solid value in the market place. The economic crisis we face today requires us to make a limited sacrifice for an ensuing, temporary period in order to put our economy back on the tracks and keep it growing. It is a matter of trading off a relatively small immediate cost in order to cut down inflation, to stabilize the dollar as an international medium of exchange, and to maintain the most powerful engine of production the world has ever known.

This means that for the next 12 months every item in the Federal budget not vitally necessary either for present needs, or to sustain our safe transition to the future, will have to be treated on an austerity basis. It means a tight ceiling on Federal employment, postponement of major public works programs, a reduction in our troop commitment in Europe, and across-the-board cuts in the large majority of Federal activities, including some of those near and dear to California. One of those activities where cuts will come inevitably will be the space program.

I believe the space program is especially vulnerable to cuts. Indeed, the reduction of funds over the past two years years for space activities has been considerable, and last week the director of the space program testified that his agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, would go along with the latest efforts at cutting the program.

Do we abandon the space effort as dead? Should we give it up? I do not believe we should. I believe it must and it will survive the present austerity period. What we do with that program, then, is the question.

First, I think we must recognize that the very vulnerability of the program has been in part the result of a woeful mismanagement by the administration.

What we need, and what we have lacked, is an administration which will allocate space dollars according to the skills and manpower and brainpower available, rather than on a basis of political preference. I believe that situation will be changed this next November.

The technological future of America must not be sacrificed to geographic political manipulation.

Once before, I successfully fought an effort to take research and development dollars from the states which win them on merit, like California, just to divide them elsewhere on a so-called need basis. I will continue to guard the rule of fair play on a merit basis. It can only help California.

I am going to discuss today what I believe we must do now to prepare for the future of our space effort. Potentially, it is a bright

hope for the future economy of California and the nation. We must turn that potential into reality.

We have a tradition in California of looking to the future both as a challenge and a source of good fortune. That means striking out in new clearly charted directions without fear of the unknown. This was the spirit of the early frontier that even today distinguishes California life.

Without new horizons we become limited and cease to advance. I would prophesy the end of our free society on the day when our leadership in business or government says "This is it. Our job is finished. There are no more tasks ahead. We've built America."

Here in California, we look forward. More money is spent on research and development in our advanced economy each year than in all of Western Europe. That is money spent on the future, and, of all the new horizons, the grandest is especially our own. I refer, of course, to the last frontier in outer space.

There is no federal program more in need of full public understanding than the space program and its relationship to a balanced and growing economy. In my view, the lack of public understanding stems directly from our failure as a nation to establish in simple digestable terms what we hope to achieve, and what this investment means to our future and prosperity. The consequence has been a growing cry from some for severe reductions in the space program. Indeed there are some who would eliminate it altogether.

In California, we know from bitter experience what ups and downs in income and employment result from a stop-and-go investment policy in the aerospace industry. It is a paradox that well-meaning people want to alleviate poverty and economic dislocation in some places by creating it in others. It is all the more a paradox when the activity to be cut is the very one offering the best opportunity for growth and prosperity.

We do not seem to know what we are about. Our current mission is to put a man on the moon in this decade. But that objective hardly describes the full goal of a national space program. It tells us nothing of any of our military, scientific, or technical requirements in the years and decades ahead. It takes no account of the enormous technical advantages to be gained by pressing on the frontiers of discovery. It says nothing of the achievement of knowledge of our universe for its own sake. Finally, it ignores the latent threat of space competition, and the nightmarish weaponry potentially deployed by the determined enemy in the form of satellites, partial orbital systems, or other yet undreamed of interplanetary contrivances designed to destroy with ever greater sophistication.

When looking at future space investment, we must be careful to count the pay-off already gained. The catalogue of achievements now ranges from heat-resistant frying pans, to fool-proof fingerprint identification, from a new system tested in the San Bernardino Mountains to predict earthquakes, to a new method of skid-proofing California freeways, not to mention vast areas of new technology in lasers and micro-electronics. The spinoff from space technology is already proving an enormous boon to both soldier and civilian.

We are on the threshold of a new system of spy-in-the-sky activities which can substantially reduce the risk of surprise attack by conventional means. Over a year ago, I advocated that a system of satellites be placed over the Near East to observe the deserts surrounding Israel as a means of giving advanced warning to the world on any preparations for massive assault from the desert. That capability is already ours. We may dare to hope that in future years observation techniques might become so accurate as to help us guard against infiltration by individual terrorists.

We are on the verge of a revolution in the technology of natural resource exploration and exploitation. Using remote sensing devices in orbiting satellites man will make vast strides in locating valuable minerals, oil and water. Commercial fishing will improve with the ability to trace the location of schools of fish by satellite. These are the predictable results, and with the application of imagination we can forsee abatement of disease, detection of pollution sources, location of plant infestation, better mapping and revolution in the science of population studies.

This sounds fantastic. Indeed it is. The whole problem about space is that we are moving into the unknown—with its unseen perils and its untapped bonanzas.

We must move into the unknown with purpose. The entire multi-billion dollar space program, and the industry and economy and jobs which have been built on it, will eventually fall into expensive disarray if America fails to define its goals beyond the moon. For a decade the driving force of the program has been the national goal to put men on the moon and to bring them back. Once the manned lunar landing is achieved, America's aerospace program will be without a guiding purpose. We need goals not only in pure scientific terms. We also need space goals which clearly state the potential benefits of the program to people, or the public will justifiably fight a single penny being thrown into space.

In 1937, the Administration convened a group of scientists to look into the future and to predict the new industries which advancing science would create. The learned gentlemen produced a report that was a landmark of its time. They did foresee television and polaroid photography. But they failed to anticipate that in a scant five years there would be practical applications of radar, in ten years there would be atomic energy, in twenty years man would be in space.

The experience of the 30's shows that we are unable to predict what we can achieve. Imagination still runs behind the wonder of discovery. While we cannot predict, we can determine the road to take, and decide which requirements merit priority. In my view, the mission to the moon is only a point at the near end of a long chain of possibilities.

We have in the past employed with some success, a mechanism to give direction to our national thrust into the unknown. At the end of World War II, the Finletter Commission's report on "Survival in the Air Age" set down the guidelines for the establishment of our nation's air arm. A decade later, under President Eisenhower, a group of distinguished scientists addressed the hotly debated missile question. Both of these commissions had enormous impact in providing guidance and goals for a vital national effort. The 1960's and particularly the current economic crisis, pose the questions of outer-space—not only how far and how fast we should go, but where and why.

Earlier this week, I sent a message to the President of the United States calling on him to appoint a Presidential Commission on Space composed of the most highly qualified men in our nation—scientists, businessmen, military, legal, diplomatic and political leaders to evaluate our space program, to decide what we can and ought to be doing and to fix our goals and to organize accordingly. We cannot allow a great nation to gauge its activity on the frontier of knowledge by reaction to rival efforts of the Soviet Union. That is not right for the leader of the free world. Nor does it allow us to stake out our own destiny as Americans have always done.

Naming a commission does not mean automatically spending more money on our space effort. Commission recommendations would hopefully tell us where we can spend less, where we can cut waste, where we can best stop a program with relatively little promise. Most of all, a commission which does its job properly will tell our next president, a concerned Congress and a puzzled public what is indeed happening in America's space programs.

A clear understanding of the program will permit us to move forward with a steady investment plan. We can avoid the pitfalls of spasmodic changes in employment. We can reap the benefits of discovery in the unknown. We can continue to expand the limits of the human mind and knowledge of our universe. We can increase the chances of national security for ourselves and our posterity.

If handled correctly, the information provided by my proposed Presidential Commission on Space would permit our economy to grow in real terms far beyond its present frame.

It is nice to put a man in space. It is essential to find some benefits of that project on earth. To get the job done, we must show the courage to chart our course and follow it. It is we who must manage our technology and make it work for us. Success will take us not only beyond the moon, but a long step forward on earth as well.

SPACE AUTHORIZATION: THE QUESTION OF ECONOMY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I believe that the record of the administration in practicing economy in the space program is a good one. This request has been cut even more deeply by the Senate Space Committee.

However deep President Johnson's zeal for the space program, there is no doubt that he has carefully reviewed his priorities. During the past few years, he has severely cut space spending. His proposed space budget for fiscal year 1969 is $691 million less than he recommended in fiscal year 1968; $943 million less than he requested in fiscal year 1966; and $1.34 billion less than fiscal year 1964.

With all of the earthly demands on the tax dollar, what is the case for space, the taxpayer asks? Does it matter if we reach the moon a few years later than now planned? If we ever land on Mars? Or develop a new generation of powerful nuclear rocket engines?

I am convinced that the space program matters a great deal, and has ever since the U.S.S.R. put up its first sputnik ahead of the United States in 1957. And so I believe that space spending deserves the priority it has enjoyed in the budget process.

Our space program involves more than the Nation's prestige, as important as that is during this time when the American image is suffering badly in many countries of the world. More is involved than the continuing health of the aerospace industry and the employment of the hundreds of thousands of people engaged in the space program. More is involved than the difference that the space program can make between prosperity and recession in America's long industrial boom. More is involved than the beneficial byproduct of space technology to other endeavors here on earth ranging from new techniques for forming metal to tiny biomedical monitoring devices providing for the medical needs of our people.

The fact is that a great nation cannot ignore the need to master and command the science and technology of the times. Indeed, in substantial measure, the recognition of greatness stems implicitly

from this mastery. To achieve leadership in science and technology, the space program must have goals—goals like those set by President Kennedy in 1961 to land a man on the moon and return him safely to earth within this decade; scientific goals such as those set for our unmanned programs of photographing the moon and the planets; and of expanding our understanding of the universe. What is really involved in the space program is the acquisition of knowledge which challenges the human spirit to the utmost and provides both the environment and the opportunity for our people to challenge the unknown. It is out of this basic and fundamental fact that the Nation reaps many of its regards in the form of more advanced technology applicable to every aspect of our living, not only in the direct space applications that are already evident, but also in the challenge of our national spirit. Moreover, from the standpoint of our national security, we must command advanced technology and we cannot permit any other nation to surpass us.

If we fail to undertake the rather limited but nevertheless very necessary space activities proposed in this budget, then there will be a very long delay between the time we accomplish the objective of our present program and proceed to anything new. We are not the only nation strong in science and technology, and if we permit our programs in these areas to lapse, we will reap the bitter rewards in the very near future.

The United States has come a long way in its space program since those unhappy days of late 1957. Our space program received a great thrust forward when President Kennedy with the cooperation of Congress decided on the manned lunar landing program—a decision, as I have said, which history will record as one of President Kennedy's great decisions and one of the great Presidential decisions. In the next century children will still read of Queen Isabella's decision to send Columbus in search of a new passage to India and of the discovery of America. A few pages further on—or maybe only a few paragraphs—these same children will read of President Kennedy's decision to send a man to the moon.

As I said earlier, the space program has no greater supporter than the President of the United States, and in these difficult times, there are great demands on our resources. Because of other problems, he has appropriately reduced the program; he has recognized the need to proceed at a slower pace; but he has recognized the need to proceed.

The Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has reviewed the President's recommendations and has recommended further reductions totaling about $220 million, but the program recommended to the Senate by its committee does provide that we move forward.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to support this program because of its importance to the United States of America.

AMENDMENT NO. 842

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 842, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] proposes an amendment No. 842, as follows:

(h) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Administrator or his designee within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 30 and June 30 thereafter the names of any nonprofit institutions of higher learning which the Secretary of Defense determines on the date of each such report are barring such recruiting personnel from premises or property of any such institution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this amendment is offered in behalf of myself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mrs. SMITH. A number of the other members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences have indicated their support of it.

The amendment was not incorporated in the bill in committee. It was, however, offered and discussed. It was withdrawn, and the language has been reworked somewhat and some conferences have been held with individuals knowledgeable of the workings of our military services with respect to recruiting.

I make that statement so that it will be understood why this provision is not in the bill, since I am a member of the committee.

I commend the chairman for his leadership, and also the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], who has done outstanding work. Perusal of the record of the hearings also indicates very thorough consideration by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

It was not my privilege to be able to attend all of the public hearings, but I did attend all of the executive hearings. In the course of the discussion of this bill in executive session, I asked the question, "What educational institutions, if any, to which NASA is making grants, have a policy of barring the recruiters for the Armed Forces of this country?"

I had previously read in the newspapers—this was some 3 or 4 months ago—that Columbia University had barred certain recruiters for the Armed Forces from its campus. We are speaking now not about student resistance or trouble caused by students; we are talking about the administration of a college or university taking the position that certain of our recruiters cannot come on the campus.

That question was embodied in a letter to the Secretary of Defense. The letter was answered by Mr. Alfred B. Fitt on May 8, 1968, in a letter addressed to Mr. Gerald J. Mossinghoff, liaison officer of NASA, and reads as follows:

This is in response to your letter of April 11, 1968 in which you requested the names of colleges and universities which officially bar Armed Services recruiters from their campuses.

We have canvassed the four Services on this matter. Army and Air Force have reported that no such bars exist at the present time.

Navy reported that, by official action of the institution, its recruiters are not permitted to recruit at the following colleges and universities at this time:

Columbia University, New York, New York.
Fordham University, New York, New York.
New York State University, Queens, New York.
New York University, New York, New York.
Rutgers University, New Brunswick and Newark, New Jersey.
Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey.

Similarly, the Marine Corps reported that, as a result of official action by the institutions, it is not permitted to recruit on the following campuses at this time:

Barnard College,[1] New York City, New York.
Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.
College of New Rochelle,[1] New York City, New York.
Finch College,[1] New York City, New York.
Long Island University, Farmingdale, New York.
Pratt Institute, New York City, New York.
Queens College, Brooklyn, New York.
Sarah Lawrence College,[1] New York City, New York.
Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.
University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.
Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio.
Hood College,[1] Frederick, Maryland.
Howard University, Washington, D.C.
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio.
University of Puerto Rico, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Department of Defense would strongly oppose the imposition of sanctions on schools resulting from these isolated situations, which are, in the large majority of the cases, considered temporary suspensions rather than permanent prohibitions.

Then they go on to say that military recruiters visit colleges and universities as the guests of the institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 8, 1968.

Mr. GERALD J. MOSSINGHOFF,
Director, Congressional Liaison, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOSSINGHOFF: This is in response to your letter of April 11, 1968 in which you requested the names of colleges and universities which officially bar Armed Services recruiters from their campuses.

We have canvassed the four Services on this matter. Army and Air Force have reported that no such bars exist at the present time.

Navy reported that, by official action of the institutions, its recruiters are not permitted to recruit at the following colleges and universities at this time:

Columbia University, New York, New York.
Fordham University, New York, New York.
New York State University, Queens, New York.
New York University, New York, New York.

[1] Denotes women's college

Rutgers University, New Brunswick and Newark, New Jersey.

Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey.

Similarly, the Marine Corps reported that, as a result of official action by the institutions, it is not permitted to recruit on the following campuses at this time:

Barnard College,[1] New York City, New York.

Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.

College of New Rochelle,[1] New York City, New York.

Finch College, New York City, New York.

Long Island University,[1] Farmingdale, New York.

Pratt Institute, New York City, New York.

Queens College, Brooklyn, New York.

Sarah Lawrence College,[1] New York City, New York.

Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.

Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio.

Hood College,[1] Frederick, Maryland.

Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio.

University of Puerto Rico, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Department of Defense would strongly oppose the imposition of sanctions on schools resulting from these isolated situations, which are, in the large majority of the cases, considered temporary suspensions rather than permanent prohibitions.

Military recruiters visit colleges and universities as the guests of these institutions. Further, many of the schools listed above host one or more ROTC units. The imposition of a form of financial sanction on universities to compel recruiting on campus would have a serious detrimental effect upon the excellent relations now existing between military recruiters and the great majority of universities and university officials throughout the country. It is the judgment of military recruitment officials that such a policy could impair these relations and, in the long run, serve to handicap their college student recruitment programs.

Sincerely,

ALFRED B. FITT.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to make one or two comments about the amendment.

The amendment is prospective. It does not seek to bar grants to institutions that have some time in the past barred recruiters from their campuses. The test is, at the time the grant is made, are they barring our recruiters from the campus? It boils down to a very simple proposition: Are we going to tax the men fighting for our country, and their relatives and their friends, to pay their portion of a grant to a university that will not even let the recruiters of the U.S. Government come on the campus? I can conceive of but one answer to that: We should not.

Also, are we to admit that when it comes to scientific knowledge, capability, and know-how, we are so bankrupt in this country that we are dependent upon a university that has as its policy the barring of recruiters of our armed services? I think not.

Much has been said about distributing these grants to more universities. Here is our chance. Some grants have been going to universities which, for some reason or other, have an official policy of not permitting the recruiters of our Armed Forces to come on the campus. I do not believe it is necessary to plead the case for the need for such an amendment. I do call attention to this: In the amendment is language to make an appropriate exception when it is necessary to do so for the interest of the Government. Conceivably, some university could have a longtime research project going, and it is about to be completed, and to abandon it would result in loss and damage to the space program of the country, or other loss. For that reason, we have this language in the amendment:

Except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a preivous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States.

In offering this amendment with that language in it, I desire the legislative intent to be clear, that the exception is to be used only for the benefit of the United States, never for the benefit of the institution or some department or some researcher who would like to finish his work. The exception to the rule is in the amendment to protect the United States and is only to be used for that purpose.

Mr. President, the space program is very important to the country. I do not concur with the feeling that the program should be junked in order to take care of this cause and that cause. There must be restraint. There must be a reduction. There is a substantial reduction in the bill.

Sometimes the question is raised, "What good does it do to go to the moon?" Well, I do not know. When we get there, we may not find anything that will have a direct relationship for a long time to man's problems here on earth. But I do know this: In order to send a satellite to the moon and in order to send a manned spacecraft to the moon, the United States has to acquire information and add to the world's knowledge very significantly. Our gain will be in the scientific advances that come to the country by reason of the efforts of getting to the moon. If we fail to take part in that program, we will not lead the world or be among the leaders in scientific advance.

It is a program that must be carried on by the National Government. It is not of the type that can be carried on in the main by private individuals. The States cannot assume the responsibility. It has a direct relation to the defense of the country. If another nation can set an object in orbit around the earth and bring it down precisely at the point they wish, that has great potential from the standpoint of military action. Therefore, for our own defense not only must we carry on our space activities, but also, I believe we must give further attention to the military aspects of the matter, not for the purpose of aggression but for the purpose of keeping the peace; because as long as that know-how is in the hands of Uncle Sam, it is in the hands of the most generous, most just, most helpful peace-loving nation on earth—a nation that has never used its might to overrun and control other people, a nation that has repeatedly helped nations when we had no legal obligation to do so. Therefore, we cannot permit a situation to exist in which the free world does not have a participant in the whole realm of space. For that reason, I support this bill.

I believe that the amendment will be a good addition to the bill. It will not hurt the space program. I am satisfied that most of these institutions, probably all, will comply with it, because it is prospective in nature. If they do not comply with it, if it becomes law and an institution says to our country, "The recruiters for the Armed Forces are barred from this campus," certainly, something is wrong; certainly, there is a time to quit; and, certainly, there is a situation in which the governing bodies of those institutions need to look at the administration of them.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Could the Senator state for the record what military recruiters do on the campus? What is the day-to-day operation? Do they set up an office there and point out the benefits of a career in the military service, or just what do they do?

Mr. CURTIS. A member of the Committee on Armed Services would be better qualified to give the Senator from Washington a detailed answer.

I have made some observation of the situation. It is true that they are there to recruit members for the armed services. But they are also there to serve young men and women who are enrolled, because they answer the questions of the students. The students are facing a military obligation. They are able to find out where their talents can be used, and the periods and terms of service.

So this is a two-way street. It is not only to recruit personnel for the Armed Forces but is also a distinct service to the fine young men and women enrolled at the institution, who expect to discharge their responsibility for military service and are in need of information and answers to their questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose a young man in college intended to enlist in one branch of the service? This would be a place for him to go to find out about it; or, he may have some sentimental reasons for going into the Army instead of the Marines, or vice versa.

He could find out the difference. It would enable him to make a better decision about his military service, which I hope the RECORD will show is purely voluntary in this case.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no forcing these people to do anything. They are there as a service. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct. This situation does not relate to selective service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. CURTIS. It relates to recruiting of personnel and, as the Senator pointed out, it is a service to the individual involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They do not interfere with classes, education, or anything of that nature; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. I believe the Senator is correct.

I wish to point out, however, having read in the RECORD that the Secretary of Defense was opposed to this matter, since that time the amendment has been redrawn. I am not prepared to say that they now support it. I am prepared to say that some individuals, knowledgeable with procedures in the Department of Defense, have improved the language and I believe it is regarded as workable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall state it another way. If someone went to the university and wanted to try to convince young men or young women not to enlist, he would have a right to say so in most universities, would he not?

Mr. CURTIS. I would expect so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me that is the case. They are there only to try to help the young people to try to make up their minds about this matter. In the case of a Marine recruiter, he would not be a fellow who would try to incite anyone but he would be there merely for informational purposes. He might say: "This is what the Marine Corps is all about. If you are going to enlist, perhaps you would like to come into the Marine Corps."

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is important that Congress stop right away this practice which has been referred to. I believe institutions have an obligation, patriotic in nature, and in the interests of our country to cooperate with programs of the U.S. Government. I think this will correct the situation. I do not believe that very many universities will continue this practice if Congress takes this action.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope not, if these people are doing what the Senator and I have discussed. We have recruiting stations in different parts of the country. In some areas they may be a little removed from the campuses because there is no room on the campuses. However, it seems to me they perform a service and it is merely permissive of these people. There is no ordering of them to do this or that.

Mr. CURTIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be added as a coauthor of the Curtis amendment.

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

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1999.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1999) to amend the District of Columbia Public Education Act which was, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

SECTION 1. Title I of the District of Columbia Public Education Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 107. In the administration of—

"(1) the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321–326, 328) (known as the Second Morrill Act),

"(2) the tenth paragraph under the heading 'EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS' in the Act of March 4, 1907 (7 U.S.C. 322) (known as the Nelson amendment).

"(3) section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 329) (known as the Bankhead-Jones Act),

"(4) The Act of March 4, 1940 (7 U.S.C. 331), and

"(5) the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U. S.C. 1621–1629),

the Federal City College shall be considered to be a college established for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301–305, 307, 308) (known as the First Morrill Act); and the term 'State' as used in the laws and provisions of law listed in the preceding paragraphs of this section shall include the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 108. (a) Section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended (1) by striking out '$7,650,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,800,000', and (2) by striking out '$4,300,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,320,000'.

"(b) In lieu of extending to the District of Columbia those provisions of the Act of July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301–305, 307, 308), relating to donations of public lands or land scrip for the endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, there is authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia the sum of $7,241,706. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall be held and considered to have been granted to the District of Columbia subject to those provisions of that Act applicable to the proceeds from the sale of land or land scrip.

"SEC. 109. (a) In the administration of the Act of May 8, 1914 (7 U.S.C. 341–346, 347a–349) (known as the Smith-Lever Act)—

"(1) the Federal City College shall be considered to be a college established for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301–305, 307, 308); and

"(2) the term 'State' as used in such Act of May 8, 1914, shall include the District of Columbia, except that the District of Columbia shall not be eligible to receive any sums appropriated under section 3 of such Act.

"(b) In lieu of an authorization of appropriations for the District of Columbia under section 3 of such Act of May 8, 1914, there is authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to provide cooperative agricultural extension work in the District of Columbia under such Act. For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, sums appropriated under this subsection may be used to pay the total cost of providing such extension work; and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums may be used to pay no more than one-half of such cost. And reference in such Act (other than section 3 thereof) to funds appropriated under such Act shall in the case of the District of Columbia be considered a reference to funds appropriated under this subsection.

"(c) Four per centum of the sums appropriated under subsection (b) for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture for administrative, technical, and other services provided by the Service in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 110. The enactment of sections 107 and 109 of this title shall, as respects the District of Columbia, be deemed to satisfy any requirement of State consent contained in any of the laws or provisions of law referred to in such sections."

SEC. 2. Sections 107 and 108 of the District of Columbia Public Education Act (added by section 1 of this Act) shall take effect with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1968.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment of the House is acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill which I introduced and to which the Senate just gave its final approval provides to the citizens of the District of Columbia the services and benefits derived from a land-grant college. Though the language in the bill as passed by the House is different from the Senate-passed bill, the intent is identical and authorizes the same programs.

The District of Columbia is the last area in this Nation that Congress has authorized the establishment of a land-grant college. I believe it is highly significant that Congress has just taken the unprecedented action in authorizing land-grant programs specifically for an entirely urban area. The legislation finally enacted by Congress today will, I believe, be a significant precedent toward establishing urban-grant colleges throughout the Nation to help alleviate slums and poverty in our cities. This legislation offers a real pioneering opportunity in urban-grant programs by the Federal City College. This college, in my judgment, is ideally suited to undertake this important task. My committee will be looking to the Federal City College to be creative and innovative in establishing urban-grant programs in the Nation's Capital.

The final action taken by Congress on this legislation today makes the Federal City College the latest authorized land-grant college and, in actuality, the first urban-grant college authorized by Congress.

I wish to compliment my very distinguished friend and colleague from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] for the very wonderful report he gave me and the full District of Columbia Committee in connection with this legislation. I wish also to pay special tribute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the late Senator Robert Kennedy for their championship of this very important legislation. They all fully understood the true significance and the impact that this legislation will have on the lives of tens of thousands of youngsters and the tens of thousands of families who live in the District of Columbia in circumstances approaching abject poverty. The members of the Senate District of Columbia Committee fully expect this legislation to provide urgently needed supplemental assistance to these youngsters and to their families who are hopelessly caught up in impoverished circumstances by informational, educational, and vocational inadequacies.

I also wish to compliment the full House District of Columbia Committee for its support of this legislation, especially my friend from California, Mr.

SISK, and my friend from Minnesota, Mr. NELSEN. Their assistance in getting this legislation through the Congress has been invaluable.

I also want to pay tribute to Mr. Russell Thackery, executive director of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the District of Columbia government for their support of the bill. Finally, I would like to commend Dr. Frank Farner, president of the Federal City College, and Dr. Eugene Wiegman, dean of Community Education of the Federal City College, for their untiring work and efforts in behalf of the bill.

I close by saying that as the damning darkness hangs over many American cities this summer, I believe that this legislation, which will soon be forwarded to the President for his signature, is very significant legislation which can help light the candle toward achieving a more stable and meaningful urban society.

LONGER TERM LEASES OF INDIAN LANDS ON THE HUALAPAI RESERVATION IN ARIZONA

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 4919.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4919) to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments to H.R. 4919.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15856) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, unless the Senator from New Mexico wishes to speak at this time, I wish to address the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not wish to speak at this time. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it was partly at my suggestion that the committee did not pass on the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska at the time the bill was being drafted. My purpose was solely to check to see what effect the proposal would have with respect to the military and in order to get the complete picture of the entire situation.

After some conferences with the military, this language was revised somewhat. They do not support the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, but the amendment certainly makes it much more workable from their point of view and I think from the point of view of NASA also.

I am glad to support the amendment. I think the Senator from Nebraska has rendered a service in the fine work he has done on this subject. I believe he has worked out a definite amendment that does present a sound approach. It could not be hurtful or injurious to others.

Mr. President, I wish to make this comment with respect to the question of the Senator from Washington. I think the Senator from Nebraska answered correctly. I have never heard of any abuse by any recruiting officer in connection with anything they have done on any of the campuses of any institutions. I think this situation of barring those officers was largely created by sentiment in connection with the war. However, this question goes far beyond the war. We will have to have a sizable military force for years to come.

It is a help to the men on the campuses. It is a help to the Government to render the service to the young men and find more about the talent, and it enables the young men to find out more about the service, what they offer as well as many others major facts concerning their situations.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had always understood, right or wrong, and I do not wish to argue the matter, that many of the protestors have been the ones who have suggested that we have a volunteer military. It seems to me that is what we are trying to do. In many places where I have been there has been a lot of protest. They talk about the military being voluntary and this is what we are trying to do.

Mr. STENNIS. The word of the recruiting officers is a contribution toward voluntary military service.

Mr. President, I would like to add my support to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. In substance this amendment provides that where a finding has been made that Armed Forces recruiting personnel have been barred from the premises of institutions of higher learning, no funds appropriated pursuant to this legislation may be used for grants to these institutions unless the Administrator of NASA determines that this grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant which is likely to make a significant contribution to aeronautical and space activities of the United States.

It is not anticipated that this amendment will be very extensive in scope. It is my understanding that of the 21 schools which have barred recruiting, only seven now have NASA grants. In these instances, of course, it may well be that the institutions would revise their policy with respect to Armed Forces recruiting personnel.

It is important, however, Mr. President, that the policy aspect of this amendment be emphasized. In effect, it should be considered a warning that the Government on the one hand will not be making grants to the same institutions which refuse to cooperate with the Government with respect to permitting Armed Forces recruiting personnel on their property.

The legislative history of this amendment should be made clear and I would emphasize the following points:

First, the finding of fact as to whether Armed Forces recruiting personnel have been barred from the premises of an institution would be determined by the Department of Defense. The amendment provides that a list of such institutions will be furnished by the Secretary of Defense to the Administrator of NASA within 60 days after the enactment of this authorization, with a subsequent report being furnished as of each January 30 and June 30 thereafter. It should also be made clear that changes to this list can be made between these dates where there has been a change in university policy.

Second, the amendment provides authority under which the Administrator may make an exception to the requirement of the amendment if he finds that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant which is likely to make a significant contribution to the country in terms of aeronautical and space activity.

In summary, Mr. President, this amendment, in my opinion, will in no way have a harmful effect on our national space program. At the same time it will serve to establish a wise policy with respect to the use of NASA grants for institutions of higher learning.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have cosponsored the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, and I now rise in its support.

NASA grants to universities are part of an overall cooperative program between the Federal Government and universities to strengthen institutions of higher learning. And, it has always been my belief that to attain cooperation, both parties involved must act in a responsible and amendable manner.

Senator CURTIS' amendment merely puts the universities on notice that they cannot, with one hand, bar Government representatives from the campus while holding out the other hand to obtain Government subsidy. Using a slightly old-fashioned proverb—the amendment says, "you can't have your cake and eat it too."

I have no doubt that only a small number of universities will be affected by this amendment—but more importantly—its passage would clearly set forth the sense of the Congress on a subject that has become of concern to a great many people.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, who also is a member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, is necessarily absent from the city today on official business. However, he has asked that his statement in support of H.R. 15856 be inserted in the RECORD as part of the discussion on the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Brooke, I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

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

The statement of Senator BROOKE is as follows:

If the Congress were to agree to all the Presidential recommendations for research and development for FY 1969, obligations for R&D would increase about $0.9 billion from $16.9 billion in 1968 to about $17.8 billion in 1969. There would be major increases for the Department of Defense and for the AEC—about $1 billion. Other agencies would receive increases amounting to about $0.3 billion. These would be offset by a decrease of $0.4 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

However, the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has recommended a cut of $0.2 billion in the budget request for NASA, so, in fact, R&D increases will be offset by a decrease in NASA's obligations of over $0.6 billion.

Those of us who have dealt with the R&D programs of the federal government realize the significance of this effort to our country. It is an investment in the future. One of the most important parts of this effort is the NASA aeronautics and space program. Dr. Werner von Braun refers to the national space effort as "the cutting edge of our technology," for no other program cuts across so many scientific disciplines and so many technologies, providing building blocks for the future.

The demands on our national resources today are tremendous. The war in Vietnam is costing some $30 billion a year. At home, it is clear as it has never been before that the Congress must take action to guarantee to the poor of our center cities their full right to participate in American life. I have said before, and I will repeat now, that this is where our priorities must lie.

But, at the same time, it would be a tragedy of the highest order if we turned our backs entirely on science and technology. The nation's scientific effort is not and cannot be a faucet to turn on and off. Scientific research must progress in orderly increments; individuals must be assured that they will have an opportunity to complete an effort begun. To call a temporary halt to efforts in progress would not only jeopardize their success but would, in the long run, greatly increase their cost.

With its tremendous resources, this country has the capability to attack all the present day problems and still carry out the aeronautics and space program of NASA as recommended by the Committee. To do less will deny our people the fruits that accrue to those who successfully undertake difficult scientific and technological programs. If we do not move forward with a vigorous space program, we can expect in the future to be less of a national power, to command less prestige among the other nations of the world, to suffer the loss of some of our national pride, to forego some defense benefits, to be less able to participate effectively in international cooperation and so be less effective in forging a peaceful world. We will feel particularly the impact on education since few programs have benefited education more than the national space effort.

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has worked long and hard on this authorization bill. It has recommended $220 million less than requested by the Administration and almost a billion dollars less than was requested for the program a year ago. I believe that this bill as reported by the Committee strikes a balance between the nonscientific priorities of this year and the need to maintain an orderly space program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this amendment was discussed favorably in committee, but it was agreed that it would not be accepted until the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] had an opportunity to study the matter. The Senator from Mississippi has studied it and has said he is glad to support the amendment. I see no objection to including the amendment in the bill, and I accept the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished chairman, and ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 845

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 845 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. PROXMIRE, is as follows:

On page 17, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Act, not more than $3,370,400,000 may be expended in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for all programs authorized by this Act. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in his discretion may determine the extent to which sums authorized by this Act for particular programs are reduced in compliance with the limitation contained in this section, but nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the amount of any such authorization."

On page 17, line 3, strike out "SEC. 7." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 8.".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would cut $780 million from the space authorization bill as it was reported to the floor of the Senate. It would slice $1 billion from the amount requested in the President's budget. There are several basic reasons for this sharp cutback. First, the Senate has gone on record in support of a $6 billion reduction in spending by approving the Williams-Smathers substitute for the excise tax bill. The House is apt to approve this approach by accepting the conference report on the tax hike proposing to cut the bill.

Where are the savings going to be made?

The obvious place to start is with the space program. It would be almost impossible to make a substantial cut in other programs, including vital human resources, without crippling or perhaps killing them.

Let me say that the $6 billion reduction in expenditures means about a $12 or $13 billion cutback in appropriations. Thus, what I am asking for the space program, I think, is modest. It is in proportion and, frankly, if I had my way, it would be substantially bigger than that. Thus, it is a modest suggestion.

Second, the space cut would not have a major adverse impact on the moon shot program. It would simply prevent us from committing ourselves to post-moon-shot goals which are, as yet, clearly defined—I should say unclearly defined. They might well cost $10 billion in the next few years. As Members of the Senate, we should exercise our own legislative responsibility. We should make at least some specific and meaningful cut in expenditures rather than passing the entire buck to the executive branch. My amendment would give the Senate the opportunity to do just that. Members of Congress and Members of the Senate are frequently complaining—and understandably and rightly so—about the erosion of legislative authority and legislative power, that the executive branch has taken over more and more. Well, if we simply tell the executive branch to cut $6 billion in spending and $12 billion in appropriations anywhere they want to, certainly a major part of our legislative responsibility will have disappeared. We shall have abdicated.

Let me point out that the basic argument against going ahead as fully as the committee has asked us to go ahead with the space program is not simply a matter of money but a matter of manpower resources. The space program, more than any other governmental program I know about, uses the most competent, scientific capabilities we have in the economy, scientists who are desperately needed in graduate education, in defense, in industry, as well as technicians who are broadly needed in the country. This is truly a highly skilled program if ever there was one.

Six years ago, when Senator Kerr was handling the bill I introduced an amendment providing for a manpower study. Unfortunately, the amendment did not succeed. I wish that it had, because we would be in a much better position to know the degree to which we could afford to have scientific personnel which is, as I say, so urgently needed elsewhere, to go into a program which has its merits but which has, in my view, been placed far out of proportion to its justification.

There has been a tendency for people to look at the space program and space spending as strictly what we do with the NASA budget. Actually, that is only one part of it. There are other space programs in other agencies which are very substantial.

I invite attention to the fact that whereas the 1969 budget estimate for new obligational authority for NASA is $4.2 billion, the Department of Defense space program budget request is $2.2 billion; the Atomic Energy Commission has a $154 million space program; the Department of Commerce has a $30 million space program; the Department of the Interior has a $4 million space program; the Department of Agriculture has a $1 million space program; and the National Science Foundation has a $2

million space program. That adds up to $6.6 billion to be authorized this year for space.

Furthermore, I point out that the expenditures estimated by the Bureau of the Budget are not only extensive outside of the Space Agency, but in the aggregate also amount to an increase—a fairly substantial one in 1969 as compared with 1968 in expenditures, the year in which we say we indicate the Senate has committed itself, and very substantially, to cut back on the budget request.

The facts are that expenditures for the programs were $6.7 billion in 1968, and the Budget Bureau has asked that they go to $6.8 billion in 1969—$6.826 billion in 1969.

In considering space spending, it is very important that we recognize it is not limited only to NASA, that the NASA program, while it has a distinct military contribution to make, is not a major military space program. That is separate. That is in the defense budget.

Mr. President, let me indicate why it is so important for the Senate to reduce the program, and reduce it sharply.

Here is a program that has had very little in the way of guidelines, very little in the way of cost analyses, and very little in the way of attempts to establish priorities and then stick to them.

The best way to illustrate my point is to quote the testimony of the Comptroller General, Elmer Staats, to the Joint Economic Committee, only a few weeks ago.

In the course of his testimony, I ask Mr. Staats the following question:

Chairman PROXMIRE. Let me ask you, Mr. Staats, without the benefit-cost system analysis, without discounting, without using a discount rate, how can an agency possibly evaluate with any objectivity its investment program?

Mr. President, before I go ahead with Mr. Staats' answer, we know that if we are going to go into a program such as NASA has, as the Department of Defense has, as the Department of the Interior has, as the Department of Agriculture has, and so on, we should have some notion of when the benefits will come. We should be able to discount the benefits when they are in the future, because we all know now, better than ever before, that costs may force us to finance the programs so that we have to pay interest—and big interest—and, therefore, we have to discount the value of those programs as the value comes up in the future.

If we do not do that, we do not have any clear notion on how useful the program is and whether it is going to cost more than it is worth. There is no question that we should know whether the program is going to cost more than it is worth or not. They have not told us. They have not given us the kind of information the Comptroller General says they should give us.

Let me read Mr. Staats' answer:

Well, I think the answer is that there has to be some evaluation of benefits and costs in any judgment that is involved in a budgetary process. The question is whether or not it is a good judgment or a bad judgment. The question of whether or not you are making decisions erroneously in terms of priorities depends heavily upon the use of some analysis of this kind.

As suggested in your committee report, the danger may well be that we are spending money in some areas which will yield far less in terms of return for our tax dollar than we would if we invested in some other areas, and this, of course, is the great danger.

And, I may add, than if we did not tax it away from the private sector and left it in the private sector, with a return of about 12 percent.

Mr. Staats went on to say:

I would like to read a paragraph from the reply we had from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which has a very major capital investment program.

Mr. Staats then read the following from NASA's reply to the Comptroller General:

We have not, however, applied specific discount rates. That is to say we have not attempted to express in terms of percentage discounts, the effect of future costs and benefits, although these economic factors are implicit in our consideration of alternative programs and assessment of priorities. Frankly, we find it extremely difficult to quantify such elusive economic considerations as they affect research and development efforts in the space environment.

Mr. Staats' observation on this—and he picked this out as one of the most generalized, and therefore, in my view, one of the most useless kinds of replies—was:

I cite this as one kind of situation where they are no using discount rates. They say it is implicit. This may or may not be true.

Unless they have some more systematic approach to it it seems to me it would be very difficult to say in a case of this type that it is implicit in all of these decisions.

Then I said to Mr. Staats:

But I would just say that if it is implicit, lets make it explicit. After all if they can say they don't know what the benefits of space exploration are then maybe we had better forget about it. They should be able to make an attempt at quantification. If we don't have some kind of objective measurement in these areas, it just means we are pushing money out in the hope that maybe it will do some good. We don't know what good it will do and we can't even make an estimate.

If the Defense Department, with all of the great problems involved there, and the enormous amounts of money, in determining cost effectiveness and so forth can do it [that is, apply discount techniques] as widely as they do it, it seems to me that space and other agencies that make investment programs should do it, that they should certainly make their implicit findings explicit so that we know what we are doing.

I went on to say:

Then you can properly conclude on the basis of this study that the Federal Government has been engaged in practices which do inevitably result in a substantial amount of misallocation of resources. We know that. You are not giving us an estimate, but my own estimate is that it would be in the billions of dollars a year as compared with the kind of investments we would make if we had a standard system which was used throughout government—and not rigidly, still permitting value judgment, intuition and going ahead with low yield programs if there were other reasons for doing so—if we had this criteria, a basis for the Congress and President making a decision.

Mr. Staats said:

This certainly could be a proper conclusion, I think, unless a decisionmaker has this kind of information before him; certainly the opportunity is there for errors of judgment, and I think it would be almost certain that this does occur in the absence of this kind of——

Then Mr. Staats said:

In a very recent letter which we received from the Defense Department they first say they agree on the desirability of a greater degree of standardization of government practice. Then they also say that:

"Our discount rates correspond closely to the opportunity cost concept, but in arriving at our rates we did not use exactly the opportunity cost concept as you describe it."

Incidentally, the Department's regulations are fairly recent, about two years old. The Department's letter goes on:

"Since our reasoning led to what I believe to be the same end result, I doubt that the differences are worth noting.

"My staff would be glad to discuss this matter in more detail with your staff if you wish. I doubt that the cost of Treasury borrowing is the relevant rate for the type of problems with which we are concerned. The data we gave on the projects where discounting was used and the analysis considerably understates the use of these practices. The 73 projects mentioned are those where the discount calculation actually appeared in the budget submission. There must be hundreds of other investments decisions in which discounting techniques are used, but which do not show up in the data because they involve amounts that are not large enough to require individual consideration in the budget or because the discounting techniques showed the project was not sufficiently attractive to warrant submission. Moreover, discounting concepts are used on lease or buy decisions and we did not include these in the list. For example, the recent Air Force decision regarding its Phase II computers, with which I think you are familiar, was based on data that included an analysis that calculated the implicit interest cost of leasing for a year."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to say to the distinguished Senator that I am not clear, from reading his amendment, just what he means, because we have questions of authorizations, we have questions of new obligational authorities, and we have questions of expenditures, so sometimes I get mixed up, at least in my own mind. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator this question, after stating I am not sure I understand the meaning of his language: Is it the intention of the Senator's language to limit NASA's expenditures during fiscal 1969 under appropriations "made pursuant to this authorization" to $3,370,400,000?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. The intention is to limit the authorized appropriation to $3,370,400,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator mean to limit the authorized expenditures?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The authorized appropriation. There is no way this amendment directly limits the expenditure. As the Senator knows, that is something that would require some different kind of resolution, as I understand. I checked with the Appropriations Committee

and I was told that, in their analysis, a reduction of $1 billion in appropriations for the space program would result, if nothing else were done, in probably a cutback of half a billion dollars in expenditures. That may be wrong, but it is an off-the-cuff estimate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think I understand what the Senator intends. I want to restate my question under that understanding. It is his intention to limit NASA's expenditures during fiscal 1969 under appropriations made pursuant to this authorization to $3,370,400,000?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. That is what I hope to do. That is certainly my intention.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the explanation of the Senator's amendment which was just put on our desks, the Senator says:

> Second, this space cut would not have a truly adverse impact on the moon shot program. It simply would prevent us from committing ourselves to post-moon-shot goals . . .

What figure does the Senator have to justify that statement? As the Senator knows, I am chairman of the subcommittee that handles the appropriation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator may be absolutely correct on this, but the post-moon-shot goals do not amount to the figure the Senator mentions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The moon shot amounts to $2 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Apollo program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Apollo program amounts to $2 billion. This amendment would leave $3,370,400,000 for the whole program. There are no specific strings to which the Administrator is tied. He could go ahead with the whole Apollo program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I like to look at the so-called Apollo program in contrast to what the Senator is talking about, when we would proceed beyond the Apollo program to programs involving the other planets. Part of the money the Senator is talking about is for other purposes than strictly the Apollo program. It involves building boosters for weather satellites. A small amount is involved for subsonic and sonic research.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. In my remarks, I go into detail showing how $1 billion can be cut out of the NASA program without, in my view, adversely affecting the Apollo shot itself, or affecting other necessary programs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When the Senator limits it to the Apollo program, he has the figure correctly. There are five or six other programs, but there is also a program which involves the Voyager and one that goes around the planets. Then there is a large program for science astronomy. There are several other programs. The program that goes beyond Apollo and involves other planets does not involve as large an amount as I interpret the Senator's amendment to indicate.

I am a little like the Senator is in this respect, and we have discussed this matter before. I hope after we are through with Apollo, that in the explorations of space for scientific purposes, learning about the other planets and the universe, which becomes of no particular military value whatsoever, but involves merely scientific knowledge, we will be able to work out something with other countries in the world, not only with the Soviet Union, but India, Australia, France, Canada, and many other countries, so that, in a joint effort, all mankind can get the benefits of what we learn.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I could not agree with the Senator more. That is exactly why I have offered this amendment; because otherwise, we shall be making such a big commitment of money to go ahead with manned flight to other planets that the argument will be made—the Senator from Washington, and I have heard it again and again—that after all, when we have spent billions of dollars over the years, we should not stop now.

I believe we should keep our options open; and we will not be able to keep them open if we go ahead and fund this program as fully as the committee has requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we could make that worldwide agreement, think what it would do for all mankind, for every country to get together, as we have been doing in the field of oceanography, where a great deal of joint work has been done, and as we did during the International Geophysical Year, in which this country participated.

But, of course, if all the countries cannot get together, we will have to go ahead with our program, regardless. But I am hopeful that can be done. It seems to me that it would be a great thing for mankind, psychologically, if in no other way, if we could all get together in an effort to find out what is beyond us in the universe.

But I do not think the cut which the Senator suggests would affect only that particular part of the Apollo program. It would affect some other programs as well.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; it would affect a number of other programs. I intend to point out the kind of things it could affect.

Once again, I would leave it up to the Administrator. I am not saying every program has to be cut a certain amount, or that some programs would have to be eliminated.

I call attention to Congressman RYAN's recommendation for clear alternative choices for the Congress on post-Apollo application. He favors a presentation of two explicit alternative post-Apollo programs—one emphasizing manned missions and the other unmanned missions. This should include detailed comparisons of projected costs for each mission in the alternative programs; it should include as well the goals and expected benefits for each mission and a list of probable data penalties in each approach. The presentation should include the relation of these missions to longer-range NASA plans, and should spell out clearly the total financial requirements for total programs as a basis for open and public discussion of the relative costs and benefits of the alternative approached.

Congressman RYAN also made a very useful criticism of the NERVA nuclear rocket engine impact on future budgets. He pointed out that an expensive long leadtime flight hardware development such as the NERVA nuclear rocket engine for which there is no mission requirement should not be authorized until such time as the Congress approves a national goal which would lead to such a requirement. Although the options provided by such a development may be desirable, it should be remembered that other options concerning allocation of resources are closed when such a costly and extensive development is undertaken.

If we are going to commit ourselves to go to Mars and other planets, and spend billions of dollars—and I have seen some high estimates on what it would cost us to put a man on Mars, or any planet except the moon—it will mean that we will not be able to have either a tax reduction or, on the other hand, to continue with the programs in our cities, our educational programs, and measures to meet other domestic needs. We must put these matters in perspective, and evaluate them in terms of what the benefits are.

As I say, my amendment will leave a great deal of discretion in the hands of the Administrator to spend the authorized funds. As the text of my amendment indicates there will be a cut of $1 billion but I will also indicate areas where these cuts might be made. However, the Administrator will be able to spend up to the figure authorized by the Senate substitute on any individual program he feels merits such an expenditure so long as the overall total of expenditures does not exceed the $3,370,400,000 provided by the pending amendment.

It is hoped that should the amendment be successful, NASA budgeting procedures will necessarily be changed to permit the allocation of available funds on a priority and a specific program basis, enabling the Congress next year to analyze the actual costs of each program, trends in its costing if they can be reconstructed, and projected needs for the program.

This amendment thus provides, along with my remarks, both specific cuts possible and the flexibility for NASA to set spending priorities within the $3,370,400,000 limit.

Mr. President, following is an outline of the various specific cuts, and my reasons for the amounts I recommend the Administrator cut from the various programs. Again, these are suggestions and should not be taken as mandatory. My main purpose in delineating specific cuts is to demonstrate to my colleagues that the total cut of $1 billion is a composite of carefully thought out cuts in each program.

Mr. President, I should like to make an outline, now, of the various specific cuts, with the reasons why I suggest they be cut from the programs.

First. Apollo: I recommend a total cut from Apollo of $151.8 million. This consists of the Senate committee's cut of $13.8 million and a $38 million—7 percent cut across the board.

Originally I had intended to add $50

million of this cut to the administration operations authorization, to be used solely for the conversion to civil service or in-house employment of those employees presently not under civil service.

However, I realize that this would involve an increase in Federal employment for NASA at a time when there is legislation in conference that would freeze Government employment. Therefore, in deference to the wishes of the senior Senator from Delaware and the senior Senator from Florida I will not call up the amendment calling for an increase in U.S. employees for NASA civil service.

I am a firm believer in keeping Federal employment as low as possible. My record makes this very clear. Yet I do not feel we should let slavish adherence to a principle keep us from saving a dollar wherever we can. For this reason, to save the taxpayer's hard-earned dollar, I recommend that the Congress and NASA take a hard look at this policy area and design meaningful guidelines for levels of both contract and civil service employees and justification for such levels.

Mr. President, as basic support of this position, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the cover letter of a report submitted to the Congress, by the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Elmer B. Staats. The report is dated June 1967, and states the results of studies contrasting personnel costs for the same mission accomplished by contract and then by civil service employees.

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

[B-133394]

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE and the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

The accompanying report presents the results of our review of the relative costs of using civil service personnel or contractor-furnished personnel to perform engineering and related technical support services at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Goddard and Marshall Space Flight Centers.

Our review at Marshall was limited to three contracts for services to be performed in three laboratories, for which Marshall incurred about $24.4 million in costs, excluding common costs, during the contract year ended in fiscal year 1966. At Goddard, we reviewed six contracts providing for engineering and related technical support services; the estimated cost of these contracts was about $19.9 million, excluding common costs, over a 3-year period.

Our review of the relative costs of obtaining the necessary services through the use of support contracts and through the use of civil service employees showed that estimated annual savings of as much as $5.3 million could be achieved with respect to the contracts we reviewed at Goddard and Marshall if these services were to be performed by civil service employees.

Also, it appears that additional savings could be achieved at the Marshall Space Flight Center and other Space Administration centers as evidenced by the results of studies accomplished or sponsored by the agency itself.

The indicated savings are attributable, for the most part, to the elimination of many contractor supervisory and administrative personnel, which would result from a conversion to civil service staffing and the elimination of the fees paid to the contractors.

By letter dated April 20, 1967, the Associate Administrator for Organization and Management provided us with the Space Administration's comments on our findings and conclusions. As a general justification for the use of the contractor personnel, the Associate Administrator stated, in essence, that the rapid development of the civilian space program had, from its inception, required the extensive use of support service contracts to accomplish assigned objectives. The Associate Administrator informed us that there were factors and considerations other than costs which would continue to be of a major significance in determining whether to contract for services.

Although recognizing that we gave consideration to factors other than cost in presenting our conclusions, the Associate Administrator stated that, in the situations discussed in our report, such factors supported the Space Administration's decisions that contracting for the services involved had been in the best interests of the Government.

We have no basis on which to question the Associate Administrator's views regarding the need for such services to carry out the objectives of the Space Administration's rapidly developing program, or his views regarding the significance of factors other than cost in determinations to contract for services. We recognize that, because of changing objectives or requirements, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as a practical matter, would probably have to continue to depend to some degree on support service contracts.

Although we recognize the possible merit of those considerations, it is our view that the Space Administration's policies relating to the use of such contracts have not been sufficiently clear as to the consideration which should have been accorded to relative costs in determining whether contractor-furnished or civil service personnel should be used.

In any event, we believe that, in contrast to its past rate of growth, the Space Administration has now achieved a relative degree of stability and should be able to better consider relative costs in assessing the extent to which it should continue to rely on the use of support service contracts. In this regard the Associate Administrator advised us that the Space Administration recognized the need for more specific guidance on cost considerations and that such guidance would be part of any redefinition of policy resulting from a current review of agency experience in the use of support service contracts.

We are bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress because of the potential for savings that we believe would result from greater consideration by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of the relative cost of contractor and in-house performance of support services. Also, because the action to fully correct the situation discussed in this report would require a significant change in the Space Administration's policy relating to the use of support service contracts and because of the potential effect that a significant change may have on its civil service personnel requirements, the Congress may wish to consider the policy aspects of this matter in further detail with agency officials.

The Congress may also wish to explore with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the impact that cost considerations should have in determining whether to use contractor or civil service personnel in those cases where either contractor or civil service personnel could equally carry out the operation.

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to read a paragraph to the Senate, as it states exactly the point I am trying to make:

> We are bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress because of the potential for savings that we believe would result from greater consideration by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of the relative cost of contractor and in-house performance of support services. Also, because the action to fully correct the situation discussed in this report would require a significant change in the Space Administration's policy relating to the use of support service contracts and because of the potential effect that a significant change may have on its civil service requirements, the Congress may wish to consider the policy aspects of this matter in further detail with agency officials.

This excerpt from Comptroller General Staats makes clear that there should be some change in employment policy and such a change in policy will result in substantial savings to the Government. I submit to the Senator that the switching of funds from contract employment to civil service employment could result in substantial savings for fiscal 1969 and continue as we pursue our space efforts in the years ahead.

Savings of $151.8 million from $2,038 million results in an Apollo authorization, under this amendment, of $1,887 million.

Second. Apollo application: I recommend a cut of $186.4 million from the Apollo applications program. This cut is identical to the amount cut by the House bill. I believe that this lower figure is consistent with the defined goals of the program. As I said earlier in my remarks, this program was cut substantially last year and NASA itself diverted over $60 million from it to support other programs. Furthermore, the program is full of uncertainties as to definite goals. It seems that the only firm goal in mind at NASA is to achieve a substantial financial commitment from the Congress.

Until it is made very clear, what the specific goals of the AAP program are and that there is no duplication between the AAP programs and the Air Force's MOL and there is further clarification and resolution of the manned versus unmanned flight controversy, I urge that my colleagues accept this cut and permit this program to proceed at a better-planned and more prudent pace. As the President's Science Advisory Committee asked in its February 1967 report:

> Whether the pace of the overall manned flight program necessitates the acquisition of these longer duration flight data substantially earlier than available from the MOL.

This question has not yet been answered and until it is answered there is no justification for authorizing nearly half a billion dollars for AAP.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the cutting down on this program for post-Apollo flights would represent no threat to our national security as some would have us believe. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering of the De-

fense Department, stated in a letter on May 31, 1967 that—

> The main contribution of NASA's space program to defense is in the technology being developed rather than in major items of hardware. . . . While much of the basic spacecraft technology developed by NASA could contribute to a space surveillance system, the contribution to a ballistic missile capability would be substantially less. In fact, the DOD ballistic systems and technology programs, which have contributed heavily to NASA's space effort in the past, are expected to provide technology advancements of value to NASA in the future, particularly in such areas as guidance and control, upper stage propulsion, and reentry materials.

Mr. President, certainly that statement from the military should put to rest the statements that curtailing some of the less-defined programs in NASA would hurt our defense posture. Indeed, the statement backs up exactly what I referred to when I said that NASA could contribute more to post-Apollo space investigation by developing new technology rather than applying present technology to bigger and bigger boosters that only can be meant for manned-flight beyond the Moon, before the Congress has authorized such flights or even considered and debated whether this type of flight is to become national policy. First, the scientific controversy should be resolved and then Congress can decide on controlling policy before NASA takes it upon itself to commit the Nation in the 1970's to flights to Mars and beyond.

Savings of $186.4 million—the House figure—from the requested $439.6 million, would result in an authorization of $253.2 million. This figure is sufficient for NASA to carry on a post-Apollo program that does not commit us to deep-space manned flights yet permits the advance of a technology that will permit the design and construction of the hardware necessary to achieve this goal should the Congress determine this to be national policy.

Third. Advanced missions: In view of the fact that substantial cuts are being made in the AAP and other programs and their pace brought under firmer control, it logically follows that those programs being planned even further in the future should likewise be cut back. Funds authorized for advanced missions study are to be used in determining the need for an intermediate launch vehicle for the space station program. Since this program will not become operational until the mid-seventies, the delay in funding advanced missions seems to be fully justified. I support the reasoning contained in the Senate report. However, since the overall R. & D. savings contained in my amendment are substantially above those in the committee amendment, it logically follows that the funds needed for advanced missions should be corresponding lower. Less money available lengthens the timespan in which those various programs can become operational. A restraining hand on Apollo applications necessarily puts advanced missions further in my future.

For this reason I propose to save $4 million from the requested $5 million, leaving $1 million for advanced mission planning.

Fourth. Physics and astronomy programs: The Senate committee cut $5 million from this program. I propose to add to that cut the sum of $41.9 million achieving a total saving of $46.9 million.

This program can be cut both in number of flights, types of hardware, and in the support for the various launches. Slowing this program to a more manageable pace will permit fuller evaluation of the data already gained from past explorations of the solar system, interplanetary environment, and ionosphere. I believe, particularly with respect to sounding rockets, we may be indulging in some scientific overkill here. Surely, this is an area where some economies can be achieved without essential damage being done to the program. I doubt very much that it is necessary to send up over 100 sounding rockets a year. Surely, space matter, radiation levels and energetic particles at the 40- to 175-mile range does not change radically every 3½ days.

Other areas where economies can be achieved are by delaying or eliminating IMP, the two planned Explorers and Sunblazer. It would also seem here that Explorer is planned to do the work of the sounding rockets. If we are going to have a satellite in the 40- to 175-mile range we will be gathering the same data gathered by the sounding rockets. I don't believe that sound arguments can be made for retaining both of them. This is one area where the Administrator can look for overlap and allocate funds where they will achieve the most for the least money.

Savings of $46.9 million from $141.9 million results in a recommended authorization of $95 million for physics and astronomy.

Fifth. Lunar and planetary exploration: The Senate committee cut $15 million from this program. I propose to add savings of $50 million to that to achieve total savings of $65 million.

While the descriptions of the functions of this item and its various programs indicate that their purpose is to gather scientific data about the moon and the other planets in our solar system, it seems clear to me that the real object of this total program is to commit the United States to manned exploration of the solar system during the late 1970's. Again we would be putting the cart before the horse. I would like to remind my colleagues at this point, that it is estimated conservatively by space experts that to embark now on a policy of deep-space manned flights will commit us to expenditures in the nature of $200 billion. It may well be that by the early seventies we will be able to afford such an outlay for space exploration; though I seriously doubt it. Yet the fact remains, we cannot afford it now and we can't pay for it now, except by bigger deficits, higher taxes, inflation and continued serious neglect of more pressing problems right here on earth, right here in the United States.

Again since my amendment and suggested specific cuts envision a substantial savings in all manned programs and significant savings in unmanned programs, it is logical to expect lunar and planetary exploration to slow its pace to that of Apollo Applications.

Because of this program's close tie-in with the After Apollo program, it can be reduced substantially without causing any serious damage to our presently defined national goals on space. That goal of reaching the Moon by 1970 is a fact; however, the continuation of manned space flights to Mars, Venus, and Mercury is not. Testimony before both committees of Congress and the reports of both committees make it quite clear that research and development in extremely expensive programs calling for manned flights to other planets in our solar system is included in this request. But I state again that the Nation has not yet committed itself by law to deep-space manned exploration. Yet a look at practically every item in the budget requests show that what we are doing now is a mere prelude to what will be done on the manned level during the next decade. Size of boosters, size of projected antenna systems, development of a nuclear rocket: all are gradually committing us to backing into a stupendously expensive program that the country would not approve and the Congress would not approve of our undertaking if our eyes were open to total projected costs. Again I refer to the figure of $200 billion to place a man on Mars.

The statement in the Senate committee report that Titan Mars 1973 "provides maximum flexibility to implement future mission options depending upon the national interest and economic support for planetary exploration" would seem to lend itself in 1973 to the argument that since we have already spent millions and millions and millions of dollars developing this capability we must now go ahead and put a man or men on Mars. Again, we are backing into deep-space manned exploration at a time when we simply cannot afford it.

Savings of $65 million from the requested $107.3 million results in a recommended authorization of $42,300,000.

Sixth. Bioscience: In the bioscience authorization I concur with the Senate committee recommendation for a saving of $9.2 million. Taking the $9.2 million from a request of $48.5 million results in a recommended authorization of $39.3 million.

Seventh. Space applications: Again I concur with the Senate figure for space applications authorization. The saving of $13.5 million from a request of $112.2 million results in a recommended authorization $98.7 million.

Eighth. Launch vehicle procurement: The Senate committee cut $10.6 million from this request. I would add savings of $28 million, arriving at total savings of $38.6 million.

In view of the savings achieved in the programs that will utilize these various launch vehicles, there will be a corresponding smaller need for launch vehicles. Cuts can be made in Scout, Delta. Agena, and Centaur procurement, since the specific programs which they are connected with will also be reduced or slowed to a pace that is fiscally manageable.

Ninth. Sustaining university program: Because of the impact other cuts in hardware will have on basic research, I recommend that no cuts be made in this program. The tendency for basic research to be cut before the giant rockets even feel the pinch is well known in the scientific community. I would not want to see this happen and suggest that university programs be converted to basic research as much as practicable and that the full request of $10 million be allocated.

Tenth. Space vehicle systems: I concur with the Senate reduction in the program of $3.5 million. This cut can easily be taken from the supporting research and technology portion of the authorization without hurting the other smaller efforts within the program. Reductions in space vehicles themselves logically calls for reductions in their support systems needs. The recommended authorization is $31.8 million.

Eleventh. Electronic systems: Again I agree with the Senate committee reduction of $3.9 million. The recommended authorization is $35.5 million.

Twelfth. Human factors: Here I also agree with the cut made by the Senate committee. The reduction of $2 million from $21.7 million results in a recommended authorization of $19.7 million.

Thirteenth. Basic research: Here, as with the sustaining university program, I do not recommend any cuts. Basic research will suffer enough from cuts within the administration, I fear, and I will not add to its difficulties. However, I do believe that this type of research is of far more value ultimately than developing enough rocket thrust to theoretically get the Washington Monument rushing skyward. I support this type of research and hope the Administrator sees fit to leave it fully funded. This type of approach demonstrates the need for some reordering of priorities within NASA.

Fourteenth. Space power and electric propulsion systems: I concur here with the committee reduction. Savings of $2.5 million from a request of $44.8 million results in a recommended authorization of $42.3 million.

Fifteenth. Nuclear rockets: I concur with the House reduction of the nuclear rockets program from $60 million to $11.7 million, a saving of $48.3 million. As the House report says:

> In view of the magnitude of this commitment, and with a full appreciation of the progress to date in this field, the Committee deferred the NERVA engine development work for Fiscal Year 1969. This deferral was made primarily because of the large fund requirement and because there are no approved missions at this time that cannot be made with existing boosters. The $11.7 million remaining in the program is available to carry out necessary supporting research and to test the experimental reactors at the Nevada site.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Can the Senator comment in more detail about the nuclear rockets program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator refers to the nuclear rockets program.

I read from page 53 of the Senate committee report with reference to the nuclear rocket program:

> The objective of the Nuclear Rockets Program is to provide rocket propulsion systems for application to high-energy, high-payload missions of the future. In carrying out this objective, the AEC–NASA Space Nuclear Propulsion Office is conducting a detailed system-analysis, design, development, and test program to provide an approximately 75,000-pound-thrust NERVA engine of between 800–850 seconds specific impulse for flight status by about 1976. The data, designs, and experience required to develop this engine were established during the earlier technology phase of the program.
>
> The specific NERVA activities to be conducted during fiscal year 1969 include the completion of the technology phase of the NERVA program and continuation, at an increased level, of the design, development, procurement, and component testing of the 75,000-pound-thrust NERVA engine initiated in fiscal year 1968.

Earlier in my remarks, I say to the Senator from Kentucky, I indicated that I was concerned about this type of program because it seems to commit us to manned flights.

The principal reason for having rockets with this terrific thrust, as I understand it, is that they are necessary if you are going to put a man on a distant planet. The scientific community, as the Senator from Kentucky is aware, is divided on this matter. Many scientists feel it is unnecessary, that the benefits from having a man on Mars would be very slight, that we can have instruments do the same work with far less risk of life and far less expense.

My fear, if we go ahead with the program of having this engine, is that, having committed ourselves, the argument will be made that Congress has already appropriated this money and the Government is already committed to going ahead, that we have spent billions of dollars and we had better proceed. For that reason, I believe we had better keep our options open, especially at a time when our fiscal problems are so great.

Mr. COOPER. I have been following the Senator's argument; that if we approve the authorizations for the various items he has discussed, in effect, Congress would be approving—at least, through the authorization of money—programs which it really had not considered and which in some cases we may not ever want to undertake.

The reason I asked the Senator about this particular item is this: I recall that at the beginning of our major space effort, after the Sputnik was put in orbit, the United States was hampered for a long time by the fact that it did not have the necessary propulsion or booster system; while it was recognized that we had the best instruments and more sophisticated facilities and satellites, we could not match the Soviets for several years.

For years we were still working on propulsion or launching systems of greater power.

I do not know what the Congress and our country might want to do 5 years from now or 10 years from now. But I raise this question: If we did find it necessary in the Congress and the country to undertake advanced programs, would we find ourselves in the same position with respect to nuclear rocket, nuclear engines—in which we found ourselves after Sputnik, with respect to booster systems—unable to make the progress that could be very necessary?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recall very well, also, that that was seemingly the only area in which the Soviet Union was ahead of us. We had more flights, more miniaturization, much more sophisticated instruments. But they were able to beat us in some of the great projects in space because they had bigger boosters and could send more people up, keep them up longer, and so forth, than we could.

Well, it depends on the objectives. I am sure that if we make the assumption and the commitment now that we want to put a man on Mars, and we are willing to commit ourselves to $200 billion—which is one estimate, and I believe a reasonable and sensible estimate, of what it would cost—then I believe the logic of the argument that we should go ahead now with these big boosters makes sense. However, as I understand it, we do not need these big boosters for the Apollo program, and they are not part of the Apollo program.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator explain where he gets the $200 billion figure? No reliable authority has set it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that this estimate was made on the basis of general study of other scientific estimates, both on the floor of the House and in the committee of the House, and it has not been refuted. Other people say it will not cost that much.

I would be happy if the Senator would indicate what his estimate would be of the cost of putting a man on Mars. It is going to cost approximately $40 billion to put a man on the moon. It seems to me that it would be far, far more expensive to put a man on Mars—at least $200 billion and probably more than that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to make this statement carefully. The committee has reviewed the NASA program very carefully. It is our view that there is no money in the budget for a manned planetary flight. Can anyone show where it is in the budget? Not a dollar is provided in the budget for that purpose. The Senator has been talking about it all afternoon. Can he show the $200 billion figure on paper?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am saying to the Senator from New Mexico that of course it is not. I am not claiming that the committee has told us. If it did, I believe we would have a clear-cut issue before the Senate, and we would be able to cut this authorization easily.

The only reason for this enormous commitment of funds to these very powerful engines, for example, is so that we can put a man on planets or on the moon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not necessarily.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What purpose do they serve, then?

Mr. ANDERSON. Planetary flight. They do not necessarily have to put a man on Mars.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They would be use-

ful for what purpose besides going to another planet?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would be to have a fly-by. That would not be landing a man on Mars.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is one of the difficulties of the program.

Mr. ANDERSON. The difficulty of the program has been that the people working for the committee hour after hour have the facts and it makes it difficult in a session of this nature.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was going to say to the distinguished Senator that the difficulty is to create these enormous and expensive engines, and they say there are no specific missions for them to perform. It would be different if they had some kind of mission involving the Apollo program but this is outside the Apollo program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

I do not question for one moment that much knowledge can be gained through this program. I think it is very worthwhile, but nevertheless we are going to have to make significant cuts in many of these programs.

The conference report dealing with the tax bill, which is now awaiting action by the House of Representatives, provides for a $6 billion mandatory expenditure reduction for fiscal 1969. It also provides in the second section that it be mandatory that we reduce the obligational authority in fiscal 1969 by $10 billion. Then at the end of this year they are supposed to rescind $6 billion of the outstanding obligational authority.

Mr. President, the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to reduce new obligational authority from $4,150,000,000 to $3,370,000,000. This is $1 billion less than the budget asked for and about $780 million less than reported by the committee.

Without debating the merits or demerits of this particular program, I merely point out that we must establish a system of priorities; the only alternative would be to pass to the President this authority to make the reductions. We would be conferring upon the President the instruction and direction to cut $10 billion from new obligational authority for 1969 and to reduce spending by $6 billion.

I think that we in Congress should establish our own system of priorities by cutting back on some of these programs. This program is one in which we can make reductions.

I certainly support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I wish to join him as a cosponsor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Delaware. He certainly is the leader in the Senate on economy. I have followed his lead almost 100 percent of the time. However, he has done a magnificent job in this respect.

Mr. President, I hate to think of the problems we would have in terms of keeping spending down if it were not for the Senator from Delaware. His support is most welcome. He is always most logical in his perspective. He has not made unreasonable proposals that we eliminate services. His approach has always been thoughtful and designed to cut out what we do not have to have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We have to cut those items which have the least priority at this time. To get the record straight, the bill before us would authorize new expenditures in 1969 and years thereafter in the total amount of $4,150,560,000.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin of which I am a cosponsor, would reduce the overall authorization that could be permissible in 1969 and thereafter to $3,370,400,000, notwithstanding the authorizations in the act.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I wish to ask a question or two on the nuclear rocket engines to which the Senator has been addressing himself.

I understand that in the overall amendment he is proposing to cut back to $11.7 million, which is the House figure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. I wonder how the figure of $11.7 million was reached. Could the Senator tell me that? Why is the figure not $12.5 or $10 million?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Frankly, I cannot tell the Senator. I can tell him, in general, they cut the program for the reasons I indicated. The House said:

> In view of the magnitude of this commitment, and with a full appreciation of the progress to date in this field, the Committee defered the NERVA engine development work for Fiscal Year 1969. This deferral was made primarily because of the large fund requirement and because there are no approved missions at this time that cannot be made with existing boosters. The $11.7 million remaining in the program is available to carry out necessary supporting research and to test the experimental reactors at the Nevada test site.

I presume the reason they made it $11.7 million is that was their estimate of what it would take to forget the development of the NERVA engine, to lay that aside, and rely completely on experimental research and reactors.

I think it is necessary and desirable for the RECORD that it be pointed out that none of this is mandatory. The administration would be free to spend $9 million or $13 million if it were consistent with the remainder of the program. These are some areas that could be cut.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I support wholeheartedly and enthusiastically the action of the legislative committee in reporting the bill.

In allowing for the NERVA I project, I think it can be demonstrated it is worthwhile, that it has an essential mission, and should go forward; but I am not going to trespass on the Senator's time for that purpose. I shall attempt to be recognized on my own time by the Presiding Officer later.

I have been advised, and this is the purpose of the question, that the $11.7 million was the cutback figure of the House of Representatives and it is insufficient even to take care of the phasing-out operation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. They have certain contract obligations. Even if they phased out, it is something like $30 or $35 million.

I am wondering if $11.7 million—with which I do not agree, in any event—is realistic. Possibly the chairman of the committee could throw some light on the matter. I wonder why that figure is used. The Senator has said he took the figure from the House of Representatives.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a liquidating figure. It should have been $38 million. They got $11 million by mistake in the RECORD, that would completely wipe out this work.

Mr. BIBLE. But with respect to completely wiping it out, I might say to the Senator, the figure would not do that. It should be in the range of $21 to $30 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. I am not espousing that and I do not propose it. I wondered where the figure came from.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It came from the House of Representatives.

There is one particular matter to which I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Nevada, and that is that there is discretion for the Administrator. If there is need for $21 million, it would not be easy, but it would be possible for him to secure other funds. He could spend more than $11.7 million if my amendment is agreed to.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Is it the intent of the Senator from Wisconsin to proceed with the overall approximate $1 billion cut, with that discretion vested in the Administrator?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Rather than the individual amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am simply discussing what might be reduced. I am not saying this is what has to be done. I am saying: "You must cut $1 billion in the budget request, but the specific cuts can be made now." It does not have to be made this way.

Mr. BIBLE. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which I understand the Senator from Delaware is cosponsoring, will be an overall $1 billion cut to be exercised in the discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Delaware and

then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree with the answers the Senator gave to the Senator from Nevada, but to clarify the matter I think we might modify the language somewhat.

All the authorizations under the bill naturally are not for spending in the year authorized. Some of this year's authorizations will be spent in 1969 and some in subsequent years. The way the amendment reads it is tied to expenditures in fiscal 1969. I suggest that to make it clear, on line 5 we amend it to strike out the words "in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969," and let the amendment read "not more than $3,370,400,000 may be expended for all programs under authorizations by this act."

Then there would be no question that it gives discretionary authority to put the cuts where they prefer. The money can be spent in 1969 or 1970, whichever they think would be more feasible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that line 5 of my amendment containing the words, "in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969," be stricken and a comma added after the word "expended"——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the amendment to my amendment be taken—oh, I will send the modified amendment to the desk shortly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it will save a lot of time——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object because such a change would completely contradict the statements made twice into the RECORD already by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin as to what his purpose is. I do not propose to have a complete change in direction as to what his purpose is at this stage in the proceedings.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The intention is to cut back on authorizations in this bill. It can be corrected in this amendment, or a new amendment can be offered to accomplish the same result by three rollcall votes.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that the request for unanimous consent changes this amendment in a very important way, so as to make it differ in its meaning from what has been stated in the RECORD twice by the Senator from Wisconsin, as to what his meaning is and what his intention is; and I prefer not to have it done that way. If the Senator wants to offer a different amendment later, that is all right. But, as it is now, the RECORD shows clearly what the Senator is trying to do, and what the distinguished Senator from Delaware is trying to do; namely, to effect a change of purpose already stated twice in the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to my good friend from Florida, whom I highly respect, and who is an extraordinarily able and distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, and understands these things very well, that by deleting the words "in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969," I am simply saying that, "nothwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, not more than $3,370,400,000 may be expended for all programs authorized by this act." I achieve what is my objective, and what is also the objective, I believe, of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would likewise achieve what the Senator from Florida wants, because we would not tie them down as to what they can spend under the bill for 1969 under new outstanding obligational authority. This is merely a reduction of the authorization under the particular bill from $4,150 million to $3,370,400,000, which is $1 billion less than the new obligational authority requested by the Budget. It is $780 million less new obligational authority than was reported by the committee. That is exactly what the Senator from Wisconsin stated at the beginning.

Mr. HOLLAND. What are the words the Senator from Wisconsin wished to delete?

Mr. PROXMIRE. On line 5 of the amendment, "in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969." Those words would be deleted.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, this amendment would leave the limitation of $3,370,400,000 for expenditures not only in this year but also for all years in the future; is that it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under this particular authorization program; yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But only under this authorization. Next year would be another authorization.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not affect the outstanding authorizations or carryovers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think I shall continue my objection. If the Senator wishes to draft another amendment and put it in, that will be a different situation; but this would change it. As the Senator well knows, the meaning of his amendment has already been stated by him and placed in the RECORD twice, in response to specific questions addressed to him by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection if the Senator from Florida wants to insist on his position, but I really think that it would make a lot of unnecessary work for the Senate and about three extra rollcall votes to get back to the same objective. It would take unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment, or it could be rephrased in 20 different ways. Thus, in the interest of orderly procedure and to save a lot of time I believe that the Senator from Wisconsin should have the right to modify his amendment. It is clear that the authorization the committee reported was $4,150,560,000 and that the budget had asked for $4,370,400,000, and it is also clear that the Senator from Wisconsin was trying to reduce it by $1 billion below what was the budget request, which would be about $780 million below what the committee reported.

Now the committee report points out that the expenditures and the authorizations in years heretofore have been in excess of that, so it would be reasonable to expect that the expenditures could be even higher this year. But I do not believe that the Senator from Florida wants to tie this as a limitation on the overall expenditures of the agency by including the outstanding authorizations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with that explanation, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Does the Senator intend to have the NERVA program completely terminated? Is that the intent of his amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The intent of my amendment—as the House acted on it, as I understand it, relative to the work on the NERVA engines—would be to permit the rest of the program, what they call "necessary supporting research" and testing of the reactor at the Nevada site. The senior Senator from Nevada and the junior Senator from Nevada are experts in that field. It is in their State. I know that the Senators from Nevada understand the program thoroughly and in detail, and if they tell me that it would take more than $11.4 million to keep the program alive at all, I think they might very well be right. But what I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is, this is a suggested way in which the Administrator could save $1 billion. If he has to spend more than $10 billion or $15 billion, he is free to do it, provided he can get the $10 billion to $15 billion elsewhere. Thus, I am not locking out the NERVA program, or any others.

I am merely suggesting ways in which possibly this amount of money could be saved. The two Senators from Nevada made a very good point on this particular program.

Mr. CANNON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the NERVA program has been a very successful, ongoing program up to the present time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CANNON. Is the Senator also aware of the fact that there are two engines in the process of completion and on which most of the work has been accomplished, in a bought and paid for sense, but they could not be tested if the Senator's amendment were to be adopted?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that. It could be done. Anything could be done. They can go ahead with the full budget funding. They could not go above it, but they could go as far as the Senate suggested. I am suggesting that this is one place in which it could be cut. The reason for it is that there is no approved mission for the engine.

Mr. CANNON. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the statement made by Mr. Klein as it appears in the hearings. Let me read from the hearings:

Senator CANNON. Now, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has reduced the $60 million request by $48.3 million, as we all know, leaving only $11.7 million in

the bill. If this cut were to stand, what is the effect on personnel employed by Government agencies and contractors in the program?

Mr. KLEIN. That cut, Senator Cannon, would essentially wipe out the entire program. The best we can determine, it might about pay for the cost of termination, immediate termination; that is, but would not at all provide for the testing even of hardware that is on hand. So it is immediate termination, essentially.

Senator CANNON. That was going to be my next question: What would be the effect on the test firing of the experimental engines, No. 1 and No. 2, which have yet to be accomplished in the technology program?

Mr. KLEIN. It would not permit us even to conduct those tests.

In view of that statement, I wonder if the Senator would feel that his position should be modified with respect to the NERVA program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. I realize it is going to be extremely difficult for the Administrator of NASA to make these judgments, but it is one of those disciplines that has to be enforced on the executive branch, because the Senate has now decided to cut expenditures by $6 billion. We have to find ways to do it. If the program has to be closed down, then it has to be. They can start it up again if they decide it should be started up again. The argument for closing it down has nothing to do with the fact that they are fine people who have made a success of the program. What it has to do with is that there is no apparent purpose for these engines once developed. They have no approved mission at this time that cannot be done with existing boosters. They just do not need it.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator made the statement that this program could be started up some time in the future if it were desirable. Is he aware of the fact that to close it down and start it up sometime in the future would be more costly than to continue the program at the present time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That may or may not be true. Once again, it is discretionary with the Administrator. I may also say to the Senator from Nevada that it is perfectly possible, in view of the nature of technology in this field, that advances may be made that would make it cheaper to start in the future.

Mr. CANNON. Does the Senator also know that the Senate and the House have already approved for the AEC some $69 million to proceed with the program, a program directly related to the NERVA program; that Congress has acted to approve that amount, and that amount could not be used except in connection with the NERVA program? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, I am aware that whenever any of these programs are stopped, there are bound to be some kind of protests. The only way to economize is to economize. The only way to stop it is to stop it. It is going to be painful no matter how we do it.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator's statement does not get at the problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say it is possible to go up to $55 million. I suggested $11 million, but $55 million is the only limit that is applied to the particular program by the Proxmire amendment for nuclear rockets. So there is absolutely no reason why the Administrator has to go down to $11 million or $13 million or $20 million, for that matter.

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe the Senator has answered the problem I raised.

I would like to quote from page 58 of the report, as follows:

Since the Nuclear Rockets program is a joint program of the AEC and NASA, and since the authorization for the AEC portion of the program ($69 million) has already been approved by the Congress, it would be inconsistent to reduce the NASA portion by the $48.3 million suggested by the House.

The House committee's report said:

"This action was taken in recognition of the severe funding requirements of the Nation and with the full understanding of the progress that has been made in this program. In no way should this action be construed as a lack of confidence in the program but purely as a desire to defer the actual NERVA I development and reduce the level of effort in the nuclear rockets program."

Then the House and Senate both turned around and approved the AEC portion of the $69 million for this program. It has to go as one program or not go at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is perfectly possible that the Appropriations Committee may cut the AEC appropriation, for that matter. We are going to have a lot of very, very painful cuts this year. There is no question about it. I am simply suggesting that we can cut this particular budget, and cut it deliberately, knowing what we are doing, and take responsibility for it. I think we can do so responsibly. What I am suggesting here is to leave with the Administrator the discretion to determine, when he is familiar with the situation, whether it has to be cut to $11 million or whether it should not be cut that much.

Mr. CANNON. I agree with the Senator that we may find areas than can be cut, but I also agree that cuts should be made that are responsibly made. I think the next two paragraphs following the paragraphs I just read from the report are pertinent, and I would like to read them:

Many of the activities of the Nuclear Rockets program are in mid-stream and the $11.7 million left in the program by the House would not permit testing of experimental engine systems already built and might not even cover all termination costs. In spite of the language in the House report, then, it seems unavoidable that the Nuclear Rockets program would have to be terminated if funding is reduced to the level recommended by the House.

Through fiscal year 1968 about $1.1 billion will have been invested in it by both NASA and AEC. To terminate it now would be to waste the knowledge already paid for and to lose the many highly skilled people on the program to other pursuits. The experts agree the technology is available to proceed now with the development of the NERVA I nuclear rocket engine and that nothing would be gained, and indeed much would be lost, if the development of the nuclear rocket engine was not undertaken at this time. Nearly everyone agrees that nuclear rocket propulsion will be required for space exploration, and attempts to reinstate the program at some future time would be extremely costly both in time and money.

The Senator seemed concerned about the fact that there was no specific mission, but I think the record is quite clear, from the testimony of all the experts, including Dr. von Braun and others, that this engine would be required for future missions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What kind of missions?

Mr. CANNON. It is my understanding that the Senator earlier made the statement that it would be used for manned planetary explorations in the distant future. That is not contemplated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What is contemplated? They do not have any approved missions for which they can use the present boosters. They do not need it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Webb, in his testimony before the committee in the hearing on NERVA, said:

In considering how best to move ahead within the overall budgetary restraints without causing a major hiatus in the development of nuclear propulsion, we concluded, as we informed the Committee last fall, that a nuclear engine of approximately 75,000 pounds thrust would be the best system to proceed to develop. Our studies show that for all types of missions that we now foresee, an engine in this class will provide performance gains approximately equal to those possible with the larger engine, except that it is not the optimum size for very large planetary flights such as manned planetary landing missions.

In other words, he is pointing out the engine they have said they want to get—not NERVA II, but the upgraded NERVA I—would not permit them to go ahead with large planetary flights such as manned planetary landing missions.

Mr. Webb went on to say:

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to be very clear that we are not proposing to proceed with nuclear engine development on the basis of manned flight to the planets, and that such missions are not included in our plans at this time.

Then he does go on and states the type of missions that can be accomplished with the upgraded NERVA I engine.

Again on page 809 of our hearings, Mr. Webb made it clear, in response to a question from the chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico:

Mr. WEBB. No, sir; we have no plan in our program for a manned flight to Mars or any other planet. We do have plans, as you know, to go the Moon, which is a satellite of the Earth and is different from these other bodies in that it is the first stage toward the development of a national capability to proceed outward.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my good friend from Nevada that once again, the language in the report is exactly the kind of thing which I have been referring to all day, which does not make any sense at all to me.

Listen to this:

Through fiscal year 1968 about $1.1 billion will have been invested in it by both NASA and AEC. To terminate it now would be to waste the knowledge already paid for and to lose the many highly skilled people on the program to other pursuits.

And so forth. This is the argument for going on indefinitely with these things. We spend more this year in this bill on NASA, and next year and the year after the committee will come in and say we

have to spend more because we have already spent so much.

It is true that there may be, possibly, some other kind of use for this engine, but the facts show there are no contemplated missions at this time which cannot be made with existing boosters.

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator will yield further, that certainly is not an argument for going on indefinitely. It is an argument for going ahead and completing the program.

It is like starting a program for building an automobile, going ahead and building the front end, and not completing the rest of it. If you are going to start a project, you ought to complete it. If it is worth doing, and we are going to do it, we ought to do it now, when we can do it at an optimum cost, rather than some unspecified time in the future.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If you are building an automobile, you can go ahead with your design and engineering and plans; but that does not mean you have to build it.

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator will yield, this has been built to a great degree. We have two engines already built, that have not been tested, and cannot be tested unless the program is funded. This equipment has been bought and paid for, and is hardware on the shelf.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They can be tested in the future, if not now.

Mr. CANNON. They can be tested if the committee's recommendations are followed, but they cannot if the Senator's recommendation is followed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me read just two paragraphs from the House report. The House committee went into this in great detail, and took the same position I am taking. The report says:

> The funds required for the NERVA engine development extending through 1978 are estimated at $600 million. This is the total cost to NASA and to the Atomic Energy Commission. The distribution is $333 million to NASA and $267 million to AEC. Upon completion of this engine development it would then be necessary to develop the flight stage for a particular mission. This latter cost has been estimated at $500 million.

So if the Senator is telling me that because we have authorized $65 million for the AEC we have to go ahead, I am saying that this is just the beginning. The Senator says these engines are just about finished. If that is true, I cannot read, because this report says $600 million for further development, and then $500 million after that for the flight stage.

I quote further:

> In view of the magnitude of this commitment, and with a full appreciation of the progress to date in this field, the Committee deferred the NERVA engine development work for Fiscal Year 1969. This deferral was made primarily because of the large fund requirement and because there are no approved missions at this time that cannot be made with existing boosters.

I think that the Senator from Nevada does make a very strong case, as his colleagues did. Perhaps they could persuade the administrators to use other funds in this program. But I do think the argument the House of Representatives made also stands up, and I say to my good friend from Nevada that we are, after all, bound to have these difficulties when we cut back programs. We are not going to be able to finish everything; we have to interrupt some of them. Perhaps we will have to spend more dollars in the future if we decide to go ahead than if we had proceeded directly; but that is one of the problems you run into when you decide that you have to cut spending. It seems to me this is one of the painful decisions we have to make.

Mr. CANNON. Will the Senator yield further on this point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I think the distinguished chairman of the committee made four very good points in his opening statement, and I believe that they should be reemphasized here:

> At this point I would like to include in the record four points made by Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, in testifying in support of this program. I think they are most pertinent to the matter under discussion:
>
> "First, during the second decade of the space age we will undoubtedly find that there are important civil or military requirements for space vehicles and missions requiring nuclear propulsion or for which it will provide decisive advantages.
>
> "Second, as in other fields of advanced technology, the Nation should not shortsightedly cut off or constrain the development of new technology of great promise because specific requirements or applications cannot be clearly identified and justified in advance.
>
> "Third, it is very important that we move ahead with nuclear rocket engine development in fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 to give a clear signal that the United States does not intend to limit its development of large launch vehicle and payload capabilities to those of the Saturn V class space booster.
>
> "Fourth, it is important to proceed with the development of a nuclear rocket engine at this time to serve as a central focus for a continuing advance in the nuclear and other technologies involved. We may well find over the next half dozen years important benefits and applications in other fields coming out of the work on nuclear propulsion, so much of which is at the most advanced boundaries of our current knowledge and technology."

I think that does make a very good case, and I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I think he makes a strong case. I simply say in response that I believe there is great merit in the House position, which I support. I think that merit is increased, furthermore, by the fact that the Administrator does have discretion in this matter, and if he feels that particular programs need greater funding, he can reduce other programs. This is just a suggested list of reductions; it is not mandatory.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I raised a question about this particular item about an hour ago for these reasons: I have been following the Senator's argument for reducing the authorizations for specific items, and his general grounds for all reductions.

As I have followed his argument, the Senator did not, first, want Congress to commit itself to large future programs, by this means of gradually increasing authorizations over the years, without really making a decision as to whether it wanted to engage in such a future program.

But I noted that in the Senator's proposed reductions, item by item, he did not reduce any one of the items extensively. On the first item, for example—the Apollo program, in addition to the cut that has been made by the committee, the Senator proposed a cut of 7 percent.

As I followed the Senator, item by item, it seemed to me that he suggested what I thought were reasonable reductions. But when the Senator came to the item we are now discussing, he is proposing a cut of from $50 million to $11 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Fifty-five million dollars to $11 million.

Mr. COOPER. Such a cut, it seems to me, differs from the treatment of other items, and would have the effect of ending the entire program. To attempt to make judgments about the U.S. space program is difficult for all of us except those who are on the committee on the Appropriations Committee, who have a chance to hear all the testimony, and who have studied the subject for years.

But I recall the problem that the country experienced at the time the Russians put up their Sputnik. We had highly sophisticated instruments and sophisticated satellites, but we did not have a booster system that could launch large satellites. For years we witnessed the Soviet Union sending into space larger and larger satellites; then a satellite carrying a dog; and then satellites carrying men. The United States was behind.

This program involves a new kind of engine. According to the report, it is described as a new development, one that could be a highly advanced means for the propulsion of a space vehicle. Its technology could also be applied in other fields.

I believe it would be more reasonable, and I would feel much better about voting for the Senator's amendment, if he would not insist on suggesting that the nuclear engine be cut so extensively—and thus close out a program which might be of inestimable value in the future.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The reason I propose to cut the amount sharply to $11 million is that I follow the recommendation of the House. The House made an even greater cut. Of course, the Senate did not agree with the House. But I say, in support of the position I have taken, that I have not specified in the amendment that the cuts have to be made in each program. I simply propose an overall cut of $11 million, the cuts to be made at the discretion of the Administrator and within limits set by the Senate. However, if the Administrator felt he should cut the amount for the engine program, he would be free to do so. He may make cuts in other parts of the program, as well.

The argument of the Senator from Kentucky is a strong one. However, the House also said it simply did not have any approved missions for which this booster is necessary.

Mr. COOPER. As a matter of commonsense, it seems that, unlike the Senator's other proposals, his suggestion in this case would discontinue a program which is in progress and which might mean more for the future development of technology, not only in the area of space but in other fields as well, than would some of the other items.

The Senator relies on the House position; but we do not have to accept that position. We must make our judgment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not relying completely on the position of the House. The Administrator is free to act within certain limits.

Mr. COOPER. If I were in the Senator's place, I would act differently with respect to the item for nuclear engines.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that the Administrator, who would have discretion, would act quite differently from the Senator from Wisconsin if the amendment should prevail and should be retained to any extent in conference.

Let me add one more sentence from the House report. I read from page 90:

> Nuclear propulsion would also reduce by several million pounds the weight of the space vehicle required to be launched from earth orbit for manned planetary missions.

So while this is not the only purpose of the manned planetary missions, as specified, it is one of the principal purposes for a nuclear rocket.

Once again, I say that I simply do not think we ought to make a commitment, or even an implicit commitment, for manned planetary flight.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am particularly intrigued by the approach which the Senator follows. Apparently he wants to follow anybody except the Senate committee, which has made this recommendation. In one breath, the Senator says, "Let us leave the cut to the discretion of the Administrator. He can put in $55 million, or a larger or a smaller amount, if he wants to." In the next breath, the Senator says, "I recommend that we follow the proposal of the House committee, which reduced the amount to $11.7 million."

I am wondering whether the Senator thinks that the Senate committee made no study at all, when it recommends a particular handling of this problem, specifically in language that is different from the House language, and does not leave tremendous discretion with the Administrator, rather than with Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; I followed the recommendations of the Senate committee to a great extent. I accept the limits the committee placed on each program. I do not change them at all.

But I do feel that if we are to have a saving of $6 billion, which the Senate has forced itself to take by adopting the Smathers-Williams amendment, we ought to be responsible enough to indicate areas where the savings should be made. We ought to recognize what the implications will be if we do not do that.

If we go ahead with the kind of funding that the committee recommends for the space program, it means that we will virtually wipe out other programs. We will have to make a proportionate cut in every program that comes before us.

This is a modest reduction in space spending. If we will carefully examine the budget, as I am sure the Senator from Florida has done, and try to figure out how we can cut $6 billion in expenditures during the coming year, we will find that it is a very difficult and painful task, one which will require at least the kind of cut that I am recommending.

Mr. President, this statement supports not only the wise deferral by the House of this program but underlines my earlier statement that we are developing hardware for which there is "no approved mission at this time." Here is a prime example of how we are being maneuvered backward into investing in programs that have not yet been defined as national goals by the Congress. I fully support this saving. It is eminently justifiable.

Sixteenth. Chemical propulsion: In this request, I concur with the saving recommended by the committee. The reduction of $6.5 million from a request of $36.7 million leaves a recommended authorization of $30.2 million for chemical propulsion.

Seventeenth. Aeronautical vehicles: I recommend a reduction for this program of $35.6 million. Mr. President, it is no coincidence that this figure is the exact sum of the amounts requested for supersonic and hypersonic aircraft technology supporting research. Research in these two areas are a gift to the aircraft manufacturing industries. I do not see the fairness to taxpayers who will never be able to afford supersonic commercial air travel or even live to see hypersonic commercial air travel subsidizing this kind of research. If there is a need for this type of transportation, then it is economically viable. If it is economically viable, then there will be a return on investment. If the aerospace industries feel this is an area of promise, then the Government should not preempt this field that will eventually pay such high dividends.

Admittedly there is some benefit to the military from this type of research. However, I am in favor of the military funding and conducting their own research in these highly sophisticated fields.

If there is a military justification for hypersonic flight, then let the military develop it and let the nonmilitary applications of hypersonic flight technology take second place, as it should. Again, if industry expects to benefit from such research, then let them undertake to pay for it. Let us not grant funds received from hardworking, average Americans so the jet set can fly ever faster between the glamorous capitals of the world.

Reduction of this program by $35.6 million results in a recommended authorization of $41.3 million. Should the Administrator still wish to subsidize industry, it will be at the expense of other more justifiable items in aeronautical vehicles program.

Eighteenth. Tracking and data acquisition program: The Senate committee recommends savings of $15 million. To this figure I would add $100 million, resulting in a total savings of $115 million. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks on Apollo, I would have preferred to have half of this added to the administrative operations authorization for use in converting contract employees to civil service at a net saving to the Federal Government. However, because of the practicalities of the situation, the Administrator will have to absorbe this whole cut as best he can and allocate to the AO budget only so much as is absolutely necessary to support fiscal 1969 programs in their reduced size.

Another important point here is that a reduction of this size will require the Administrator to assign costs for tracking and data acquisition to each specific program on the basis of intensity of coverage and time involved in servicing each specific project. This will require closer identification of total project costs and enable Congress to get a better idea of the real cost of each specific project and judge whether its benefits warrant the investments made and projected in effecting it.

Saving $115 million from the request of $304.8 million results in a recommended authorization of $189.8 million.

Nineteenth. Technology application: This is another area, Mr. President, where I recommend that no cuts be made. I believe it is essential that there be some centralized agency to analyze the nonaerospace application of discoveries and technology resulting from space research and technical programs. I concur in the Senate committee's reasoning that there is no pressing need to conduct "various undefined management studies," but feel that the savings effected should be applied to additional research in this field which promises so much.

This is where we should recoup some of the huge investments already made in aerospace efforts. I recommend authorizing the full $4 million.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

Mr. President, I also recommend a cut of $45 million from the funds requested for construction of facilities. I realize that this is the total figure requested and that this leaves no specific funds in the construction budget. However, I point out that this is another opportunity for the Administrator to move closer to the ideal of identifying total costs of each project. Surely, part of the costs of a project should be the facilities needed to conduct it properly. The construction costs should come out of the total funds identified as necessary for the project. As I said before in my remarks, this will also give Congress a better idea of the costs of a program and evaluate its progress or lack of it and the benefits to be achieved for the investments made.

In addition to pointing out the necessity for more accurate cost figures, I should like to call attention to the Deep Space Network 210-foot antenna facilities, discussed on page 83 of the Senate reports. This $17 million item calls for the construction of two such antennas. They are identified as "deep-space," and a description of their capabilities leads one to suspect that they will be the means for communicating more per-

fectly with manned flights to Mars and elsewhere in deep space.

Again, this type of project can be delayed until it has been determined by Congress that we are going to Mars. Until such a determination, the present 85-foot antennas and the one 210-foot antenna are well able to communicate with, and receive data from, various probes and satellites. Admittedly, it would be preferable to be able to install and use this improved system. But until we can afford this new "stereo" we will have to get along with "monaural."

In addition to this project not being needed at this time, it represents costs for new tracking and data acquisition facilities that should be identified by share in the costs of each project that will utilize its functions.

Again, Mr. President, this cut is justified on the grounds that costs should be borne by each specific project and the fact that much of this planned equipment can well be deferred.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

Mr. President, for administrative operations authorization I recommend a saving of $45,027,000. This would leave $603,173,000 in authorizations for this request. This figure is identical with the recommendations of the House. I use this figure rather than recommend a larger cut, since this would result in wholesale reductions-in-force of civil service personnel, and I have already discussed my belief that Congress should investigate as a matter of high priority the savings to be effected through conversion of contract employees to civil service employment.

However, it still remains a fact that economies can and must be effected in the administrative costs of running the space program. The substantial cuts in hardware programs and their support activities should be accompanied by a lessening of the administrative costs represented by this request. But there should also be, to the degree practicable, conversion of contract to civil service, using the funds authorized in administrative operations. It is for this reason that I do not recommend a lower figure than that coming from the floor of the House. The floor debate in the other body made very clear the continuing increase of administrative costs while research and development costs have been falling. Therefore, I believe that the Administrator, when presenting subsequent budget requests to Congress, will receive a more receptive welcome on this one request item if he is able to show impressive conversion economies with the same job being done for less money.

Mr. President, I have recommended for Senate consideration certain specific savings that can be made in the space program. I trust I have demonstrated that this is not a meat-ax approach and that thought was given to the relative needs of each program, as I saw then. The savings of $732,700,000 in research and development, the $45 million in construction, and the $45,027,000 in administrative operations adds up to total specific cuts of $822,727,000. To this figure I would also recommend an across-the-board cut of $177,273,000, which added to the specific cuts of $822,727,000 would provide a total saving to the American taxpayer of $1 billion—$1 billion that will not have to come out of programs that have a far greater urgency than placing an American on Mars in the next decade. The principal program now, I hope, would be to reduce the deficit which is so great and so inflationary.

The Administrator, I again emphasize, has the flexibility within this amendment to allocate funds within the limits of the $3,370,400,000 total authorization and the maximum allocated to each specific program in the Senate substitute. The savings I recommend are just that: recommendations. The Administrator will be abe to effect these specific cuts with more precision and fairness. But these cuts must be made if we are to begin this hard, searching look at reordering of our national priorities in light of what is necessary and not what is desirable; what we can afford and not what we can leave for those who follow us to pay.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair), what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin suggests would negate the long and careful work of the committee, which has carefully reviewed and scrutinized each program in arriving at a considered judgment designed to preserve the balance and integrity in the overall program. I do not believe that this is sound legislative practice, and I, for one, believe that the Senate should not endorse it.

He suggests, on the one hand, that we pay little attention to what the Senate committee has done and consider very kindly what the House committee has done. On the other hand, he suggests that we should leave the thing in the lap of the Administrator and dodge the congressional responsibility. I am fearful that we could not steer that course accurately and come through with a good, sound program, and I hope the amendment will be rejected.

I wish to mention a fact which has not been mentioned—at least, I am not aware that it has been—but it is the very meat of this question. The committee reduced the NASA request by approximately $220 million. That was after the administration itself had cut its request $730 million below the figure of last year. Therefore, the total reduction in this program since last year is $950 million—nearly 20 percent. I know of no other program which has been sent to Congress this year that has been reduced by that amount or by such a high percentage.

The second point, which is unrelated, is to strongly support the point made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], who now presides so graciously over the Senate. He made the point that the activities of NASA and its scientists and the universities which are serving it have very greatly supplemented our information in many scientific fields. Mr. President, that is so true. Only a minute or two before we came to the floor to enter into this debate, most of us were visiting with the presidential scholars from our State—I was—downstairs in the Senate Caucus Room. Two presidential scholars are from Florida. One of them is a specialist in the field of physics and the other in the field of bioscience, both of which fields are given emphasis in the investigative and experimental programs of NASA. I am certain that the studies and work and opportunities for advancement of those two young people, in whom our State is interested—and we are proud of them, and I am sure that is true of the youngsters from every State who are here as presidential scholars—are vastly enlarged by reason of the knowledge which has been gained through NASA experimentation in the field of science.

The third point I wish to make is in furtherance of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin relative to the field of chemical propulsion. He stated that in his opinion it was wise to follow the advice and findings of the Senate committee. I am glad that in that one instance—there were some other instances, also—the distinguished Senator did see fit to follow the suggestions of the Senate committee.

Since in my State we are particularly interested in the large solid motor project, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the closing two paragraphs at the bottom of page 61 of the Senate report, under the head "Large Solid Motor Project," and the first two paragraphs at the top of page 62, which are under the same head.

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

LARGE SOLID MOTOR PROJECT

Three test firings of the 260-inch diameter 75-foot-long large motor were successfully completed by fiscal year 1967, with peak thrust of 5.9 million pounds produced in the last test. In fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969, the large motor project entered a sustaining phase to preserve a competitive option between solid and liquid rockets for the boost stage of an intermediate vehicle of about 100,000 pounds payload in the event there is established a requirement for such a payload.

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Your committee recommends a reduction of $6.5 million in the chemical propulsion program.

The House made no reduction in this program and the House bill provided that of the $36.7 million authorized to be appropriated: "$3.1 million is to be used only for the 260-inch solid motor project."

The Senate committee deleted this language from the bill. However, the reduction recommended by your committee is not directed against any specific part of the chemical propulsion program, and, as in the case of reductions by the Committee in other Programs, the Committee leaves the application of the reduction in the Chemical Propulsion Program to the discretion of NASA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I strongly hope that the Senate will reject this amendment, which would be very hurtful, which is not well thought out, and which has had to be changed one time during the course of the debate and needs further change to make it more meaningful if it is to do anything such as has been suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a few mo-

ments ago in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I questioned him concerning his conclusions on the nuclear rocket item. I believe the budget figure was $60 million and the House figure was $11.7 million. He recommended that we go back to the House figure. He made it very clear that he was not suggesting that by way of amendment, but that this could be taken into consideration by the Administrator. I said at that time I disagreed with the conclusions he made on the NERVA project.

Mr. President, I reemphasize my disagreement. I think the recommendation of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in placing total funding for NERVA at $55 million is realistic. I have a few remarks I wish to make, and I shall not occupy the Senate floor for a very long period of time.

Mr. President, I believe it is correct that we have expended approximately $1 to $1.1 billion in this effort to date. It seems to me that to abandon the effort at this time would be shortsighted, it would be poor economy, and it would be a crippling blow at a very important part of our space effort.

It is my understanding that to keep this particular project we must spend in the neighborhood of an additional $600 million. Therefore, if we were to cut down now, as is suggested on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, it would, I am advised, set back the program 5 or 6 years. It would cost an increased $250 to $300 million if the project were ever reactivated. Therefore, it seems to me it would be not only a bad move in the competitive world in which we live in the space effort, but it would be very poor economy in the long run.

I think the conclusions of the committee in its report go right to the heart of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the recommendation of the committee in that regard.

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

COMMUNITY COMMENT

A special effort was directed to thoroughly review the Nuclear Rockets Program. Three days of hearings were devoted to this program during which eight expert witnesses testified. As a result of this careful consideration your committee recommends a reduction of $5 million in the Nuclear Rockets program, but strongly recommends against the crippling reduction of $48.3 million suggested by the House.

The Nuclear Rocket's program to date has been directed to the development of the technology necessary to build a nuclear rocket engine. This technology program has been extremely successful in producing propulsion efficiencies and operating times much greater than expected. Because of this success, the United States is now in a position to move forward with the development of a flyable engine which would provide the United States with a major advancement in space propulsion capability.

Due to the high efficiency of nuclear rocket engines compared with the efficiencies achievable with the chemical rocket engines, the nuclear rocket engine, NERVA I, will provide a vastly increased performance capability for space exploration by the last half of the 1970's; moreover, it is the only major space propulsion development underway in the United States which can give an increased propulsion capability by that time as lead times for the development of advanced space propulsion systems are long—between 5 and 10 years.

The NERVA I engine, when used in a nuclear third stage on the Saturn V launch vehicle, would increase the payload capability of the Saturn V from 65 to 100 percent and enhance its operational characteristics for a variety of missions. Some of the missions for which a NERVA I power stage would provide operational and payload advantages are: large payloads to synchronous orbit; earth orbital plane transport missions; heavy manned or unmanned lunar missions; and, eventually heavy payload missions beyond the moon. However, the size of the NERVA I engine makes it undesirable for heavy planetary missions and therefore very unattractive for manned planetary missions.

Since the Nuclear Rockets program is a joint program of the AEC and NASA, and since the authorization for the AEC portion of the program ($69 million) has already been approved by the Congress, it would be inconsistent to reduce the NASA portion by the $48.3 million suggested by the House.

The House committee's report said:

"This action was taken in recognition of the severe funding requirements of the Nation and with the full understanding of the progress that has been made in this program. In no way should this action be construed as a lack of confidence in the program but purely as a desire to defer the actual NERVA I development and reduce the level of effort in the nuclear rockets program."

Many of the activities of the Nuclear Rockets program are in midstream and the $11.7 million left in the program by the House would not permit testing of experimental engine systems already built and might not even cover all termination costs. In spite of the language in the House report, then, it seems unavoidable that the Nuclear Rockets program would have to be terminated if funding is reduced to the level recommended by the House.

Through fiscal year 1968 about $1.1 billion will have been invested in it by both NASA and AEC. To terminate it now would be to waste the knowledge already paid for and to lose the many highly skilled people on the program to other pursuits. The experts agree the technology is available to proceed now with the development of the NERVA I nuclear rocket engine and that nothing would be gained, and indeed much would be lost, if the development of the nuclear rocket engine was not undertaken at this time. Nearly everyone agrees that nuclear rocket propulsion will be required for space exploration, and attempts to reinstate the program at some future time would be extremely costly both in time and money.

The program presented by NASA would provide a flexible nuclear rocket engine that can be adapted to many kinds of missions. It is, therefore, the committee's recommendation, that this country move forward now with the development of a nuclear rocket engine. At the level recommended by your committee for the Nuclear Rockets program, $55 million, NASA can move forward with that development during fiscal year 1969. This level will protect the $1.1 billion already invested and avoid the costly and inefficient reinstatement that would necessarily follow if the program were terminated this year.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I sincerely and vigorously urge that there be no cut in this particular program.

I think it was developed in my questioning with the Senator from Wisconsin that we could not even attempt to phase out or close down with the figure here. The Senator from Wisconsin frankly admitted the figure was a House figure and that more money might be required.

I think the record will show that it would cost more even to phase out this project. Of course, that is false economy and it would not be in the best national interest.

I wholeheartedly support the position of the committee as voiced by its very distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from New Mexico.

A year ago, when the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget was last before Congress, I raised the warning that too much was hanging in the balance to play budget-cutting exercises with the space effort. Congress of course has the responsibility to reduce spending wherever it can at the Federal level. The space program is as open to spending cuts as any other Federal program. But blind, arbitrary slashes can cause mortal wounds.

We avoided the mortal wounds last year, but we again face that danger this year. And one of the prime targets is the nuclear rocket development program—our Nation's effort to power the space program with nuclear energy. As we have discussed, the House chopped this program back from $60 million to $11.7 million. In so doing, it failed to leave enough money even to close out the project. The ax fell without reason or direction.

The Senate Space Committee, commendably, has recommended a restoration that would put the total funding for the NERVA nuclear rocket engine at $55 million. That recommendation must carry, or we will sacrifice any meaningful future for our space effort.

We have heard all the arguments in behalf of NERVA many times over. We know that this nuclear rocket engine is the inevitable next step forward, that the program is already eminently successful, that 1 year's delay now will cost us 5 to 6 years later, that leadtime is needed to maintain a continuous advance in technology, and that if we do not perfect a nuclear rocket engine, the Russians soon will. I will not attempt to retrace all these familiar points. I would rather concentrate on the area that concerns us most in this year of financial problems. I will argue on the money points.

Few among us, I think, realize the NERVA program—which will double our space capability—is costing less than 1½ percent of the overall space budget. The request this year, for example, is 1.3 percent. What is more, it is not expected ever to exceed 3 percent at any time during the flight engine development. So, point 1 is that this program, which will deliver such big results, is costing comparatively little. The experts call this cost-effectiveness, I think.

Point 2, as I pointed out earlier, we have already invested well more than $1 billion in this effort. It becomes nothing short of foolish to abandon it now at this critical juncture merely to shave a few figures off the authorization total.

Point 3, it would actually be more expensive in immediate spending to shut down all this fine work. The actual cost of keeping it running is less than the phase-out expense. Regardless of the House recommendation, we cannot get by on $11.7 million—unless we blow the

whole thing up with the cheapest dynamite we can find.

So we must begin to ask—where is the saving? We are really too far committed—and we should be—to withdraw now. If we examine all the issues with reason and justice, we will see clearly that it is far too costly to defer or delay.

Point 4 is perhaps the most telling argument. That point is the long-range cost of shuting down and reactivating at some future date. The added price of this rather futile gesture toward budget cutting runs to an estimated $300 million, as I stressed earlier.

This is costly economy, Mr. President. I do not think our Nation can afford it.

There is one additional point, which I stressed in testimony to the committee. That is the strong support for this program that has been demonstrated by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This committee, in successfully recommending nearly full funding of the Atomic Energy Commission's share of NERVA had this to say:

The committee is disturbed by the recent signs indicating that support for this program may be faltering, and that development of the NERVA nuclear rocket engine may be curtailed. They are the more surprising in view of the rapid technological advances being made in the program. Lack of support for the NERVA engine in fiscal year 1969 could seriously impair this country's ability to make use of the tremendous technical capability developed in this program over the past 12 years. Worse yet, without the development of a nuclear rocket engine, it is not possible to project a viable space program based on a significant step-wise advancement in propulsion capability. Deferral is not possible without incurring certain irreversible penalties which will be very costly to this Nation in the long run. The flight engine program is a logical continuation of an existing capability, not a build-up of a new one. Moreover, the recommended pace has been determined in the light of current budgetary pressures. Only because of intense competition for funds, largely to meet commitments in the defense area, has the committee seen fit to recommend a cut of $3 million in this year's program.

Mr. President, I urge approval of the space committee's recommendation on the essential NERVA program, and I urge that we remain steadfast in conference with the House so that this vital program will not be demolished.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, further in response to the point to the Senator from Wisconsin that there is no mission for NERVA, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the report wherein Dr. von Braun appeared before our committee. Certainly he is one of the most distinguished experts in this field in this country or in the world, for that matter.

I am reading from the record at page 928 and 929:

Senator CANNON. In your statement, you indicated that at the time of the development of the F-1 and the J-2 engines, we did not have a mission for either one of those engines. Is that correct?

Dr. VON BRAUN. That is correct; yes.

Mr. President, the F-1 and the J-2 engines are the engines that are so important in the Saturn program. We could not have gone ahead with the Saturn program if we had not had these engines available.

Dr. von Braun made clear that they did not have a mission at the time they were planned and developed. This is the point the Senator was concerned about.

I asked Dr. von Braun:

Is this somewhat the same situation we are finding ourselves in now, there is not a specific mission designated for the NERVA I, and yet we have had a great area of possibility in the future?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Senator Cannon, it is precisely the same situation. Rocket engines have typically a leadtime of 6 years or so between approval of a feasible concept and availability of flight hardware. I think even in the case of our nuclear engine, the leadtime is probably in the same category. So it is not surprising that we cannot define precise flight missions at a time when we have to start the development of a flyable engine.

Senator CANNON. Well, now, some suggestions have been made that we should wait for a more advanced technology before proceeding with the development of a nuclear rocket engine. However, you answered Senator Young, I think, that we have the complete technology available for the development of a NERVA I engine at the present time. Is that correct?

Dr. VON BRAUN. That is correct; yes.

Senator CANNON. So really, that argument is not a very valid argument, then, to say that we should wait until we develop something else and then we can decide on an engine?

Dr. VON BRAUN. All of the more advanced nuclear propulsion concepts that I know of are still in the pipedream stage.

Senator CANNON. In the what?

Dr. VON BRAUN. In the pipedream stage. Their feasibility has not yet been demonstrated, even on paper.

NERVA PROGRAM CUT WOULD BE UNWISE DECISION

Senator CANNON. You gave quite a good definition of advanced technology and the problem we create if we terminate this type of program—what it would do to our technological base. How important, actually, do you really consider that? Is it a really important thing, or is it a desirable objective, or how would you define it?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Well, I think nuclear technology as such is undoubtedly one of the most important activities in physics and advanced technology today. I think a fascinating program requiring the cooperation of hundreds of experts in this field has all the qualities of a cutting edge of scientific and technological progress in a field of paramount national importance.

Senator CANNON. Well in your judgment, would you define it as being an unwise decision if we were to determine, now, not to go ahead with the NERVA program?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Definitely; yes, sir.

Mr. President, few question the importance of science and technology to the prosperity of the United States and its leadership in the free world; and since the NASA programs provide a great deal of that science and technology, it makes little sense to cut these programs more than they have been cut already.

All Senators are anxious to reduce new authorizations and appropriations to a minimum, and all requests for fiscal year 1969 must be examined carefully. Many of the new requests are up substantially from previous years, but this is simply not the case for the NASA budget—it is down substantially from previous years.

The amount recommended by the committee for NASA for fiscal year 1969 is $700 million less than the committee recommended for NASA in fiscal year 1968, $439 million less than was appropriated in 1968, and $950 million less than NASA requested in 1968.

So huge reductions have been made in our civilian space program due both to congressional action and to reductions in the request of the administration for fiscal year 1969.

If one goes back a few years and looks at the trend of the budget since fiscal year 1965, he finds that the trend of the NASA budget is down—down 21 percent since fiscal year 1965, or $1.1 billion. Most of the NASA reductions have taken place in the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 budgets. NASA's budget for fiscal year 1968 was trimmed by about half a billion dollars from the previous year. The administration trimmed it another $279 million this year, and the committee is recommending a further cut of $220 million—a total reduction of about $1 billion.

These reductions have been made despite the fact that the Nation's civilian space program has been and is one of the most successful programs ever carried out in this or any other country. It has produced more new scientific knowledge and technology during the past decade than any other undertaking and what has been accomplished is nothing compared to what we can expect during the next 10 years if we support these programs.

Mr. President, it makes no sense to me to cut these programs any more than they have been cut. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been very successful in accomplishing goals it set out to attain. If we want to cut programs, let us cut those agencies whose programs are unsuccessful.

Mr. President, I urge the Members of this body to support the bill reported out by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, much has already been said in opposition to the amendment. I can only add that I am unalterably opposed to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin which apparently proposes to cut almost one-fourth of the funds necessary for NASA to carry out its programs for fiscal year 1969.

This is entirely unreasonable. The committee has already reduced the NASA request by some $219 million, and it was done on the basis of a careful evaluation of each proposed program.

Mr. President, I therefore recommend that the amendment not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Caro-

lina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Bayh	Ervin	McGovern
Brewster	Gore	McIntyre
Burdick	Griffin	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Gruening	Morton
Case	Harris	Moss
Church	Hart	Nelson
Cooper	Hartke	Pell
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Proxmire	Symington	Williams, N.J.
Randolph	Talmadge	Williams, Del.
Russell	Tydings	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—38

Aiken	Fong	Mundt
Allott	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Anderson	Hill	Muskie
Baker	Holland	Pearson
Bennett	Hruska	Percy
Bible	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	Smith
Cannon	Magnuson	Sparkman
Curtis	McClellan	Spong
Dominick	McGee	Stennis
Eastland	Metcalf	Thurmond
Ellender	Miller	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—28

Bartlett	Hayden	McCarthy
Boggs	Hollings	Monroney
Brooke	Inouye	Montoya
Carlson	Jackson	Pastore
Clark	Javits	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smathers
Dodd	Lausche	Tower
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Yarborough
Hansen	Long, La.	
Hatfield	Mansfield	

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment (No. 845) was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was defeated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to support the bill which authorizes appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The committee report shows it performed with distinction in thoroughly analyzing the requirements of our national space program in the context of other national needs.

This bill represents a balanced response to the needs of our national space effort. There have been reductions in the amounts authorized, but these reductions are reasonable and uniform and they do not destroy balance in the program. Neither do they deny the administration the flexibility it seeks in the conduct of NASA's affairs. I am greatly concerned over the possible effect of our accepting the bill reported by the other body. That bill makes drastic reductions in one or two victim programs. It occurs to me, that the fiscal year 1969 authorization bill reported here to the Senate allows adequate room for wise decisions based on sensible priorities with regard to the use of available resources.

We must remember when considering this bill that our committee's recommendations are $950 million less than the amount that was requested by NASA for fiscal year 1968.

It can surely be stated, therefore, that NASA listened to the Congress, and I was certainly one of the spokesmen, when we advised the executive branch that fiscal year 1969 was to be a year of restraint in Federal expenditures. The Senate Space Committee has requested approval of a bill that is 20 percent below the level of expenditures requested by NASA 1 year ago, and rather then penalize NASA by cutting this bill even further by various floor amendments, I feel we should approve our committee's bill, and thereby acknowledge the responsibility with which the NASA Administrators approached their fiscal year 1969 requests.

I wish to say an additional word respecting one aspect of our space program in which I am extremely interested—our Nation's only advanced space propulsion effort, the nuclear rocket engine.

The committee has approved an authorization of $55 million for this important program. It is one of the most difficult, yet highly successful technical efforts ever undertaken in our space propulsion development work. NASA's current request for $60 million to support development of the NERVA I nuclear rocket engine is important, not only for the future strength of our national space effort, but for several very practical reasons.

First, without an authorization of at least the amount recommended by our space committee, the program stands little chance of survival. This year's funding represents the final phase of a technology program which started about 6½ years ago. Unless the program is supported this year and funds are made available to use the new technology and develop the engine hardware, the program will terminate. Personnel who are presently working on the program will leave.

Reductions made last year in the program, in fact, caused major reverberations in the program, with respect to personnel. When part of the program was deleted, Westinghouse, the principal subcontractor for the program, was forced to drop almost one-quarter of its people who were working on the engine development. I have been informed that the prime contractor experienced a similar reduction as a result of funding cuts. The danger of loss of personnel, and thus of irreplaceable technology, is very real. This highly skilled and unique team of engineers and scientists must be sustained or we will lose them and thus waste a very valuable national resource in the field of atomic energy and space propulsion.

Second, if we were to allow cancellation of the program this year, it would be most unfortunate since it would have been done for shortsighted reasons. All of the experts that I know, who have spoken about this program, emphasize the great technological achievement of demonstrating that the nuclear rocket is not only feasible, but that it should be a highly reliable propulsion system for future space exploration. The program has been most successful to date, and we are now at the point of being able to take advantage of this technology. Our committee's recommendations would enable NASA to take advantage of the funds expended to date in developing the technology for the purpose of building a nuclear rocket engine, always the end objective in this program.

Third, the United States has already spent over $1 billion to develop the nuclear rocket engine technology, to power the third stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle. Testimony of Government witnesses has consistently emphasized that this engine is essential in order to accomplish a wide variety of necessary future space missions. These missions

relate to earth orbital operations, advanced lunar missions and scientific missions into outer space. We must exploit and make profitable the technologies we have spent large sums to develop. In one area, for example, President Johnson has said that the development of reconnaissance satellites has returned a value to our Nation 10 times what has been spent in the entire field of space. We can hope that in the field of meteorology and communications and in the manned space program, our experience will be similarly profitable. We can be absolutely sure that there will be no gain beyond what we now have if this nuclear rocket program is deleted.

The nuclear rocket engine permits an expansion of our space capabilities which can assure future space profitability. I would very much dislike to see a decision made which commits the United States only to chemical propulsion systems which severely limit future U.S. spacecraft performance.

In my estimation, if we were to allow this, we would be abandoning nuclear space propulsion and a viable role in space to the Soviet Union. It would be foolhardy to assume that the Soviets do not have their own nuclear rocket engine development effort, just as we do. Of course, it may be harder for us to see the results of their program. They are still a closed society. But, I am sure there would be great rejoicing in Moscow if our decision today resulted in dropping this crucial program which has been so successful to date.

Fourth, the Senate has already approved funding of that portion of the program conducted by the AEC. It is difficult for me to see how we could come to an inconsistent and contradictory decision with regard to the NASA portion of this joint program.

Fifth, the capabilities described by many Government witnesses demonstrate to me that the engine will have not only civilian applications but will surely have important uses in our military establishment. In his most recent testimony, the Administrator of NASA said that there will undoubtedly be important civilian and military applications of the nuclear rocket engine.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I wish to say again that I support the report of our committee. I do so with particular satisfaction that the committee has chosen to cure a most serious deficiency in the bill reported by the other body. That deficiency had the effect of canceling, with funds insufficient even for termination costs, the nuclear rocket engine program. I urge Senators to support the Senate bill.

AMENDMENTS NO. 844

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 844.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with; that they be printed in the RECORD at this point; and that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] may be added as a cosponsor of the amendments.

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

The amendments (No. 844) are as follows:

On page 9, line 17, strike out "$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$253,200,000".

On page 9, line 21, strike out "$39,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,700,000".

On page 9, line 23, strike out "$117,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$115,700,000".

On page 10, line 7, strike out "$55,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,700,000".

On page 11, line 3, strike out "$635,560,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$603,173,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment.

Let me say that I am glad to yield first so that a unanimous-consent request on a limitation of time may be propounded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Senators opposed to the amendment may want to know what it is first.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This amendment is to provide that the authorization would be reduced in each category to the lowest figure of the House or Senate. It will be reduced to approximately $400 million below the request of the administration and about $180 million below the Senate committee recommendation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin please state the modification?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. The modification is in line 4. The figure "$11,700,000" should be changed to "$33,000,000." That was an error in printing discovered by my staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. Indeed.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the House version of the authorization is $338,977,000 less than the budget request. My amendment would save an additional $61.3 million.

The Senate version is $219,840,000 less than the budget request. My amendment would save an additional $180.4 million below the Senate committee recommendation.

The authorization resulting from my amendment would be $3,970,073,000, or just $27 million short of $4 billion.

Surely, $4 billion should be more than sufficient for NASA to carry on all the delineated projects in the budget, with little change in plans.

This amendment is a moderate one, and surely the very least we can do in carrying out our responsibilities, in view of the fact that the Senate has gone on record in favor of reducing expenditures this year by $6 billion, is to adopt the amendment. I submit that if we fail to reduce the space budget by at least the amount in this amendment, we can not responsibily expect the Executive to go ahead and cut $6 billion from its expenditures without taking over our responsibilities.

I have already gone into some detail on how economies of $1 billion could be achieved. For that reason I was happy to agree to a unanimous consent agreement on a time limitation on this amendment.

The same reasoning that I went into in some detail before, but with lesser savings, can be applied using the $400 million cut.

The advanced projects program can be cut. NERVA can be cut. All the hardware programs can be reduced. Corresponding restraint can be exercised in the various support programs. Surely, this saving of approximately 9 percent is not unreasonable, particularly when you realize how much of the Federal budget is not amenable to cutting. After adding together the sacrosanct defense budget, the interest on the national debt, statutory payments such as veterans' and social security benefits, and the costs of providing essential government services in all departments of government, there is only about $30 billion out of approximately $170 billion in consolidated Federal expenditures from which the pending $6 billion can come. And when you realize that more than $4 billion of that $30 billion is earmarked for putting a man on the moon, and, less obviously so, on Mars, the obviousness, hopefully, the inevitability, of a large saving being achieved in the space program becomes clear.

I have already spoken at some length in outlining the unpleasant alternatives to our not living up to our responsibilities for fiscal restraint—the state of the economy resulting from another huge deficit; the penalizing of those on fixed incomes through inflation; the worsening of our balance-of-payments deficit; and the inexcusable neglect of our human resources programs.

This catalog of ills is not read as a scare tactic. Every Senator knows them to be inevitable, inescapable companions to fiscal irresponsibility. I urge the overwhelming support of the Senate for this moderate, restraining amendment to the space authorization.

I yield the floor, but withhold the rest of my time.

Mrs. SMITH obtained the floor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield on the other side's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes to ask a question?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator, in his previous statement, on the NERVA program, stated the Administrator would have the authority to determine how

much money was spent. Under this amendment, would it not completely eliminate any discretion on the part of the Administrator and limit the amount——

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. This amendment does what the House said should be done since there are no planned missions with nuclear engines. The House thought $11.7 million was enough. That is what the amendment provides.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is changing his position in response to my questions in the colloquy we had, when he said he would not favor canceling out the NERVA program and would let the Administrator have that discretion. This amendment would eliminate the NERVA program if the $11.7 million figure were to stand.

Has the Senator changed his position on that since our colloquy?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The position was, under the previous amendment, that it would have been up to the discretion of the Administrator. Under this amendment, he does not have that discretion. But I say, and my feeling right along has been, that this program could be postponed. It does not eliminate the program. It provides $11.1 million for the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Wisconsin would have a sweeping and critical effect on significant space programs merely on the basis of what appears to be an arbitrary decision to revert to amounts approved by the House.

I cannot believe this is a legislative practice the Senate wishes to endorse. In essence, the proposed amendment would negate the careful review and evaluation work of your Space Committee.

Your committee has already reduced the NASA request by some $219 million; and this amounts to a reduction of approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars from the amount authorized last year.

These cuts were made with reluctance by the members of the Space Committee and only because the current fiscal condition requires that agency budgets be pared to a minimum.

I fully subscribe to the need to cut expenditures—but should not other agency budgets be subjected to similar reductions?

Our space program has already demonstrated some remarkable successes, and there is every reason to expect that enormous practical benefits, affecting all mankind, will result from our current efforts in space science and technology.

I, for one, would welcome any suggestion as to where this NASA bill could be further reduced—providing, first, that the reduction is subject to the same careful consideration applied by your committee; second, that the cut does not put a demise to necessary and useful programs; and, third, that it is the sense of the Congress to apply similar reductions to all other civilian programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would take the bill back to the House figures on five important programs reducing the NASA bill $180,487,000 below the recommendation of the committee. Apparently the Senator has more faith in what the House does than he has in the Senate committee's recommendations.

Mr. President, the committee reviewed very carefully the actions of the House on these five programs and after long and deliberate considerate recommended the amounts now in the bill before the Senate.

Mr. President, the Apollo applications program is designed to use the hardware developments of the Apollo program. At the level of the House cut—$186.4 million—the Apollo applications program would have to be restructured and manned space flight operations after the Apollo program would be stalled preventing the United States from reaping the full reward from the huge investment made in the Apollo program. With the reduction—$89.6 million—recommended by your committee, the Apollo applications program will obviously have to be cut back, but the program will not have to be completely restructured and the opportunity to continue manned space exploration on a reasonable schedule will be preserved.

Mr. President, in assessing the $15.2 million cut against the bioscience program, the House cut $11 million from the 21-day mission of the biosatellite project. The House report says that—

> The committee believes that a delay of an additional year is appropriate in the light of currently limited resources.

The Senate committee examined this carefully and found that it would be very inefficient and costly to proceed as recommended by the House committee. However, we did find that the biosatellite 21-day mission could be slipped for 6 months and a cut of $5 million assessed permitting a more efficient program and one that will not cost nearly so much. The committee views on this are set forth on page 31 of its report.

Insofar as the launch vehicle procurement program is concerned, this program provides the vehicles to launch the unmanned spacecraft. Both the House and the Senate committees annually examine this very carefully and provide only the funds needed to buy the launch vehicles for approved programs. With all due respect to the Senator from Wisconsin I must say to the Senate that this program should not be cut except to remove vehicles that are not required.

At the level of the House cut in the nuclear rockets program—a cut of $48.3 million—the nuclear rockets program would have to be terminated. Not only would the United States be prevented from moving forward with the development of a nuclear rocket engine, but many of the activities in the program, which are at the forefront of the new technologies, would have to be stopped. Many of the final test activities are in midstream and these would have to be stopped. The $11.7 million left in the program by the House is not, in fact, sufficient to complete tests for which hardware is already built. In addition, $11.7 million would not cover all termination costs.

Mr. President, the nuclear rockets program has been an extremely successful development to date. The country has invested about $1.1 billion to date in that program and we are now ready to move into the development of a nuclear rocket engine—the program objective. The committee examined this program in great detail during 3 days of hearings. There is unanimous agreement among knowledgeable scientists and engineers that nuclear rocket propulsion will be required for space exploration and that the technology is available to proceed with the engine development. This is a joint program carried out by both NASA and the AEC; and the Congress has already authorized the AEC portion of the program.

Mr. President, the committee spent a great deal of time studying NASA's administrative operations request, and the committee has recommended to the Senate a reduction of $12.64 million in this program. With this reduction, substantial numbers of people will have to be let go by NASA. But if the Senate accepts the House figure—a cut of $45 million—then, NASA will have to terminate about 4,900 people—about 15 percent of all of the civil servants working for NASA—provided they can get them all off the payroll by September 1, 1968. That would be a most difficult and desperate thing to do and would prohibit the agency from carrying out its function as designated by the Congress. The committee recommends strongly against a cut larger than it recommends.

Mr. President, as I said before, the committee reviewed carefully the House actions in formulating its recommendations to the Senate. We believe they cut too deep in some programs and not enough in others and made our recommendations to the Senate accordingly.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will support the recommendations of its committee rather than the action of the House.

I cannot conceive that the Senate would agree to an amendment of this nature. The Senate committee spent a long time considering this measure. The House committee did also, and there is a wide difference in our opinion. This is an important program, and I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. As a member of the Space Committee, I have supported major cuts in our budget for 2 years. I have felt we simply had to cut back the extent and size of spending on the space program. The budget cuts actually made from the original request of the administration for fiscal 1968 amounting to $5,100,000,000 in these 2 successive years, have now been cut back, with this bill, by $950,000,000.

That is a 20-percent reduction in a

major program. I support the committee report, because I feel the space program has taken its due share of cutting back. To cut back an organization and a program that looks 7 to 10 years in the future by 20 percent—in 2 years—is a major piece of surgery. I have had to go through this in a business corporation, on occasion, and I know of the personal adjustments that must be made and the tearing apart of programs that has to be undertaken.

I know what it is like to reduce the size of an organization's operations and undertakings. I can speak from some experience as to the problems that will be caused by successive cutbacks in 2 years of 20 percent of the operating revenues of a going concern. These successive reductions in the amounts available to the space program are very severe. The year-to-year appropriation process does not accurately reflect the impact of disruptive continuity in programs which in their entirety stretch over a 7- to 10-year period. Nor can we presently feel in 1 year the impact of cuts already made.

In short, no one should be under any illusions that the pace of our research and explorations in space has not been checked. No one should be under any misconception that this program has not borne an important share of the necessity—which is an urgent one—to reduce Government expenditures.

Mr. President, there are two areas in which there is substantial disagreement between the House bill and the Senate report. They are both items in which are bound up the directions and the pace of space efforts in the future.

The first is Apollo applications, the program that is intended and is being designed as a follow-on to the present Apollo program. The second is the NERVA project, our single ongoing program aimed at assuring the United States a viable nuclear rocket capability.

The Apollo applications budget request was for $439,600,000, a substantial increase over the $315,000,000 appropriated last year but less than the fiscal year 1968 request.

While the House committee reduced this amount to $395,600,000, the amendment on the floor reduced the amount further to $253,000,000. Thus, while the recommendation of your committee represents an increase over final amount in the House bill, it represents a reduction from the amount requested by the House committee.

The Apollo applications program is designed to build on the capabilities developed in the Apollo program for manned space flight. Just as the present Apollo successes are heavily dependent on the development of that program during the years the Gemini program held the center of public attention, the future manned spaceflight capability of the United States depends on the solidarity of present groundwork in Apollo applications.

Your committee has made an informed judgment, I believe, in reducing this program by $89 million. While this is consistent with a similar reduction last year, its long-range effect will necessarily be a cumulative one with last year's reduction. If we are to have a capability for manned space flight programs in the 1970's responsive to the national needs, we cannot then plan it and create it overnight.

Work must be done now to anticipate those requirements. The objectives of the program are flexible and to some degree they remain undefined. This is appropriate if we are to capitalize on later developments and directions, accomplishments of the Apollo program objectives and changing national goals are sure to bring. But the requirement for present investment is clear. I urge that the investment continue in fiscal 1969 in the amount approved by your committee.

Nuclear rocket propulsion is clearly the motive power of the future in space. This is the basic fact recognized by your committee's recommendation of $55,000-000 in funds therefore. With $1.1 billion in funds already spent on the program, it is now clear that the high efficiency of nuclear rockets will far surpass the capability of chemical rockets.

The House reduction of this program from $60 to $11.7 million was based on lack of definite mission objectives. While this criticism presently is well taken on the present state of future planning, I believe that as an argument for reducing the authorization, it misses the point. The question is, "Will there be future space missions beyond the 1970's?" If the answer to that question is affirmative—as I believe it is—then the question only remains whether the costs of development of nuclear capability will bring a worthwhile return in increased efficiency and flexibility. From the preliminary data, the chances that this is a wise investment are great. The balance between these chances, the amount already spent on this program development and the minimal amount found by your committee necessary to sustain it is decidedly in favor of the amount contained in the committee report. I am happy the gentleman from Wisconsin has deleted the portion of his amendment relating to the NERVA project.

Mr. President, almost every dissertation on expenditure reductions gives NASA funds a prominent position. I agree NASA must absorb a fair share of cuts, and possibly more. In my view, it has already been cut, and cut severely. I would like to suggest several reasons why further major cuts are unwarranted at this time.

In the first place, it should be obvious that the money appropriated is spent right here on earth. More than 99 percent of NASA's expenditures are right here in the United States—buying goods and services, and providing employment for about 300,000 people.

Second, the space program is not some kind of modern makework project. It does not consist of digging holes and then filling them up again. NASA and its programs are at what Dr. Wernher von Braun calls the "cutting edge" of technology. In developing new launch vehicles and new spacecraft, our space scientists and engineers are working at the very frontiers of current knowledge. They are working to solve problems that have never been addressed before by man. They are true pioneers of this day and age.

Third, it is in these developments—the new technology, new materials, new sources of power and new knowledge—that the real importance of the space program lies. These are the developments which will enrich tomorrow's industry, tomorrow's source of wealth in an increasingly competitive world.

Far from being lost money, it is seed money. It is a necessary expenditure to our Nation's healthy economic growth, which is essential if we are to solve our own domestic and international problems.

Mr. President, I believe very strongly that if we lose our desire to meet these challenges at the frontiers of knowledge; if we consciously choose to arrest the momentum of our magnificent efforts in the last 10 years; then we will be in a worse position—not a better one—to meet our responsiblities as a great nation.

Mr. President, I support the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall vote "yea" on this amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, for the following reasons:

Reduction of expenditures must be made wherever possible, in an effort to reduce an ever-increasing Federal deficit and its inflationary pressures on the economy, and the subsequent effects on world monetary arrangements.

President Johnson has stated that he would accept a $6 billion cut in expenditures in order to obtain a requested 10-percent tax increase. In other words, he would accept the Smathers-Williams amendment.

If that measure is accepted by the House of Representatives, the expenditure reductions must be made, and it is the responsibility of Congress as well as the Executive to assign priorities.

Mr. President, the costs of the Vietnam war are rising daily. Until such time as we are able to eliminate or reduce those expenditures—and I intend to vote for non-Vietnam military expenditure reductions—we must realize that our resources are limited, and that preference should be given to those areas of most immediate need.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another minute.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. This does not mean that the space program and other comparable programs, which regrettably should be cut and will be cut if we are to fulfill what we originated with respect to reductions, are not important to our society. Of course they are. But I believe the solvency of the United States and the preservation of the integrity of the dollar are even more important. That is why I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Do I correctly understand that the Senator has simply taken the lowest of the authorizations for each of the five items in which he makes a cut and has incorporated them in his amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. The theory is that both the House committee and the Senate committee gave that subject a great deal of time and study. What I did was to take the positions of the House and Senate. I did not cut below the House and Senate figures in any of the five items or in any other items.

Mr. NELSON. The argument has been made that making cuts of this kind should be done after careful consideration. Is it not correct to say that when the Senator took the House figure he was taking the figure that the House arrived at after careful hearings and careful executive sessions?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed; after many weeks and months of study.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] has made a telling argument with which I emphatically disagree. It is true that many hundreds of thousands of people are working in this program. That is a major point. Not only is a vast sum of money involved, but also vital manpower that is necessary in education and in other defense projects throughout the country. If ever there was a time when people who are skilled in science can get jobs, it is now. They do not have to worry about getting jobs.

Much of the policy with respect to our scientific effort and the space program is a major mistake. It is true that we should have a big space program. I favor a $4 billion space program. But to have an even greater amount and have so much of our total scientific effort in this governmental area would cause many scientists to say is an error.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield whatever time remains to me to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope the Senate will approve this amendment. A good argument has been made for its adoption. We do not want to overlook the fact that this is still a $4 billion bill. Even with the passage of the amendment the amount will be close to $4 billion. Do not forget that we shall be paying 6 percent for the money to finance these expenditures.

We now operate with a deficit of about $2 billion a month. That is the projected rate of deficit for the next 12 months assuming taxes are not raised or expenditures further reduced.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri. I do not think that we in Congress should pass the responsibility to the President. We should accept our responsibility and make these cuts. Here is a good place to start.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I doubt whether the Senator from Wisconsin realizes just what would be the effect of the amendment. The effect would be to reject the principal changes from the House bill that the Senate committee, after long study, has thought are necessary. Those principal changes are three:

First, with reference to the Apollo applications, where he proposes to cut $96.8 million below the amount the Senate committee has felt would be the utmost that could be cut off.

In the case of nuclear rockets, the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to cut $43.3 million below the figure the Senate committee has felt is the lowest reasonable amount.

In the field of administrative operations, which is the most serious of all, the Senator proposes to cut $32 million.

The principal deficiencies in the House bill, which have been corrected by the Senate committee, are proposed to be ignored by the Senator's amendment. That is all it does. The amendment merely proposes to ignore them. The Senate committee has found the three weakest places in the House bill and has proposed in the report to correct those three weakest spots. But in each case the Senator from Wisconsin, by his amendment, proposes to take the House figures and ignore the recommendations of the Senate committee, recommendations which are based on long study.

Aside from that, the Senator overlooks the fact that the Senate committee is proposing to cut the budget amount of 1968 by $950 million—almost $1 billion. We are proposing to cut the budget for 1969 already very greatly reduced over last year by $220 million.

The Senator is proposing to negate the work of the committee in the three most important provisions which it found required the action of our committee, after it had looked into the action of the House committee, as contained in the House bill.

I hope the Senator's amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

THE ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] offers an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to strike out lines 7 and 8, as follows: "strike out '$55,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$11,700,000' ".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Senate debated this question at great length earlier today. The Senator from Wisconsin has admitted that he does not want to see the NERVA program terminated, as it was proposed. The Administrator had leeway. He would not have leeway under the amendment as it is now proposed. Therefore, I have offered an amendment to strike the portion relating to NERVA. This would impose a strict limitation on the Administrator completely terminating the program, and would not even permit the termination of ongoing projects that are in process at the present time.

I am ready to vote.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I wish to associate myself with the amendment offered by my colleague from Nevada. He is a valuable member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. We discussed this point at length earlier in a colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin. I think the record is abundantly clear that a cut of $11.7 billion would have a devastating effect on the program. It would be particularly troublesome now, because the earlier amendment at least left certain discretion to the Administrator. Now no discretion would be left. To vote for an amendment such as is now proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin would be absolutely devastating to ongoing projects.

I associate myself with the amendment offered by my colleague from Nevada.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, both Senators from Nevada have made a strong case. I am perfectly happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have not been ordered on my amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a point of order with respect to the acceptance of the amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin. He cannot accept it after the yeas and nays have been ordered on his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senate should vote on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I can think of very few actions we could take in Congress this year, which hold greater potential for crisis in our Nation's future space program, than abandonment of our nuclear rocket engine program. And, that is exactly the issue before us today.

I think, one point should be made very clear: the nuclear rocket program is not something new, contrived in the last couple of years. It is a program with a distinguished history of technical accomplishment starting with studies at the Atomic Energy Commission's Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in 1953.

Since then and through fiscal year 1968, the total national investment in the nuclear rocket program is $1.139 billion; $444.8 million has been expended by NASA and $694.5 million by the AEC.

Our legislative situation today is that the House Space Committee and the House of Representatives have voted $11.7 million for this program in fiscal year 1969. This amount effectively cancels the nuclear rocket program. In fact,

it does not even provide sufficient funds to close out existing obligations. One may only observe that the House action was a monumental mistake.

Our Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, under the able chairmanship of my distinguished colleague from New Mexico, conducted 3 full days of hearings, intended to inform committee members and Members of the Senate about the state of progress in the nuclear rocket program and its importance to the national security. As a result, the recommendations before the Senate today by our committee are for $55 million for nuclear rocket development. This represents a $5 million reduction below the President's request, which is recognition of the pressures on our national economy. This reduction is in line with reductions in other phases of the NASA program this year.

My purpose is to alert my colleagues to the fact that in order to keep life in this nuclear rocket engine program, it is necessary for us to authorize the full amount recommended by your committee. Anything less will seriously jeopardize the program. Cancellation of this program now would mean surrendering vital space activities, which will have tremendous impact on our national security, to other nations engaged in the space effort who more aggressively push forward into that frontier. If the Senate should indulge any suggestion to abandon the technical progress thus far made, it would open the door to a crisis, far more serious than the great sputnik crisis of 1957 and 1958.

From the beginning, the objectives of the nuclear rocket program have been to demonstrate the feasibility of a workable nuclear rocket engine, and to develop the technology necessary to move on to engine development. It is the engine phase which we are now considering today.

The work on nuclear rocket engines represents a tremendous advance in rocket engine technology. This engine will have literally twice the capability of any chemical rocket engine. That is to say it will be capable of producing more miles per gallon than any chemical rocket engine. In addition, a nuclear rocket engine can be fired continuously for 1 hour or more at full power, and can be throttled down or stopped, with ease. Such features are extremely important to the ability to maneuver in space. Thus, many space experts refer to the nuclear rocket engine as the workhorse for future space activities.

The question has been raised, what requirement is there for nuclear propulsion. Mr. James Webb, NASA Administrator, described nuclear rocket propulsion as "extremely important." He emphasized that the efficiency and flexibility of nuclear propulsion is important to the Nation's total capabilities since there undoubtedly will be important military and civil requirements for nuclear propulsion, once it is available to the Nation. He warned, however, that it would be shortsighted to cut off or constrain the development of this new technology merely because specific mission requirements cannot clearly be identified at this early date.

Because of the dilemma presented by the phase to which this highly successful program has progressed, and under the circumstances of a highly stressed economy, I must say to my colleagues, we stand today at a technological Rubicon. We are deciding whether this Nation will have a viable space program in the next several years, or whether it will abandon the NERVA I engine development now, and give space over to those who more aggressively are exploring space. Dr. Wernher von Braun warned that he would "have great concern for the long-range future of our space program" without the nuclear rocket program which he considers "a must for our future space needs."

The fact that a specific mission requirement cannot now be identified for the nuclear rocket is not at all unique. In fact, those of my colleagues who are familiar with research and development efforts such as this, know that this situation is most ordinary.

NASA officials have testified that a nuclear third stage for the Saturn V will literally double the ability of that booster to perform a variety of missions—solar probes, unmanned planetary flights, increased payloads to any place on the lunar surface, and, most importantly, increased payloads to perform complex maneuvers in earth orbital operations.

Large multiple, orbital plane and altitude changes with very heavy payloads, are extremely important to future civil and military space missions. The flexible nuclear rocket engine offers wide utility beyond any chemical rocket engine. In fact, the current third stage of the Saturn V cannot perform the kind of missions which are being planned for future years. Some have said that the nuclear rocket engine will have applications far beyond the vision of the world's very best crystal balls.

Experts agree that the nuclear rocket engine is a major advancement in space propulsion. The NERVA nuclear rocket engine development can proceed without a specific mission assignment, with complete confidence that its utility will support our approval of this program today. This situation is analogous to experience with the chemical J–2 rocket engine, which took its maiden test flight last year after a 7-year development program. This 205,000-pound thrust engine was developed for general purposes, where high specific impulse was required for upper stages of advanced vehicles. No more mission identification than that justified its development. Last year, it powered the second and third stages of the mighty Saturn V.

The developer of the Saturn V, Dr. von Braun, said that it is "not surprising that we cannot define a precise flight mission at this time when we have to start the development of a flyable engine." Good space planning dictates that space equipment must be demonstrated before confidence can be placed in the assignment of an item of space hardware to a specific mission.

There is another more ominous reason why we must keep life in this program this year. Let us think back to the sputnik crisis of 1957 and 1958.

Recall, if you will in the 1950's, the many public statements by Soviet officials and scientists which related to their interest and intentions to undertake space flight. Their pronouncements were generally ignored by many officials who were afflicted with an attitude of complacency. The shock we felt in 1957 with the launch of Sputnik I was staggering.

Today, the Soviet Union appears to be preparing for a very early resumption of an accelerated manned space effort. The expectation of big things to come from the Soviet Union is developing, not only in the Soviet Union but throughout the rest of the world—every place it would seem, except here in the United States where we are distracted by some very pressing domestic problems, just now. The Soviet Union is putting primary emphasis on constructing large orbiting manned space platforms for which they talk of replacing crews through the use of shuttlecraft between space stations and earth and between a family of orbiting space stations.

In addition, there are a number of sources showing of growing interest in nuclear propulsion. In the report of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics they quote Prof. Leonid Sedov as "stating his belief in the importance of nuclear propulsion for very large rockets which will soon be needed." Russian cosmonauts and scientists have given strong indication of Soviet interest in nuclear rocket engines. Mr. Webb observed during our hearings:

> . . . We have gone on the primes and we have had some hints that the Soviets are developing nuclear rockets . . .

Dr. von Braun reiterated the warning by saying that Soviet scientists are apparently studying the field extensively. He noted that many articles have been written on nuclear propulsion indicating that the U.S.S.R. is looking for ways to go out in front in the shortest possible time by substantially increasing the number of options available to the Soviet Union. Mr. Webb noted the fact that the Soviet Union for some time has been moving at a more rapid rate in nuclear capability than the United States.

Now it is true that the U.S.S.R. has not formally announced its intentions to develop a nuclear rocket engine. This would certainly be out of character with that secretive society. However, there are strong hints of what they are doing which are quite similar to the kind of statements they made in the late 1950's. Dare we risk the chance that the Soviets are not developing a nuclear rocket engine? If we stop the U.S. nuclear rocket program today, as recommended by the House of Representatives, consider the impact of a future Soviet announcement that they have successfully flown a nuclear rocket propelled spacecraft which is in support of a large Soviet multimanned space station orbiting somewhere in space over the United States. Consider the national concern created by the absolute knowledge that our Nation is under direct and constant surveillance by Soviet cosmonauts.

We must consider such consequences today. If this program is allowed to die, we will immediately be 8 years behind the U.S.S.R., based on our own estimates of leadtime. If this occurs, I expect the

U.S.S.R. will drive home its new advantage and deprive us of many of our options, freely to engage in space exploration.

We cannot put off this engine development program. As the key to our recovery in 1958 was the development of chemical rocket systems, I am convinced that today the key to our future technological security lies in the nuclear rocket engine.

Although it might be possible to cancel the program this year, under the guise of "putting the technology on the shelf" we must remember that there are people working on this program who will leave the organization now responsible for development and go off to new jobs. The technology which has been developed during the life of the program will be dissipated, irretrievably. Once these people are gone, it is unrealistic to assume that the same team can ever be reconstituted. If, at some time in the future, there is a decision to once again take up the nuclear rocket program, it will require a long period of hiring new people, training them, putting them to work, and redeveloping the technology to the stage at which it stands today. The cost will be tremendous. Dr. von Braun estimates that it would cost many times the price of 1 year's program support. Estimates of $300 million have been made as to the cost of bringing the technology back to its present state. It could be done, but only after a costly period of several years.

Not alone the waste of over $1 billion already spent on the program, but the additional cost to recapture what we now have in our hands today, seems to be fiscal extravagance in the extreme. We are indeed at technological crossroads today, because the decision we make here will spell the difference between our Nation having a nuclear rocket or not.

I urge full support of the recommendation of your committee for development of the nuclear rocket engine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin as amended by the Senator from Nevada. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would note "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 181 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken	Griffin	Muskie
Baker	Gruening	Nelson
Bayh	Hart	Pell
Bennett	Hartke	Prouty
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Burdick	Hruska	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	McGovern	Spong
Case	McIntyre	Symington
Church	Miller	Talmadge
Cooper	Mondale	Tydings
Cotton	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Dominick	Morton	Williams, Del.
Fong	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Mundt	

NAYS—25

Allott	Dodd	Holland
Anderson	Eastland	Jordan, Idaho
Bible	Ellender	Kuchel
Cannon	Fannin	Magnuson
Curtis	Hill	McClellan
McGee	Percy	Thurmond
Metcalf	Smith	Young, Ohio
Murphy	Sparkman	
Pearson	Stennis	

NOT VOTING—30

Bartlett	Hatfield	Mansfield
Boggs	Hayden	McCarthy
Brooke	Hollings	Monroney
Carlson	Inouye	Montoya
Clark	Jackson	Pastore
Dirksen	Javits	Ribicoff
Ervin	Kennedy	Russell
Fulbright	Lausche	Smathers
Hansen	Long, Mo.	Tower
Harris	Long, La.	Yarborough

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment (No. 844), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The comittee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 15856) was read the third time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 182 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Aiken	Fannin	Mundt
Allott	Fong	Murphy
Anderson	Griffin	Muskie
Baker	Harris	Nelson
Bayh	Hart	Pearson
Bennett	Hartke	Percy
Bible	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Brewster	Hill	Proxmire
Burdick	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Case	Kuchel	Spong
Church	Magnuson	Stennis
Cooper	McGee	Symington
Cotton	McGovern	Talmadge
Curtis	McIntyre	Thurmond
Dodd	Metcalf	Tydings
Dominick	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—4

Gore	Morse	Pell
Gruening		

NOT VOTING—29

Bartlett	Hollings	McClellan
Boggs	Inouye	Monroney
Brooke	Jackson	Montoya
Carlson	Javits	Pastore
Clark	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Lausche	Russell
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Hansen	Long, La.	Tower
Hatfield	Mansfield	Yarborough
Hayden	McCarthy	

So the bill (H.R. 15856) was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no further rollcall votes today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that the authorization bill will be laid before the Senate, so that it will be the pending business tomorrow; is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON OCEAN CRUISES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12639) to remove certain limitations on ocean cruises. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12639) to remove certain limitations on ocean cruises, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment No. 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided, however,* That no such vessel may cruise for more than seven months of each year to ports which are regularly served by another United States-flag passenger vessel pursuant to an operating-differential subsidy contract."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
E. L. BARTLETT,
DANIEL B. BREWSTER,
NORRIS COTTON,
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
JOHN M. MURPHY,
W. S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2349) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges which were, on page 1, line 6, after "circuit," insert "one additional circuit judge for the sixth circuit."

On page 2, in the table following line 10, after

Fifth ..... Fifteen

insert:

Sixth ..... Nine

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this is the omnibus judgeship bill, amended in the House at the request of the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee, to add one judge to the Sixth Circuit Court. I have cleared this with the ranking member on that committee, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, as well as the distinguished chairman of the full committee of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL TIME TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS ON INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AND TRADE CONVENTION REPORT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who desire to file minority views on the International Wheat and Trade Convention report, be given until the close of business tomorrow to file their minority views.

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

DEATH OF ROBERT MELVIN HITT, JR.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, South Carolina lost one of her most beloved and colorful citizens last week when Robert Melvin Hitt, Jr., editor of the Charleston Evening Post, died on Monday, June 3, 1968.

"Red" Hitt, as he was known in the profession and among his friends, was a newspaperman's newspaperman. He began his career at age 5, working on the Bamberg Herald, which his father owned. With the exception of a brief period of time following his graduation from The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina, in 1935, he devoted his life to the work he loved. As a reporter, a sports editor, a news editor, and a managing editor he met each task and met it well.

As editor of the Charleston Evening Post since 1953, he enjoyed a national reputation—as a most competent newspaperman, an engaging afterdinner speaker, a dedicated civic worker, and a delightful and warmly human character. Perhaps the last phrase, a delightful and warmly human character, is one most often used to describe Red Hitt—for that he was. He could stand before a group in white trousers and blue coat, silver hair tousled, looking every inch the country gentleman that he was, and receive more laughs and appreciation giving a committee report than the afterdinner speaker could hope for. He was, indeed, a hard act to follow.

As one newspaper editorialized, he could receive through connections in his

church, which he loved and served, money to buy a gift for a resident of an old ladies home—and choose a bottle of wine and deliver it with a personal visit. His deep base voice a major asset to his speeches, could be heard across a room when he was whispering and his laugh has been likened to thunder. His keen sense of humor, his sharp wit, his spicy writing, and his editorials, always constructive even when critical, will not be forgotten.

The Charleston Evening Post, which became the largest afternoon newspaper in South Carolina under the leadership of Red Hitt, began its editorial on his death with these moving words:

The office of the editor of the Charleston Evening Post is dark. The desk is clear. The typewriter is stilled. Robert M. Hitt, Jr. has gone and behind him he has left an emptiness that hurts. Unexpectedly, he is dead at 53.

Mr. President, in the death of Melvin Hitt, our State and Nation have lost a distinguished citizen, a true patriot, a gifted writer and editor, and a great American. Descending from such worthy parents, he could not have been otherwise. His father was an able and dedicated editor and publisher, and his mother, Weinona Strom Hitt, my cousin, is a lady of lofty character, high ideals, imaginative mind, and gracious manner.

Mr. President, I join a host of other South Carolinians and Americans who mourn the passing of my cousin, Robert Melvin Hitt, Jr., and ask unanimous consent that the following editorials and articles be printed in the RECORD.

Charleston Evening Post, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, "People Simply Don't Forget Him"; Charleston Evening Post, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, "Robert M. Hitt, Jr."; the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., Wednesday, June 5, 1968, "R. M. Hitt, Jr."; the State, Columbia, S.C., Wednesday, June 5, 1968, "Final Deadline"; the Greenville News, Wednesday, June 5, 1968, "R. M. 'Red' Hitt, the 'Man Who'"; the News and Courier, Thursday, June 6, 1968, "Senate Pays Tribute to R. M. Hitt, Jr."; Charleston Evening Post, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, "R. M. Hitt, Jr., Evening Post Editor, Dies"; the News and Courier, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, "Robert M. Hitt, Jr., Editor of Evening Post Dies"; and the Greenville Piedmont, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, "Post Editor R. M. Hitt Dies at 53."

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

[From the Charleston Evening Post, June 4, 1968]

PROFILES OF AN EDITOR—PEOPLE SIMPLY DON'T FORGET HIM

(NOTE.—The following article, written by the vice president and assistant publisher of the Evening Post and The News and Courier, appeared in the October, 1966, bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.)

(By Frank B. Gilbreth)

The first time I saw Red Hitt was in 1936 when he started as a reporter for the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, where I had been working for a couple of years.

The first thing you noticed about him was the mop of flaming red hair atop as rawboned a body as ever was produced by the thriving municipality of Bamberg, S.C. (pop. then about 2,000) where his mother and father ran the weekly paper. He weighed 160 pounds which barely covered his 6 foot 3 inch frame, and he walked with a slight stoop as if somewhat embarrassed by his height. His face was long and Lincolnesque, with dark brown eyes and bushy, almost black eyebrows.

After you had sized him up physically, there was his voice—a deep bass that you could hear all the way across the newsroom, even when he was whispering. When he wasn't whispering—when, for instance, he leaned back those long bones for a laugh—you couldn't hear yourself think. Don't tell me! I had the desk right next to him.

For the vital statistics, he was born Robert Melvin Hitt Jr., June 12, 1914, and started working on The Bamberg Herald with his parents when he started grammar school. By the time he entered The Citadel in 1931, he had done everything there was to do on the paper. He wrote stories, put them into type on an ancient Model L Linotype, made up pages and hand-fed an old flatbed press which had been purchased secondhand in 1892.

After graduating from The Citadel in 1935 he reported to his father for work but was refused a job. (Southern weeklies were in shaky condition in those Depression days). He wrote letters to a number of dailies, seeking work. None too modestly he outlined his many qualifications, to the end that the letter he sent to the Greenville (S.C.) News was posted on the bulletin board with an unkind legend blue-penciled across it saying, "You're too good for us, brother."

In desperation that fall he took a job as grammar school principal in the crossroad town of Smoaks, S.C. After five weeks he had raced sixth grade pupils through a history book that he learned was supposed to last all year and he knew then he was in the wrong business.

In October, he read a news story saying that $50 million had been appropriated to start the National Youth Administration. Being a youth, he figured he was eminently qualified to be national director so he got off a letter to President Roosevelt saying so. The White House sent a letter back saying Aubrey Williams, a protege of Eleanor, already had the job. He wrote Aubrey, offering to serve as state director, but a college professor had already been selected. Doggedly, he wrote the professor and got appointed a regional director to supervise the NYA in a nine-county area. So, Jan. 2, 1936, found him, at the age of 21, in Charleston with a private secretary, three stenographers and a New Deal function to perform with no directions except to see that some needy youths were employed doing something.

A couple of weeks passed and Red, upon emerging from a meeting of school superintendents, was told that Thomas R. Waring, then city editor and now editor, of The News and Courier wanted to see him. At NYA headquarters he got the same message. Visions of a front page splash about the new NYA chieftain and his plans for salvaging the youth of nine counties passed before his eyes.

"I thought I was a pretty big wheel," he recalls, "so I said hell, I'll play hard to get. Late that afternoon I figured Tom had sweated enough so I returned his call. He said could I drop by to see him."

This was something of a letdown, but Red went to his apartment, put on his new suit, slicked his hair just in case a photo was wanted and dropped by the newspaper plant after supper.

He was interviewed all right, but not for a page one story. There was an opening on the city staff and the starting pay was $15 a week.

"I snapped it up before Tom could change his mind," Red says.

So that's when I first met him and he's been "working" on the Charleston papers ever since.

I put the word "working" in quotes because the fact is that he is one of those lucky people who can get more done with less effort than any character I have ever unforgettably met.

In a matter of weeks, he had news sources in Charleston eating out of his fairly mammoth and freckled hand. If he needed a ride to the police station to check a story, they'd send a squad car. If he was too busy to get to the station, they'd telephone and give him the dope. And sometimes, if he was too busy to be tied up on the phone, they'd write down the facts and send them to him.

I don't know how to describe the quality he has of attracting people and making them work for him—but he's a genius at it, and it explains why he's had the time to bring his golf handicap down to 5 and to take time off to make speeches all over the country.

The quality is part personality and part his looks. He towers above most people and that shock of red hair—now a distinguished silver-white, but still a shock—makes him stand out in a crowd. And that deep bass—he has sung for years in the St. Philip's Protestant Episcopal Church choir—attracts attention, even when he tries to mute it, which isn't always. He likes to talk, he's witty and he's—well—engaging! All in all, people simply don't forget him.

Jack Hornaday, a veteran syndicate man, told me that a few years ago he invited Red to play in the member-guest golf tournament at Sleepy Hollow, Tarrytown, N.Y.

"After a couple of hours in the clubhouse, everyone there knew Red," said Jack. Damnedest thing I ever saw. And you know, people are still asking me, 'When are you going to bring that fellow Red Hitt up here to play again?'"

That's the kind of impact he makes. And he's such a good speaker that he could stay on the road all the time, if he wanted to. For instance, the Jack Tar Hotel organization flew him to San Francisco a few years ago to emcee the grand opening of its new $12 million hotel out there.

To get back to the chronology, though, in the spring of 1938, Red was hurrying back to Charleston after a weekend in North Carolina. Two flat tires caused him to be three hours late reporting in, and on his typewriter was a note from the boss saying, "See me at once." Braced for a stern lecture if not dismissal, he waited for Tom Waring to return from lunch. The two went into a corner of the city room and Tom said, "What do you know about sports?" Red replied, "Not much." And Tom said "Well, you'd better start learning because you are now the sports editor."

The sports editor had quit over the weekend and Red had a new assignment. He had put out the sport pages a few times on Sundays but he never had been a really ardent sports fan.

Fortunately he had friends in the composing room, including the foreman who appointed himself as a special committee to monitor and correct Red's headlines—until the new sports editor came to know that the Chicago Americans were the White Sox, not the Cubs, and that the Yankees ordinarily didn't clash with such teams as the St. Louis Braves or the Philadelphia Giants.

He began a daily sports column which, naturally, was labeled "Hitt's Runs and Errors," and within a few weeks the sports department was functioning with unprecedented smoothness. He boned up on baseball and football and things like that and his authoritative column was deemed one of the best features in the paper.

Five years later, management of the Charleston newspapers decided that the Evening Post needed a reorganization. Hitt was offered the job of news editor and with it a free hand to do whatever he thought necessary to revitalize and improve the newspaper. The staff was composed of four old-

timers, including the editor, two girl reporters, society editor, a police reporter, sports editor and two male reporters.

Hitt took over the city desk on a Monday morning in an atmosphere icy with resentment. The oldtimers didn't cotton to the idea of the lanky, young redhead from the "other" newspaper moving in. The reporters had been deliberately accumulating copy for days and they flooded his desk with more material than he could handle in a week.

"I wasn't very happy those first few months," he recalls. "I understood the resentment and I knew I just had to wear it down. It took a lot of time."

By the end of World War II the oldtimers had come around. The Post had a new look and Hitt was gently but firmly in control. His title changed to managing editor and he was given carte blanche to build up a staff. Circulation began to climb and it has done so ever since—from a little over 20,000 when he moved in to more than 40,000 today, making the Post the largest afternoon paper in the state by a comfortable 10,000 margin.

Red was named editor in 1953 and a director of the publishing companies in 1963. He brought to the editorial page a positiveness the Post had not known for years. He has been active in all phases of civic life and it's doubtful if any small-town boy has ever been more successful at cracking Charleston's citadel of "high society." In 1948 he was president simultaneously of the Country Club of Charleston, the Lions Club, a vice president of the Chamber of Commerce and commodore of the Carolina Yacht Club. He was elected a director of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association in 1950 and has just completed a term as president of the S.C. Press Association. In 1963 The Citadel awarded him an honorary Doctor of Laws degree. He joined ASNE in 1946. He and Mrs. Hitt have five children and two sons-in-law.

His newsroom, like Red himself, is alert but relaxed and the turnover of personnel has been unusually small. He strongly believes in letting his key men have their heads. He doesn't remember ever issuing an order but his staffers say his booming voice carries with it a high degree of persuasiveness. The boys in the composing room who knew him "back when" still, for reasons he can't remember, call him "Joe".

All in all, his is a "stay loose" operation, especially when big news breaks on the deadline. And the loosest man in the shop is always Editor Hitt whose creed is that rules and policy must never get in the way of sound judgment.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, June 4, 1968]

ROBERT M. HITT, JR.

The office of the editor of the Charleston Evening Post is dark. The desk is clear. The typewriter is stilled. Robert M. Hitt Jr. has gone and behind him he has left an emptiness that hurts. Unexpectedly, he is dead at 53.

Mr. Hitt was a newspaperman's newspaperman. There was, literally, no newspaper job he could not do—and do better than most. At the age of five he began helping his father put out the weekly Bamberg Herald and the practical lessons in journalism which he learned early in life stood him in good stead, providing the stairs to a highly successful career. With the exception of a brief period of time following his graduation from The Citadel in 1935 he had devoted a full life to a business he loved.

As a reporter, a sports editor, a news editor and a managing editor he approached each daily task—no matter what—with an enthusiasm that was infectious. He was a leader but never a pusher. A man of reason and persuasion, he had that inbred quality that inspires. He had the respect of his staff.

As editor of the Evening Post since 1953 he had developed a professional reputation that was recognized nationally. He was a man of knowledge and of wisdom, a man with the ability to analyze situations almost at a glance. He was equally facile in commenting editorially on international, national or local issues. He wrote concisely and lucidly and often with humor. His editorials were at times pointed but they were never scathing. He did not indulge in personalities.

That was the kind of a man Mr. Hitt was, in the office and out. He was a friendly man, with a keen sense of humor. More important, he was a man of compassion. He cared about people. He was, above all, a man of integrity and of honor. His news judgment was sharp, but he was a firm believer in the exercise of common sense. He gave everyone a fair shake.

As an editor and as a citizen he was a promoter of Charleston and the Lowcountry. In the field of civic endeavor he was known as a man who could get a job done. He gave freely of his time and of his talents to help build a better community. We believe he succeeded.

We join a wide circle of friends in this city, in the state and in the nation in mourning his passing. To his family, of whom he was so proud, we extend our heartfelt sympathies.

A few days ago he was counseling a younger associate on the technique of writing. "Stay loose," he said. "Don't tense up. Decide what you want to say and then say it plainly and simply." We have tried to follow his advice but this time it was painfully difficult.

In the newsroom of the Evening Post we will miss his towering figure, his hearty laugh, his bass voice. We will miss his guidance and his kindness. We will miss him as a boss but even more as a friend. His death leave a void that will not be filled.

Elsewhere on this page we have reprinted today a profile that his newspaper colleagues feel best portrays Robert M. Hitt Jr.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, June 5, 1968]

R. M. HITT, JR.

A journalist of nationwide renown, Robert Melvin Hitt Jr. was a justly admired citizen of South Carolina and one of the most popular men of his time in Charleston. Through public speeches and a wide personal acquaintance he had projected a warm personality far beyond the circulation territory of the Charleston Evening Post, which he had served as editor for 15 years.

We first became acquainted with Red Hitt when he was a lanky freshman at The Citadel. At age 16, he already showed promise. In applying for appointment as campus correspondent for The News and Courier, he listed among his qualifications an ability to set type, tend a press and write any kind of copy from advertisements to editorials.

These were no idle boasts. He had grown up around a newspaper shop. His father was the late R. M. Hitt, editor of The Bamberg Herald, whom we revered among the solid and able weekly journalists of our state. Although in those days only senior cadets served as campus correspondents, we watched the progress of the boy from Bamberg. Not long after his graduation we offered him a job as a reporter for The News and Courier. Though it paid less than he earned from a government job, he readily accepted because his first interest was newspapering. Mr. Hitt's progress in the craft was rapid. First as sports editor for The News and Courier, then as city editor and managing editor for The Evening Post, he climbed the ladder of desks and in 1953 was appointed editor.

As a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, he was respected and liked by colleagues all over the country. Behind the rugged countenance and booming voice that were his trademarks was a gentle and sensitive nature. He was perceptive and sympathetic in dealing with both people and issues. These qualities, with a vivid gift for words, superbly equipped him for the duties of a newspaper editor. He discharged them with admirable style and skill.

Perhaps his most engaging quality was a keen sense of humor, quick but kindly. It spiced his writing and brought welcome wit to social conversations. Who will forget his bass voice and hearty laugh?

Brought up in a Christian home, in which family loyalty and civic obligation were regarded as matters of course, he grew in character and stature with the years. His unexpected death at age 53 has cut short a career that should have had many fruitful years to run. The newspaper profession has suffered a grievous loss. The sorrow of his family, his associates and a vast collection of friends is beyond measures.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, June 5, 1968]

FINAL DEADLINE

From the time he labored as a gangling, red-headed lad in his father's newspaper shop at Bamberg, Robert Melvin Hitt, Jr. was destined for a life in journalism.

Newspapering tugged at him through high school and at The Citadel, where his facile pen begin attracting attention both on and off the campus. But newspaper jobs were scarce when he was graduated in 1935, and it was a year later before he signed on with the *News and Courier* at Charleston as a cub reporter.

From there on out, "Red" Hitt was in his own briar patch—whether reporting, editing, or writing delightful columns such as those he turned out (while sports editor) under the heading "Hitt's Runs and Errors."

He really hit his stride when he became editor of the *Charleston Evening Post*, enlarging his interests and influence in civic affairs while continuing to make friends for himself and for the Charleston newspapers. His unfailing good humor, his *basso profundo* voice (it was likened to the sound of distant thunder) and his profound knowledge of newspapering brought him recognition in both state and national journalistic circles.

But that deep bass voice was stilled last week when he fell victim to a brain hemorrhage. Early Tuesday morning he died, leaving not only a bereaved family but also hosts of sorrowing friends in newspaper shops across the length and breadth of the land.

They, including those of *The State*, will remember "Red" Hitt not so much as the competent craftsman but as the lovable individual who never met a stranger nor made an enemy.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, June 5. 1968]

R. M. "RED" HITT, THE "MAN WHO"

Seldom has the South Carolina press suffered such a severe blow as was dealt it by the untimely death of Robert M. Hitt Jr., editor of the Charleston Evening Post.

At age 53, Mr. Hitt was at the height of his great intellectual powers and his ability to sway others with the charm of his unique personality. The loss is shared by the whole state, by the cause of good citizenship, better government and more pleasant communities.

Because of his highly developed and perfectly-timed sense of humor and his ability to win a crowd instantly and hold it as long as it suited him, Mr. Hitt was much in demand as an after-dinner speaker. He had a nationwide reputation.

"Red" Hitt was the "man who:"

Was relentless in his search for the truth in the news, but used compassion in printing it.

Was forthright in his editorial expressions,

but always constructive and never critical for the sake of mere criticism.

Was possessed of the sharpest natural wit we ever enjoyed off the professional stage, and used its keen edge to good effect. But he never hurled barbs that hurt, and he preferred to be the butt of his own jokes.

Was known by thousands over the country, admired by all who ever encountered him, had hundreds of friends in professional journalism organizations, but never changed basically from the son of a country newspaper editor who started work in a printing shop as a boy.

Rose to heights in his career and in community life, but never lost the enthusiasm of The Citadel cadet he was more than 30 years ago. He served many organizations, but never pushed for personal recogition.

Could render the report of the nominating committee and evoke more laughter than the "speaker of the evening," while in the next moment pointing out in his deep rumbling voice the easy solution to a serious problem.

Trained many young journalists, speaking to them in their classes and working with them in his offices, and left a lasting impression on them.

Could discipline a reporter, or a subordinate editor, in a manner he would never forget—without hurting his feeliings.

Could receive through connections in his church, which he loved and served, money to buy a gift for a resident of an old ladies' home—and choose a bottle of wine and deliver it with a personal visit.

Was not content merely to write about community problems, but involved himself in their solutions.

Mr. Hitt was all of these things, and more, the devoted husband and father of a fine family and an active churchman. But his greatest contribution, and the most important to him, was, first to better newspapers and, second, receiving and returning the love of his friends.

We pass this way but once, and to encounter just one "Red" Hitt along the way is to be highly privileged.

[From the News and Courier, June 6, 1968]

SENATE PAYS TRIBUTE TO R. M. HITT, JR.

COLUMBUS.—The Senate Wednesday adopted a resolution expressing the regrets of the general assembly at the death of Charleston Evening Post Editor Robert M. Hitt Jr.

The resolution, jointly sponsored by Charleston's four Republican senators, goes now to the House for action.

Hitt, who collapsed a week ago after suffering a brain hemorrhage, was described in the resolution as a man who will be "long remembered" for his contributions to journalism and community service.

In adopting the resolution, its authors wrote, the legislature will be reflecting the feelings of the entire people of South Carolina. It extended the sympathy of the legislature to members of the bereaved family.

[From the Charleston Evening Post, June 4, 1968]

R. M. HITT, JR., EVENING POST EDITOR, DIES

Robert M. Hitt, Jr., editor of the Charleston Evening Post for the last 15 years and a director of the Evening Post and The News and Courier publishing companies, died late last night at Roper Hospital. He was 53.

He had been in a deep coma since he collapsed Wednesday afternoon during a meeting sponsored by the Charleston Safety Council at the Charleston Marina.

His death was caused by a brain hemorrhage.

Funeral services will be held at noon tomorrow at St. Philip's Episcopal Chruch with the Rev. Samuel T. Cobb officiating. Burial, directed by Connelley's, will be in the churchyard.

Pallbearers will be Thomas R. Waring, Ernest A. Cutts, W. Hampton Logan, Thomas E. Myers, William D. Workman Jr., S. Norwood Hastie Jr., C. C. Rhodes and Theodore D. Maybank.

Mr. Hitt had been a newspaperman nearly all his life. He held official posts in various newspaper organizations, both state and national.

He was a tireless worker for the betterment of his profession, yet found time to maintain an intense interest in all facets of Charleston life; its political, social and civic affairs, preservation and progress.

Mr. Hitt resided at 60 Anson Street.

Mr. Hitt, familiarly known as "Red" although his red hair had turned grey with the passage of the years, was well known for his booming voice, his contagious laughter and his keen sense of humor.

He was much sought after as a master of ceremonies and after-diner speaker. The wit he always inserted in his speeches endeared him to audiences in many cities, towns and hamlets throughout South Carolina.

But his fame as a speaker went far beyond the boundaries of his native state, and often he was called upon to speak before national audiences in farflung places. He had addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., and the annual meeting of United Press International in San Francisco.

He possessed the enviable ability to see the humorous side in almost any situation. He was a marvelous story teller.

Fundamentally a gentle, kind-hearted and generous person, he counted his friends in the thousands. He was known and admired by high-ranking politicians, admirals, generals, businessmen, newspapermen the nation over, and by many others of lesser light.

The prophetic lines under Cadet Hitt's picture in the 1935 Sphinx (the Citadel yearbook) the year he graduated from the military college sums up what his fellow students thought of him, and those thoughts have been projected to this day:

"He who jests with him must have a nimble wit indeed. The name "Red" Hitt will forever arouse memories of a tall, raw-boned, red-haired jester . . .

"'Red' will leave a vacancy in the Cadet Corps which will long remain unfilled. His capabilities are many and manifest but his strong point has been, and probably will remain, publications. As managing editor of The Bulldog and as business manager of the Sphinx, he performed difficult tasks and performed them well. Furthermore, he maintained such a high sense of humor and proficiency at repartee that he was chosen the wittiest man in his class."

A man of varied talents and versatility, Mr. Hitt even entered the field of drama on one occasion. He played the second lead in the Dock Street Theater production of "The Front Page" in April, 1945.

Mr. Hitt had a sincere and lasting interest in civic affairs, and believed it his duty to lend his talents and leadership ability to any and all Charleston organizations that called upon him.

Hardly a week went by when he wasn't called on to attend a meeting of some group, or asked to head a committee, or prevailed upon to speak before a local or state organization.

The amount of time and talent he gave freely to civic duties would be difficult to match.

With the exception of three months as a grammar school principal and teacher and three months as a federal employe, Mr. Hitt's entire life was spent in the newspaper field. At the age of five he began helping with chores at The Bamberg Herald, which was published and edited by his father.

He became editor of the Charleston Evening Post in 1953 and 10 years later was named a director of the Evening Post and The News and Courier publishing companies.

The Citadel awarded him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws in 1962.

After graduating from The Citadel in 1935, he became principal of Smoaks Grammar School in Colleton County. Three months later he was named district director of the National Youth Administration program with jurisdiction over nine Low-country counties.

He resigned in May, 1936, to become a reporter for The News and Courier, launching a career that was to make him one of the most widely known and highly respected newspapermen in the nation.

In 1938 Mr. Hitt was appointed sports editor of The News and Courier. His daily column, "Hitt's Runs and Errors," became one of the most widely read items in the newspaper.

After four years as sports editor, he was named news editor of the Charleston Evening Post, which then had a circulation of about 20,000. He became managing editor in 1944 and editor nine years later. During his career with the Evening Post, its circulation rose to more than 40,000, making it the largest evening daily in the state.

He was a past president of the S.C. Press Association, a charter member and first president of the S.C. Associated Press News Council, a former director of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, a member of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity, and a member since 1946 of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Mr. Hitt was active in many local organizations. He was a past president of the Charleston Association of Citadel Men, Charleston Lions Club, and Country Club of Charleston; a past commodore of Carolina Yacht Club, and past vice president of the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce.

In 1955 he was appointed to the State Fiscal Survey Commission to investigate the state's governmental operating procedures.

While a student at The Citadel, he was a member of the Glee Club, Buccaneer Club, Junior and Senior Exhibition Platoons and co-canteen manager.

During his senior year he was a cadet first lieutenant, business manager of the yearbook, cadet newspaper managing editor and a director of the South Carolina Collegiate Press Association. Color-blindness and a knee injury kept him from receiving a military commission at graduation.

Mr. Hitt was born June 12, 1914, in Bamberg, a son of the late Robert H. Hitt and Mrs. Weinona Strom Hitt. He was a member of the vestry of St. Philip's Episcopal Church and had sung in the church choir for many years.

Surviving are his widow, the former Miss Ann Elizabeth Leonard of Charleston; three daughters, Miss Joan Leonard Hitt of San Francisco, Mrs. Douglas Alan Rodgers of Charleston and Mrs. Gardner Brockway Miller of Missoula, Mont.; two sons, Robert M. Hitt III, and John Thomas Leonard Hitt, both of Charleston; his mother of Bamberg; two sisters, Mrs. Charles L. Stuckey of Charlotte and Mrs. Thomas D. Thrailkill of Bamberg, and a grandson.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, June 4, 1968]

ROBERT M. HITT, JR., EDITOR OF EVENING POST, DIES

Robert M. Hitt Jr., editor of the Charleston Evening Post for the last 15 years and a former sports editor of The News and Courier, died last night in a local hospital. He was 53.

He had been in a deep coma since collapsing Wednesday at a meeting of the Charleston Safety Council. Death was caused by hemorrhage in the brain, which released blood into the spinal fluid.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete.

Aside from his work in journalism, Mr. Hitt, known to his friends as "Red," was one of the leading after-dinner speakers and

raconteurs in the South Carolina Lowcountry. He was well known for his booming voice, contagious laughter and keen sense of humor.

With the exception of three months as a grammar school principal and teacher and three months as a federal employe, Mr. Hitt's entire life was spent in the newspaper field. At the age of five he began helping with chores at The Bamberg Herald, which was published and edited by his father.

He became editor of the Charleston Evening Post in 1953 and 10 years later was named a director of the Evening Post and The News and Courier publishing companies.

The Citadel awarded him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws in 1962.

After graduating from The Citadel in 1935, he became principal of Smoaks Grammar School in Colleton County. Three months later he was named district director of the National Youth Administration program with jurisdiction over nine Lowcountry counties.

He resigned in May, 1936, to become a reporter for The News and Courier, launching a career that was to make him one of the most widely known and highly respected newspapermen in the nation.

In 1938 Mr. Hitt was appointed sports editor of The News and Courier. His daily column, "Hitt's Runs and Errors," became one of the most widely read items in the newspaper.

After four years as sports editor, he was named news editor of the Charleston Evening Post, which then had a circulation of about 20,000. He became managing editor in 1944 and editor nine years later. During his career with the Evening Post, its circulation rose to more than 40,000, making it the largest evening daily in the state.

He was a past president of the S. C. Press Association, a charter member and first president of the S.C. Associated Press News Council, a former director of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, a member of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity, and a member since 1946 of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Mr. Hitt was active in many local organizations. He was a past president of the Charleston Association of Citadel Men, Charleston Lions Club, and Country Club of Charleston; a past commodore of Carolina Yacht Club, and past vice president of the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce.

In 1955 he was appointed to the State Fiscal Survey Commission to investigate the state's governmental operating procedures.

While a student at The Citadel, he was a member of the Glee Club, Buccaneer Club, Junior and Senior Exhibition Platoons and co-canteen manager.

During his senior year he was a cadet first lieutenant, business manager of the yearbook, cadet newspaper managing editor and a director of the South Carolina Collegiate Press Association. Color-blindness and a knee injury kept him from receiving a military commission at graduation.

Mr. Hitt was born June 12, 1914, in Bamberg, a son of the late Robert M. Hitt and Mrs. Weinona Strom Hitt. He was a member of St. Philip's Protestant Episcopal Church and had sung in its choir for many years.

Surviving are his widow, the former Miss Ann Elizabeth Leonard of Charleston; three daughters, Miss Joan Leonard Hitt of San Francisco, Mrs. Douglas Alan Rodgers of Charleston and Mrs. Gardner Brockway Miller of Missoula, Mont.; two sons, Robert M. Hitt III, and John Thomas Leonard Hitt, both of Charleston; his mother of Bamberg; two sisters, Mrs. Charles L. Stuckey of Charlotte and Mrs. Thomas D. Thrailkill of Bamberg, and a grandson.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, June 4, 1968]

POST EDITOR R. M. HITT DIES AT 53

CHARLESTON, S.C.—Charleston Evening Post editor Robert M. Hitt Jr., who had been in a coma since last Wednesday died Monday night as the result of a brain hemorrhage. He was 53.

A charter member and first president of the South Carolina Associated Press News Council, Hitt had been a newsman for most of his life, beginning in the shop of his father's weekly Bamberg, S.C. Herald while still attending elementary school.

Hitt became a reporter on the Charleston News and Courier after graduating from The Citadel in 1936. He was named sports editor of the News and Courier in 1938 and was appointed news editor of the Evening Post four years later.

He became managing editor of the Evening Post in 1944, and was named editor in 1953.

With Hitt occupying the editor's chair, the Evening Post became South Carolina's largest evening daily, more than doubling its circulation.

Hitt was a past president of the S.C. Press Association, a member of Sigma Delta Chi, and a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors since 1946.

Survivors include his wife, the former Miss Ann Elizabeth Leonard of Charleston; three daughters, Miss Joan Leonard Hitt of San Francisco, Mrs. Douglas Alan Rodgers of Charleston, and Mrs. Gardner Brockway Miller of Missoula, Mont.

Also: two sons, Robert M. Hitt III and John Thomas Leonard Hitt, both of Charleston; his mother, Mrs. Weinona Strom Hitt of Bamberg; two sisters, Mr. Charles Lamar Stuckey of Charlotte N.C. and Mrs. Thomas D. Thrailkill of Bamberg, and a grandson.

The funeral will be at noon Wednesday at St. Philips Episcopal Church with burial in the churchyard.

THIS AGE OF PERMISSIVENESS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recent appalling events around the country lead me to the inevitable conclusion that this country has completely lost all perspective, and is fast being sucked under the swirling waters by a whirlpool of anarchy. Certainly, we are in an era of unparalleled, self-induced hysteria. We are plagued by personal indifference to the problems and rights of others. We are overrun by those power-hungry demogogs who use people for their own selfish purposes, who believe in only those laws which they alone invent and who are using the established institutions of this country as instruments of national revolution. We are pummeled by the meaningless and euphemistic phrases of political candidates, both to the left and to the right. Responsibility, self-discipline and respect are words which are "anachronistic" or "irrelvant." The actions of a dissident minority go unchecked, actions which are not just trampling the rights of the majority but the very foundation upon which our whole governmental structure is built. In short, Mr. President, we are reaping the harvest sown during the age of permissiveness, an age wherein individuals are not fixed with the responsibility for their actions, an age where right is wrong and wrong is right, an age where maturity and experience are used as derisive terms. Our society simply can no longer tolerate this divisiveness, for while we have somehow managed to stay united, we just do not know how much longer we will be able to do so. We must get a grip on our national perspective. We must restore some balance to our national mental health. The majority of this country must rise up in indignation—indignation toward the indifference to what is going on in this country. We can no longer afford to feed the forces of anarchy and violence. We must set things right.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written to me by a well-meaning, but, to my mind, misguided individual, be printed in the RECORD, together with my reply to him.

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

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford, Calif., May 14, 1968.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I would like to strongly implore you to not only vote against, but also to speak against the proposed amendments to appropriation bills which would revoke NSF and NDEA aid from students involved in protests. Although I am against some protests, I feel others are necessary for the continued advancement of the academic, political and economic goals of our country. I particularly feel the proposed amendments unnecessarily imperil the freedom of thought and action which is imperative for maintaining the high level of progress now observed in our country.

Our country exists because our founding fathers protested—to the point of revolution. Now that same government they founded is attempting to single out undergraduate and graduate students, the future leaders of our country, most of whom could not afford to continue their study if their fellowships were revoked for some vague activity which "disrupts a college's operations"—without a legal trial! There are already sufficient laws to prosecute protestors who get out of line in a fair and legal manner without resorting to the unequitable methods that these amendments would make possible. I therefore implore you again to act against these amendments.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

MAY 22, 1968.

Mr. ——— ———,
Stanford University,
Stanford, Calif.

DEAR MR. ———: This will acknowledge receipt of your May 14th letter, in which you discuss your opposition to two amendments, recently adopted by the House I believe, which would provide:

"That no part of this appropriation shall be available for or paid out to the benefit of any individual who at any time after the effective date of this Act, willfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation of this university or college which he is attending or at which he is employed."

Perhaps at the time you wrote me you were unaware of the actual wording of the amendments adopted by the House of the legislative history pertaining to them. During the debate on the amendment to the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1969, the sponsor of the amendment, Representative Wyman, stated, in part:

"This simple amendment reflects the concern of Members of Congress to do something to help restore a greater measure of order and responsibility on the troubled campuses of America. One of the ways we can do this is to make it clear that engaging in this type of offensive activity cuts off your scholarship or fellowship help if you are receiving any.

"There is no intention to penalize anyone but cutting off a scholarship for a minor infraction. The situation that this is directed to is the sort of thing that offends all of us: The usurpation of the administrative function and responsibilities of our educational institutions by willful disobedience

and willful infraction of the law, sometimes extending to criminal conduct on the part of individual students who may be receiving a scholarship under this particular segment of this appropriation."

Now, from the above, it is abundantly clear that three factors must be present in order for the withdrawal of Federal aid to take effect: 1) Ample warning, in that the action is not retroactive, but does become effective after congressional enactment; 2) A *willful* refusal by the individual to abide by a regulation; 3) The regulation must be a lawful one, in that it must have been approved through the duly constituted channels of officialdom in the institution. In light of this, I would venture to say that the amendments we are discussing might tend to restore order to the campus and thus allow those individuals not engaged in unlawful activities to pursue their studies without interruption. Former Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Yale Law School and now Solicitor General of the United States said recently:

"The right to disagree—and to manifest disagreement—which the constitution allows to the individuals in those situations—does not authorize them to carry on their campaign of education and persuasion at the expense of someone else's liberty, or in violation of some laws whose independent validity is questionable."

And, in this connection, I think mature acceptance dictates, as Livy once said, many centuries ago:

"No law can possibly meet the convenience of every one: we must be satisfied if it be beneficial on the whole, and to the majority."

In the first sentence of your last paragraph you make what I feel may well be an invalid conclusion. You stated that our country "exists" because the framers of our form of government "protested—to the point of revolution." On the contrary, I believe you will find that our country "exists" by virtue of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence and the eventual dissolution of ties with the mother country, whose lists of abuses toward its colony were of such a despotic and tyrannical nature that they could no longer be tolerated. And, if my memory of history has not failed me completely, prior to the Declaration of Independence repeated attempts were made of a lawful nature in the form of petitions to King George and the Parliament for a redress of these grievances. Indeed, the famous British statesman and orator almost succeeded in convincing his brethren of the validity of the colony's grievances. His name—Edmund Burke—and he said of the colonies:

"Deny them this participation of freedom, and you break that sole bond, which originally made, and must still preserve the unity of the empire."

But, the only answer which came from the monarch was to wage war against the coastal towns, plundering the villages and destroying lives. It was not until this final act of war from the monarch came that the colonies had no other recourse but to declare its independence from "a Tyrant . . . unfit to be the Ruler of a free People". So, while I do not mean to suggest that your contention is not analogous, I would suggest that perhaps the reasons for the final act of declaring independence may have been of a somewhat higher nature than those relating to the construction of school gymnasiums on recreation land, the recruitment on campus of students into governmental service or the question of whether or not male students should be allowed to entertain individuals of the opposite sex in their bedrooms. Just as our Founding Fathers stated, in the Declaration of Independence: "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes;", so I believe that without more justifiable reasons which have no other course of redress, the present situation on campuses throughout the country, the disruption of the learning process, cannot be condoned.

I have always stated that the duty and the responsibility of the adult population is to provide the best education possible for young people. The responsibility of the young people is to take advantage of the learning provided by the educational institution. If any changes are to be made in the provision of this education, it is the responsibility of duly constituted administration of the institution to make these changes, perhaps with the advice and urging of the student population, through the appropriate, lawful channels, and within the framework of law and order. Justice Frankfurter once said:

"Law alone saves a society from being rent by internecine strife or ruled by mere brute power however disguised . . . Violent resistence to law cannot be made a legal reason for its suspension without loosening the fabric of our society."

To believe otherwise is to state that might makes right and I would hope you would agree with me that this is the very antithesis of our form of government.

But, getting back to your original question as to how I will vote if the proposition arises in the Senate as to withdrawing Federal aid from individuals engaged in unlawful campus activities, I am inclined to support such a move in view of the apparent helplessness of some university administrators to prevent campus disruptions of the type we are discussing. I cannot see either the wisdom or the logic of using taxpayers' dollars to contribute to the activities of those individuals who would utilize a university as an instrument of revolution, such as has been freely admitted by the SDS. Nor, do I see any justice in supporting, with Federal tax dollars, a student engaged in the unlawful activity of disrupting university operations, thereby depriving other students not so supported from obtaining the education they have paid for. The Federal government has no legal or moral obligation, nor is it good policy, to finance individuals or activities which use the educational system for purposes other than education.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to take this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues a matter which I think is of grave concern and should be carefully considered by all Members of this distinguished body and, hopefully, by the people of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I am increasingly concerned over indications that the administration may be, in a subtle fashion, attempting to alter established U.S. policy toward Communist China. Many news reporters have described a recent speech on Communist China by Under Secretary of State Katzenbach as a "trial balloon" designed to test public sentiment on the possibility of changing America's policy toward Communist China in the near future.

However, Mr. Katzenbach's speech is not the first so-called "trial balloon" on the subject. Since the beginning of this year, several high administration officials have been making strangely conciliatory comments about Communist China.

I think it might be useful to review this series of administration statements to determine if a pattern is, indeed, developing, a pattern indicating that a change in America's posture toward Communist China is in the offing.

In his state of the Union message in January, President Johnson said:

> Turmoil continues on the mainland of China after a year of violent disruption. The radical extremism of their government has isolated the Chinese people behind their own borders. The United States, however, remains willing to permit the travel of journalists to both of our countries to undertake cultural and educational exchanges; and to talk about the exchange of basic food crop materials.

As far as I have been able to find out, this is the first statement in which anyone in the administration discussed the possibility of "exchanging food crop materials." I wonder exactly what the President meant by that statement? What sort of food crop materials would the United States, the greatest agricultural Nation in the world, need from Communist China? The only agricultural product of China which is known to be in surplus and in great demand in the rest of the world is opium—and we certainly do not need any of that.

I am confident that the President's state of the Union message is an accurate statement of the administration's intent—even though I do not see what agricultural products China will trade to us. I certainly hope the President's statement is not the forerunner of a request for the shipment of American surplus agricultural products to mainland China. The past two Democratic administrations have made a habit of bailing out such troublemakers as Sukarno, Nasser, Toure, and Nkrumah with loans and gifts of America's surplus agricultural products. I certainly hope the administration is not now thinking of extending this foolish policy to our self-appointed enemies in Communist China. I certainly hope we will be sure our own people all have adequate diets—and I note some people have suggested 10 million Americans go to bed hungry—before we attempt to feed the Chinese Communists.

The next indication of the possible change in administration thinking on China was the Vice President's unequivocal statement in April of this year, extending the administration's "bridge-building" theory—which had previously been applied primarily to Eastern Europe—to Communist China. This was rather an amazing about face, for only 6 months before the Vice President was issuing warnings about "militant, aggressive, Asian communism, with its headquarters in Peking, China." Following his change of heart, the Vice President said:

> I look forward to the day when the great Chinese people, no longer victimized from within, take their place in the modern world. Surely one of the most exciting and enriching experiences to which we can look forward is the building of peaceful bridges to the people of mainland China.

If the Vice President intends merely to express support for the idea that the Chinese people will eventually regain their freedom, then none could fault his statement. However, such statements must be considered in the context of the events and policies of the day. "Bridge building," in the current administra-

tion's vernacular, connotes an attempt to increase trade with Communist government now in power. In my opinion, this is hardly the time to seek increased trade with Communist China. Although we may wish to reaffirm our traditional friendship for the Chinese people, this is no time for U.S. initiatives which might legitimize the current Chinese Communist rulers or help them overcome China's grave internal problems.

Finally, Mr. President, two top officials of the Department of State, Mr. Katzenbach and Mr. Eugene Rostow, made speeches on the same day elaborating on what the President and Vice President have already said about the possibility of improving our relations with Communist China.

The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Katzenbach, speaking at the National Press Club on May 21, 1968, hinted that this country might loosen its trade embargo against Communist China if Peking would ease its opposition to commerce with the United States. One recent example of America's "new flexibility" on trade and financial matters, I am told, was the granting of a license to the Radio Corp. of America permitting RCA to pay about $600,000 to the Chinese Communists for services rendered by the Peking authorities in accepting RCA messages from overseas customers primarily located in the Middle East. According to newspaper reports, this transfer of funds is the largest ever authorized under the Foreign Assets Control Act of 1950. I believe Members of Congress would be very interested in the details of this transaction and in an explanation as to why the administration chose this particular moment to authorize payment of over half a million dollars to the Red Chinese when our balance-of-payments situation is so critical.

Mr. Katzenbach, the No. 2 man in the State Department, further stated that the administration would accept "just about any gesture" as an indication of Peking's interest in improving relations with the United States. I am amazed that such a statement would be made while the administration is trying to negotiate an end to the Vietnamese war and when it is well known that Peking is urging Hanoi to prosecute that war with renewed vigor. I am appalled that such a statement would be made when more Americans have been killed in Vietnam with the aid and support of the Red Chinese in the past 4 weeks than in any other previous 4-week period during the entire Vietnamese conflict.

Mr. Katzenbach's speech contains some other rather remarkable language. He says, for instance, that—

> The military threat posed by Peking can be, and perhaps at times has been, exaggerated.

I am amazed to find Mr. Katzenbach making such a statement when his immediate superior, Mr. Rusk, has repeatedly stated that one of the main reasons for our intervention in Vietnam is to prevent Chinese Communist expansion into all of Southeast Asia. I am amazed to hear such a statement from the Under Secretary of State just a few months after the Secretary of Defense justified the expenditure of $5 billion for an ABM—antiballistic missile—system designed to protect us from the growing Chinese Communist nuclear threat. Such glaring inconsistencies make one wonder whether the right hand of the administration knows what the left hand is doing.

Mr. Katzenbach further states that the Department of State understands Communist China's "legitimate needs for security and friendly relations with neighboring countries." This comment implies that Peking has a benign and peaceful record throughout the world. Mr. Katzenbach blithely overlooks the fact that since 1960 Communist China has made at least two open military attacks on India, created disturbances in Macao and Hong Kong, nearly conquered Indonesia from within, launched widespread subversion in Africa, continually probed the Taiwan Straits, and has encouraged both the disgraceful conduct of Chinese Communist diplomats abroad and the mistreatment of foreign diplomats and newsmen in Peking.

The Under Secretary's statement about Communist China's "friendly relations with her neighbors" seems to contradict many previous pronouncements made by both Democratic administrations since 1960 in opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The United States has repeatedly, and I think rightly, pointed out that the Government in Peking is not peace loving. The Chinese Communists clearly do not concur in the obligations which the U.N. Charter imposes upon members. I question whether Mr. Katzenbach's remarks are not most untimely, for during the past few years Communist China has aggressively attempted to put its openly stated theory of world revolution into effect. As a result a growing majority of United Nations members now oppose Communist China's entry into the world body, whereas previously the number of states voting with the United States against Communist China was decreasing. So once again this administration appears to be wavering in its support for a policy which has finally won the enthusiastic backing of friendly states, a policy which the United States has firmly endorsed since the Chinese Communists attacked United Nations forces in Korea in 1950.

The Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Mr. Eugene Rostow, speaking in Cincinnati on the same date as Mr. Katzenbach, stated:

> We have ourselves pushed aside barriers which once existed in our policy . . . We have made clear our willingness to welcome Chinese scientists, scholars, and journalists to the United States, and have encouraged our own academics to establish contact with their counterparts on the mainland of China. To facilitate these contacts, we have eased restrictions on travel to Communist China. Few applications for the validation of passports for travel to Communist China have been refused in recent years . . . We have taken other steps as well.

Mr. President, I think Members of Congress would like to know what the "other steps" referred to by Mr. Rostow are. I would like to know the reasons behind the administration's change in tactics toward the Chinese Communists. I would like to know what has prompted the administration to begin throwing bouquets at the Chinese Communists. Is there some startling piece of news about Communist China which policymakers in the State Department and in the White House know which other Americans are not privy to? If there is, the administration should share this news with the American people. If there is not, I suggest that this is a most peculiar time for America to begin courting the Chinese Communists.

As of a few months ago there was great uncertainty among China scholars as to who was actually in control in Peking. This Senator is still uncertain.

Does not the continuing conflict on the mainland make it impossible to predict now whether the Communists will be able to retain centralized control of that huge country? It is not quite possible that China will disintegrate into regional rule by warlords? Is it not even possible that the Chinese people will regain their freedom to choose a better form of government? If so, this would hardly appear to be the time to alter our China policy. It would seem to be a time for continued watchful waiting.

Friendship is a two-way street. Have the Communist Chinese taken any initiatives indicating they wish to improve relations with the United States? Oddly enough, both Mr. Katzenbach and Mr. Rostow express doubt in their speeches that the Chinese Communists are interested in friendly relations with the United States. For instance, Mr. Katzenbach said:

> Contact, exchange, detente—all threaten not only the objectives of Peking's foreign policy, but the whole ideological fabric which this generation of leaders has woven . . . such a move—the desire for expanded and improved peaceful contact between the two countries—appears still to be lacking on the Chinese side.

If Peking is interested in improved relations with the United States, it has an excellent opportunity to demonstrate good faith by helping us find a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam. If, however, the Chinese Communists continue to withhold their cooperation on this question on life and death importance to all Americans I consider it most inappropriate for our Government to extend America's hand of official friendship.

Certainly the American people are entitled to a clear statement of the administration's intention toward Communist China. I see no reason why we should be obliged to read the fine print of numerous speeches to gain an impression of administration thinking on such a crucial issue. Unless the national security would be adversely affected. I call upon the administration to issue a clear, comprehensive policy statement on Communist China.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, because of certain statements carried by the press, a great amount of confusion exists in the public mind over precisely what gun control legislation has been enacted by the Congress as a part of the omnibus crime control bill.

Title IV of the bill, "State Firearms Control Assistance," which begins on page 97 and runs through page 123 of the Senate-passed bill, is a very substan-

tial piece of legislation. It will be recalled that this was passed by the Senate without change from the manner in which it was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which held long and tedious hearings on the whole subject. Efforts to amend title IV were defeated by sizable margins. This is not to say that title IV is perfect, or that it is the ultimate in Federal gun control legislation. It is a beginning—a very meaningful beginning, and one which is administratively workable. It closely regulates commerce in handguns, destructive devices, machineguns, short-barreled shotguns and short-barreled rifles; also all firearms of any kind where the purchaser could not lawfully purchase or possess the same in accord with State and local laws; and makes it unlawful for any licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer to sell or deliver any handgun to any individual whom the licensee knows or has reasonable cause to believe is under 21 years of age. There are provisions prohibiting receipt or shipment of any firearms by felons and persons under indictment.

I ask unanimous consent that title IV, as above-referred to, be printed in the RECORD as a matter of public interest.

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

TITLE IV—STATE FIREARMS CONTROL ASSISTANCE

Findings and declaration

SEC. 901. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that there is a widespread traffic in firearms moving in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and that the existing Federal controls over such traffic do not adequately enable the States to control this traffic within their own borders through the exercise of their police power;

(2) that the ease with which any person can acquire firearms other than a rifle or shotgun (including criminals, juveniles without the knowledge or consent of their parents or guardians, narcotics addicts, mental defectives, armed groups who would supplant the functions of duly constituted public authorities, and others whose possession of such weapons is similarly contrary to the public interest) is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States;

(3) that only through adequate Federal control over interstate and foreign commerce in these weapons, and over all persons engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, or dealing in them, can this grave problem be properly dealt with, and effective State and local regulation of this traffic be made possible;

(4) that the acquisition on a mail-order basis of firearms other than a rifle or shotgun by nonlicensed individuals, from a place other than their State of residence, has materially tended to thwart the effectiveness of State laws and regulations, and local ordinances;

(5) that the sale or other disposition of concealable weapons by importers, manufacturers, and dealers holding Federal licenses, to nonresidents of the State in which the licensees' places of business are located, has tended to make ineffective the laws, regulations, and ordinances in the several States and local jurisdictions regarding such firearms;

(6) that there is a causal relationship between the easy availability of firearms other than a rifle or shotgun and juvenile and youthful criminal behavior, and that such firearms have been widely sold by federally licensed importers and dealers to emotionally immature, or thrill-bent juveniles and minors prone to criminal behavior;

(7) that the United States has become the dumping ground of the castoff surplus military weapons of other nations, and that such weapons, and the large volume of relatively inexpensive pistols and revolvers (largely worthless for sporting purposes), imported into the United States in recent years, has contributed greatly to lawlessness and to the Nation's law enforcement problems;

(8) that the lack of adequate Federal control over interstate and foreign commerce in highly destructive weapons (such as bazookas, mortars, antitank guns, and so forth, and destructive devices such as explosive or incindiary grenades, bombs, missiles, and so forth) has allowed such weapons and devices to fall into the hands of lawless persons, including armed groups who would supplant lawful authority, thus creating a problem of national concern;

(9) that the existing licensing system under the Federal Firearms Act does not provide adequate license fees or proper standards for the granting or denial of licenses, and that this has led to licenses being issued to persons not reasonably entitled thereto, thus distorting the purposes of the licensing system.

(b) The Congress further hereby declares that the purpose of this title is to cope with the conditions referred to in the foregoing subsection, and that it is not the purpose of this title to place any undue or unnecessary Federal restrictions or burdens on law-abiding citizens with respect to the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms appropriate to the purpose of hunting, trap shooting, target shooting, personal protection, or any other lawful activity, and that this title is not intended to discourage or eliminate the private ownership or use of firearms by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes or provide for the imposition by Federal regulations of any procedures or requirements other than those reasonably necessary to implement and effectuate the provisions of this title.

SEC. 902. Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 917 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 44.—FIREARMS

"Sec.
"921. Definitions.
"922. Unlawful acts.
"923. Licensing.
"924. Penalties.
"925. Exceptions: Relief from disabilities.
"926. Rules and regulations.
"927. Effect on State law.
"928. Separability clause.

"§ 921. Definitions

"(a) As used in this chapter—

"(1) The term 'person' and the term 'whoever' includes any individual, corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, or joint stock company.

"(2) The term 'interstate or foreign commerce' includes commerce between any State or possession (not including the Canal Zone) and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or possession (not including the Canal Zone), but through any place outside thereof; or within any possession or the District of Columbia. The term 'State' shall include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'firearm' means any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; the frame or receiver of any such weapon; or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or any destructive device.

"(4) The term 'destructive device' means any explosive, incendiary, or poison gas bomb, grenade, mine, rocket, missile, or similar device; and includes any type of weapon which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of any explosive and having any barrel with a bore of one-half inch or more in diameter.

"(5) The term 'shotgun' means a weapon designed or redesigned, made or remade, and intended to be fired from the shoulder and designed or redesigned and made or remade to use the energy of the explosive in a fixed shotgun shell to fire through a smooth bore either a number of ball shot or a single projectile for each single pull of the trigger.

"(6) The term 'short-barreled shotgun' means a shotgun having one or more barrels less than eighteen inches in length and any weapon made from a shotgun (whether by alteration, modification, or otherwise) if such weapon as modified has an overall length of less than twenty-six inches.

"(7) The term 'rifle' means a weapon designed or redesigned, made or remade, and intended to be fired from the shoulder and designed or redesigned and made or remade to use the energy of the explosive in a fixed metallic cartridge to fire only a single projectile through a rifled bore for each single pull of the trigger.

"(8) The term 'short-barreled rifle' means a rifle having one or more barrels less than sixteen inches in length and any weapon made from a rifle (whether by alternation, modification, or otherwise) if such weapon as modified has an overall length of less than twenty-six inches.

"(9) The term 'importer' means any person engaged in the business of importing or bringing firearms or ammunition into the United States for purposes of sale or distribution; and the term 'licensed importer' means any such person licensed under the provisions of this chapter.

"(10) The term 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the manufacture of firearms or ammunition for purposes of sale or distribution; and the term 'licensed manufacturer' means any such person licensed under the provisions of this chapter.

"(11) The term 'dealer' means (A) any person engaged in the business of selling firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail, (B) any person engaged in the business of repairing such firearms or of making or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms or (C) any person who is a pawnbroker. The term 'licensed dealer' means any dealer who is licensed under the provisions of this chapter.

"(12) The term 'pawnbroker' means any person whose business or occupation includes the taking or receiving, by way of pledge or pawn, of any firearm or ammunition as security for the payment or repayment of money.

"(13) The term 'indictment' includes an indictment or an information in any court under which a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year may be prosecuted.

"(14) The term 'fugitive from justice' means any person who has fled from any State or possession to avoid prosecution for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year or to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding.

"(15) The term 'antique firearm' means any firearm manufactured in or before 1898 (including any matchlock, flintlock, percussion cap, or similar early type of ignition system) or replica thereof, whether actually manufactured before or after the year 1898; and also any firearm using fixed ammunition manufactured in or before 1898, for which ammunition is no longer manufactured in the United States; and is not readily available in the ordinary channels of commercial trade.

"(16) The term 'ammunition' means ammunition for a destructive device; it shall not include shotgun shells or any other ammunition designed for use in a firearm other than a destructive device.

"(17) The term 'Secretary' or 'Secretary of the Treasury' means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"(18) The term 'published ordinance'

means a published law of any political subdivision of a State which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be relevant to the enforcement of this chapter and which is contained on a list compiled by the Secretary of the Treasury which list shall be published in the Federal Register, revised annually, and furnished to each licensee under this chapter.

"(b) As used in this chapter—

"(1) The term 'firearm' shall not include an antique firearm.

"(2) The term 'destructive device' shall not include—

"(A) a device which is not designed or redesigned or used or intended for use as a weapon; or

"(B) any device, although originally designed as a weapon, which is redesigned so that it may be used solely as a signaling, linethrowing, safety or similar device; or

"(C) any shotgun other than a short-barreled shotgun; or

"(D) any nonautomatic rifle (other than a short-barreled rifle) generally recognized or particularly suitable for use for the hunting of big game; or

"(E) surplus obsolete ordnance sold, loaned, or given by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of sections 4684(2), 4685, or 4686 of title 10, United States Code; or

"(F) any other device which the Secretary finds is not likely to be used as a weapon.

"(3) The term 'crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year' shall not include any Federal or State offenses pertaining to antitrust violations, unfair trade practices, restraints of trade, or other similar offenses relating to the regulation of business practices as the Secretary may by regulation designate.

§ 922. Unlawful acts

"(a) It shall be unlawful—

"(1) for any person, except a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, to engage in the business of importing, manufacturing, or dealing in firearms, or ammunition, or in the course of such business to ship, transport, or receive any firearm or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(2) for any importer, manufacturer, or dealer licensed under the provisions of this chapter to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce, any firearm other than a rifle or shotgun, or ammunition to any person other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, expect that—

"(A) this paragraph shall not be held to preclude a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer from returning a firearm or replacement firearm of the same kind and type to a person from whom it was received.

"(B) this paragraph shall not be held to preclude a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer from depositing a firearm for conveyance in the mails to any officer, employee, agent, or watchman who, pursuant to the provisions of section 1715 of title 18 of the United States Code, is eligible to receive through the mails pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person, for use in connection with his official duty;

"(C) nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as applying in any manner in the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States differently than it would apply if the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the possession were in fact a State of the United States.

"(3) for any person other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to transport into or receive in the State where he resides (or if the person is a corporation or other business entity, in which he maintains a place of business)—

"(A) any firearm, other than a shotgun or rifle, purchased or otherwise obtained by him outside that State;

"(B) any firearm, purchased or otherwise obtained by him outside that State, which it would be unlawful for him to purchase or possess in the State or political subdivision thereof wherein he resides (or if the person is a corporation or other business entity, in which he maintains a place of business).

"(4) for any person, other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, to transport in interstate or foreign commerce any destructive device, machine-gun (as defined in section 5848 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), short-barreled shotgun, or short-barreled rifle, except as specifically authorized by the Secretary.

"(5) for any person to transfer, sell, trade, give, transport, or deliver to any person (other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer) who resides in any State other than that in which the transferor resides (or in which his place of business is located if the transferor is a corporation or other business entity)—

"(A) any firearm, other than a shotgun or rifle;

"(B) any firearm which the transferee could not lawfully purchase or possess in accord with applicable laws, regulations or ordinances of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the transferee resides (or in which his place of business is located if the transferee is a corporation or other business entity).

"This paragraph shall not apply to transactions between licensed importers, licensed manufacturers, and licensed dealers.

"(6) for any person in connection with the acquisition or attempted acquisition of any firearm from a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, knowingly to make any false or fictitious oral or written statement or to furnish or exhibit any false or fictitious or misrepresented identification, intended or likely to deceive such importer, manufacturer, or dealer with respect to any fact material to the lawfulness of the sale or other disposition of such firearm under the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any licensed importer licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to sell or deliver—

"(1) any firearm to any individual who the licensee knows or has reasonable cause to believe is less than twenty-one years of age, if the firearm is other than a shotgun or rifle.

"(2) any firearm to any person in any State where the purchase or possession by such person of such firearm would be in violation of any State law or any published ordinance applicable at the place of sale, delivery or other disposition, or in the locality in which such person resides unless the licensee knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the purchase or possession would not be in violation of such State law or such ordinance.

"(3) any firearm to any person who the licensee knows or has reasonable cause to believe does not reside in (or if the person is a corporation or other business entity, does not maintain a place of business in) the State in which the licensee's place of business is located; except that this paragraph shall not apply in the case of a shotgun or rifle.

"(4) to any person any destructive device, machine gun (as defined in section 5848 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), short-barreled shotgun, or short-barreled rifle, unless he has in his possession a sworn statement executed by the principal law enforcement officer of the locality wherein the purchaser or person to whom it is otherwise disposed of resides, attesting that there is no provision of law, regulation, or ordinance which would be violated by such person's receipt or possession thereof, and that he is satisfied that it is intended by such person for lawful purposes; and such sworn statement shall be retained by the licensee as a part of the records required to be kept under the provisions of this chapter.

"(5) any firearm to any person unless the licensee notes in his records required to be kept pursuant to section 923 of this chapter, the name, age, and place of residence of such person if the person is an individual, or the identity and principal and local places of business of such person if the person is a corporation or other business entity.

Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection shall not apply to transactions between licensed importers, licensed manufacturers, and licensed dealers.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to sell or otherwise dispose of any firearm or ammunition to any person, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such person is a fugitive from justice or is under indictment or has been convicted in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year. This subsection shall not apply with respect to sale or disposition of a firearm to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer who pursuant to subsection (b) of section 925 of this chapter is not precluded from dealing in firearms, or to a person who has been granted relief from disabilities pursuant to subsection (c) of section 925 of this chapter.

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any common or contract carrier to transport or deliver in interstate or foreign commerce any firearm with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that the shipment, transportation, or receipt thereof would be in violation of the provisions of this chapter.

"(e) It shall be unlawful for any person who is under indictment or who has been convicted in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, or who is a fugitive from justice, to ship or transport any firearm or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(f) It shall be unlawful for any person who is under indictment or who has been convicted in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, or is a fugitive from justice, to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(g) It shall be unlawful for any person to transport or ship in interstate or foreign commerce, any stolen firearm or stolen ammunition, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe the same to have been stolen.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any person to receive, conceal, store, barter, sell, or dispose of any stolen firearm or stolen ammunition, or pledge or accept as security for a loan any stolen firearm or stolen ammunition, moving as or which is a part of or which constitutes interstate or foreign commerce, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe the same to have been stolen.

"(i) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to transport, ship, or receive, in interstate or foreign commerce, any firearm the importer's or manufacturer's serial number of which has been removed, obliterated, or altered.

"(j) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to import or bring into the United States or any possession thereof any firearm or ammunition, except as provided in subsection (d) of section 925 of this chapter; and it shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been imported or brought into the United States or any possession thereof in violation of the provisions of this chapter.

"(k) It shall be unlawful for any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer knowingly to make any false entry in, or to fail to make appropriate entry in or to fail to properly maintain, any record

which he is required to keep pursuant to section 923 of this chapter or regulations promulgated thereunder.

"§923. Licensing

"(a) No person shall engage in business as a firearms or ammunition importer, manufacturer, or dealer until he has filed an application with, and received a license to do so from, the Secretary. The application shall be in such form and contain such information as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. Each applicant shall be required to pay a fee for obtaining such a license, a separate fee being required for each place in which the applicant is to do business, as follows:

"(1) if a manufacturer—

"(A) of destruction devices and/or ammunition a fee of $1,000 per year;

"(B) of firearms other than destructive devices a fee of $500 per year.

"(2) If an importer—

"(A) of destructive devices and/or ammunition a fee of $1,000 per year;

"(B) of firearms other than destructive devices a fee of $500 per year.

"(3) If a dealer—

"(A) in destructive devices and/or ammunition a fee of $1,000 per year;

"(B) who is a pawnbroker dealing in firearms other than destructive devices a fee of $250 per year;

"(C) who is not a dealer in destructive devices or a pawnbroker, a fee of $10 per year.

"(b) Upon the filing of a proper application and payment of the prescribed fee, the Secretary may issue to the applicant the appropriate license which, subject to the provisions of this chapter and other applicable provisions of law, shall entitle the licensee to transport, ship, and receive firearms and ammunition covered by such license in interstate or foreign commerce during the period stated in the license.

"(c) Any application submitted under subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be disapproved and the license denied and the fee returned to the applicant if the Secretary, after notice and opportunity for hearing, finds that—

"(1) the applicant is under twenty-one years of age; or

"(2) the applicant (including in the case of a corporation, partnership, or association, any individual possessing directly or indirectly, the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of the corporation, partnership, or association) is prohibited from transporting, shipping, or receiving firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce under the provisions of this chapter; or is, by reason of his business experience, financial standing, or trade connections, not likely to commence business operations during the term of the annual license applied for or to maintain operations in compliance with this chapter; or

"(3) the applicant has willfully violated any of the provisions of this chapter or regulations issued thereunder; or

"(4) the applicant has willfully failed to disclose any material information required, or has made any false statement as to any material fact, in connection with his application; or

"(5) the applicant does not have, or does not intend to have or to maintain, in a State or possession, business premises for the conduct of the business.

"(d) Each licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, and licensed dealer shall maintain such records of importation, production, shipment, receipt, and sale or other disposition, of firearms and ammunition at such place, for such period and in such form as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Such importers, manufacturers, and dealers shall make such records available for inspection at all reasonable times, and shall submit to the Secretary such reports and information with respect to such records and the contents thereof as he shall by regulations prescribe. The Secretary or his delegate may enter during business hours the premises (including places of storage) of any firearms or ammunition importer, manufacturer, or dealer for the purpose of inspecting or examining any records or documents required to be kept by such importer or manufacturer or dealer under the provisions of this chapter or regulations issued pursuant thereto, and any firearms or ammunition kept or stored by such importer, manufacturer, or dealer at such premises. Upon the request of any State, or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury may make available to such State, or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, any information, which he may obtain by reason of the provisions of this chapter with respect to the identification of persons within such State, or possession, or political subdivision thereof, who have purchased or received firearms or ammunition, together with a description of such firearms or ammunition.

"(e) Licenses issued under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall be kept available for inspection on the business premises covered by the license.

"(f) Licensed importers and licensed manufacturers shall identify, in such manner as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe, each firearm imported or manufactured by such importer or manufacturer.

"§ 924. Penalties

"(a) Whoever violates any provision of this chapter or knowingly makes any false statement or representation with respect to the information required by the provisions of this chapter to be kept in the records of a person licensed under this chapter, or in applying for any license or exemption or relief from disability under the provisions of this chapter, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, with intent to commit therewith an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, or with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year is to be committed therewith, ships, transports, or receives a firearm in interstate or foreign commerce shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(c) Any firearm or ammunition involved in, or used or intended to be used in, any violation of the provisions of this chapter, or a rule or regulation promulgated thereunder, or violation of any other criminal law of the United States, shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture and all provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the seizure, forfeiture, and disposition of firearms, as defined in section 5848(1) of said Code, shall, so far as applicable, extend to seizures and forfeitures under the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 925. Exceptions: relief from disabilities

"(a) The provisions of this chapter shall not apply with respect to the transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation of any firearm or ammunition imported for, or sold or shipped to, or issued for the use of the United States or any department, or agency thereof; or any State or possession, or any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof.

"(b) A licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer who is indicted for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, continue operations pursuant to his existing license (provided that prior to the expiration of the term of the existing license timely application is made for a new license) during the term of such indictment and until any conviction pursuant to the indictment becomes final.

"(c) A person who has been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year (other than a crime involving the use of a firearm or other weapon or a violation of this chapter or of the National Firearms Act) may make application to the Secretary for relief from the disabilities under this chapter incurred by reason of such conviction, and the Secretary may grant such relief if it is established to his satisfaction that the circumstances regarding the conviction, and the applicant's record and reputation, are such that the applicant will not be likely to conduct his operations in an unlawful manner, and that the granting of the relief would not be contrary to the public interest. A licensee conducting operations under this chapter, who makes application for relief from the disabilities incurred under this chapter by reason of such a conviction, shall not be barred by such conviction from further operations under his license pending final action on an application for relief filed pursuant to this section. Whenever the Secretary grants relief to any person pursuant to this section he shall promptly publish in the Federal Register notice of such action, together with the reasons therefor.

"(d) The Secretary may authorize a firearm to be imported or brought into the United States or any possession thereof if the person importing or bringing in the firearm establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the firearm—

"(1) is being imported or brought in for scientific or research purposes, or is for use in connection with competition or training pursuant to chapter 401 of title 10 of the United States Code; or

"(2) is an unserviceable firearm, other than a machinegun as defined by 5848(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (not readily restorable to firing condition), imported or brought in as a curio or museum piece; or

"(3) is of a type that does not fall within the definition of a firearm as defined in section 5848(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes, and in the case of surplus military firearms is a rifle or shotgun; or

"(4) was previously taken out of the United States or a possession by the person who is bringing in the firearm:

Provided, That the Secretary may permit the conditional importation or bringing in of a firearm for examination and testing in connection with the making of a determination as to whether the importation or bringing in of such firearm will be allowed under this subsection.

§ 926. Rules and regulations

"The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems reasonably necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter. The Secretary shall give reasonable public notice, and afford to interested parties opportunity for hearing, prior to prescribing such rules and regulations.

"§ 927. Effect on State law

"No provision of this chapter shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of the Congress to occupy the field in which such provision operates to the exclusion of the law of any State or possession on the same subject matter, unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such provision and the law of the State or possession so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

"§ 928. Separability

"If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the chapter and the application of such provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

SEC. 903. The administration and enforcement of the amendment made by this title

shall be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 904. Nothing in this title or amendment made thereby shall be construed as modifying or affecting any provision of—

(a) the National Firearms Act (chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954); or

(b) section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1934), as amended, relating to munitions control; or

(c) section 1715 of title 18, United States Code, relating to nonmailable firearms.

SEC. 905. The table of contents to "PART I.—CRIMES" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"43. False personation ..... 911"

a new chapter reference as follows:

"44. Firearms ..... 921"

SEC. 906. The Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1250; 15 U.S.C. 901–910), as amended, is repealed.

SEC 907. The amendments made by this title shall become effective one hundred and eighty days after the date of its enactment; except that repeal of the Federal Firearms Act shall not in itself terminate any valid license issued pursuant to that Act and any such license shall be deemed valid until it shall expire according to its terms unless it be sooner revoked or terminated pursuant to applicable provisions of law.

RELIEF OF DR. SANTIAGO JOSE MANUEL RAMON BIENVENIDO ROIG Y GARCIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 13154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 13154) for the relief of Dr. Santiago Jose Manuel Ramon Bienvenido Roig Y Garcia, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF ANGELIKI GIANNAKOU

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 13912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 13912) for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2764 and S. 2577, which were reported today by the Committee on the Judiciary, and are identical with the bills just passed, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills are indefinitely postponed.

THE CAPTURE OF JAMES EARL RAY, SUSPECTED SLAYER OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the tragic events of last week overshadowed one of the greatest accomplishments in law enforcement activity in recent years—the capture of James Earl Ray, the suspected slayer of Martin Luther King.

Many of us have become accustomed to such achievements by the FBI, for we have seen J. Edgar Hoover and his dedicated men and women time after time accomplish the seemingly impossible. Some felt this case was impossible. Others, selfish individuals who do not know the true character of Mr. Hoover and his associates, have blandly asserted their belief that Ray would never be captured, implying that the FBI did not really want to catch Ray.

But the FBI all the while continued its job in its usual professional manner, saying nothing about the progress being made. Hundreds of thousands of manhours went into the investigation. No lead, no matter how farfetched it seemed, was left unchecked. The trail, wherever it led, was followed, FBI agents and officials alike, from Mr. Hoover on down, worked long hours, day and night, weekends and holidays, in an effort to find this man.

The break came finally last week, and Ray is now in jail awaiting his day before the bar of justice. Ray could not have run afoul of three finer law enforcement agencies in the world even if he had tried, for his final capture resulted from the cooperation of the FBI the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and New Scotland Yard.

Let all would-be assassins take note—the full force of law enforcement throughout the free would will never rest until all such criminals are brought to justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Superb Police Work," published in the Washington Daily News of June 10, 1968.

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

SUPERB POLICE WORK

Only the trial can confirm whether or not the suspect in the murder of Dr. Luther King is the right man.

But the international police diligence, patience and skill which led to the capture of James Earl Ray, alias Eric Starvo Galt, alias Ramon George Sneyd, has to go into the books as one of the most remarkable crime searches in many years.

The FBI had been looking for Ray since April 20, after a spate of intensive detective work pin-pointed the identity of the man they wanted. Police all across the United States had been involved in the hunt, and when it seemed possible Ray might have slipped out of the United States, police forces in other countries were informed.

There are no passport requirements for Americans visiting Canada and it was fairly easy for Ray to "go north."

But the Royal Canadian Mounted Police lived up to their reputation for relentless pursuit. They combed 200,000 applications and turned up Ray's picture on a request for a Canadian passport under the name of Sneyd. The FBI and the British were alerted, among others.

Britain's famed Scotland Yard made the capture as the result of typical perseverance. Ray was caught at an airport trying to leave the country.

This fellow obviously is no ordinary suspect. Whether or not he had confederates, his trail marks him as a cunning character.

In any case, we think the FBI, the Mounties and Scotland Yard deserve special commendation. And only hope that similarly skillful police cooperation will lead to the arrest of other wanton killers—the three men, for instance, who gunned down Abder Rayyan, a South Side Chicago merchant. Police could detect no motive but since Rayyan was a Jordanian immigrant, it was possible the killing was intended as revenge for the assassination of Senator Kennedy.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MARITIME PROGRAMS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1104, H.R. 15189. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15189) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 15, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. It is the sense of Congress that not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act the President should submit to the Congress proposals to strengthen and modernize the United States merchant marine.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1968, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 10, 1968:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, I the Commissioner of the District of Columbia nominate the following-named person for appointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

Dean Stephen S. Davis for a term of 5 years, effective on and after May 23, 1968.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George W. Renchard, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Burundi.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Lynn M. Bartlett, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Paul A. Miller.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for terms of 4 years from August 3, 1968:

William George Anlyan, of North Carolina, vice Dr. Barnes Woodhall, term expiring.

Max Michael, Jr., of Florida, vice Dr. Morris Tager term expiring.

George William Teuscher, of Illinois, vice Dr. Walsh McDermott, term expiring.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Lenoard E. Tripp, Wheatley, Ark., in place of S. C. Scott, retired.

CALIFORNIA

James P. Hutler, Chico, Calif., in place of I. A. Cleek, retired.

Harmon G. Hawblitzel, Duarte, Calif., in place of T. V. Holmes, retired.

GEORGIA

Virginia R. Roberts, Haralson, Ga., in place of W. W. Gable, retired.

Gordon W. Allen, Red Oak, Ga., in place of H. W. Williams, retired.

INDIANA

Nelson R. Beer, Aurora, Ind., in place of A. R. Petscher, retired.

KANSAS

June E. Schoneman, Edwardsville, Kans., in place of L. A. White, retired.

LOUISIANA

Vera M. Hornsby, Pine Grove, La., in place of J. D. Hornsby, deceased.

Kenneth O. Halbrook, Pollock, La., in place of C. T. Bigner, retired.

MICHIGAN

George A. McPherson, Rhodes, Mich., in place of L. I. Ingle, retired.

MINNESOTA

Vernon W. Olson, Bellingham, Minn., in place of L. G. Hanson, transferred.

Joseph R. Anderson, Belview, Minn., in place of R. D. Miller, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Robert L. Stubbs, Magee, Miss., in place of J. H. Magee, retired.

MISSOURI

John C. Greenwell, Jr., Adrian, Mo., in place of R. E. Ray, deceased.

MONTANA

Harold O. Gunderson, Havre, Mont., in place of E. N. Blythe, retired.

NEW YORK

Elliot B. Marrus, Cedarhurst, N.Y., in place of W. L. Divver, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bernard J. Carter, Stoneville, N.C., in place of Roy Prillaman, retired.

OHIO

Robert Burns, Sidney, Ohio, in place of W. B. Swonger, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mary C. Cardone, Bairdford, Pa., in place of G. M. Ward, retired.

Mary F. Holdren, Beaver, Pa., in place of E. L. Ervin, retired.

John A. Antonetti, Bulger, Pa., in place of Margaret Darras, retired.

Russel E. Horner, Burnham, Pa., in place of A. W. Kinsloe, retired.

Joseph D. LaGorga, North Versailles, Pa., office established in February 10, 1968.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Richard R. Jacobson, Valley Springs, S. Dak., in place of A. B. Elliott, retired.

TENNESSEE

Cecil E. Collier, Church Hill, Tenn., in place of O. H. Seaver, retired.

William J. Swann, Jefferson City, Tenn., in place of I. M. Godwin, retired.

John L. Marrs, Lobelville, Tenn., in place of K. E. DePriest, resigned.

TEXAS

Verner S. Howard, Carrizo Springs, Tex., in place of C. V. Speer, retired.

James L. McAllister, Clarksville, Tex., in place of J. T. Jolley, retired.

Marion T. Seale, Giddings, Tex., in place of M. F. Bobo, retired.

Barney W. Oliver, Greenville, Tex., in place of R. E. Hutchins, deceased.

Billie W. Creed, Plano, Tex., in place of W. G. Carlisle, retired.

VIRGINIA

Callie H. Stevens, Stanleytown, Va., in place of E. H. Kirby, retired.

WISCONSIN

Harold C. Ristow, La Crosse, Wis., in place of G. M. Hetherington, retired.

Lorraine J. Olson, Maiden Rock, Wis., in place of R. S. Foley, retired.

Robert T. Kauth, West Bend, Wis., in place of M. J. Gonring, retired.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Frank H. Price, Jr.
Raymond J. Schneider
Arthur G. Esch
Robert L. Baughan, Jr.
David H. Jackson
Burton H. Andrews
James B. Hildreth
Mayo A. Hadden, Jr.
Henry Suerstedt, Jr.
Edwin M. Rosenberg
Philip P. Cole
Daniel E. Bergin, Jr.
George L. Cassell
Howard S. Moore
Philip S. McManus
Lawrence Heyworth, Jr.
William T. Rapp
John M. Barrett
Marmaduke G. Bayne
Robert L. J. Long
Thomas J. Christman
Clarence A. Hill, Jr.
William R. Flanagan
David H. Bagley
Kent L. Lee
Frederick C. Turner
Robert B. Baldwin
Julien J. LeBourgeois
George P. Steele II

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William C. Airheart
Leland G. Alexander
Almarion S. Bailey
Edward A. Bailey
Noland J. Beat
Van D. Bell, Jr.
Ernest J. Berger
Rocco D. Bianchi
William Biehl, Jr.
Don H. Blanchard
Miller M. Blue
Norris C. Broome
Williams P. Brown
Ralph D. Cail
Edward E. Camporini
Thomas P. Casey
Earl W. Cassidy, Sr.
Albert E. Coffeen
Donald Conroy
Keith W. Costello
Wallace W. Crompton
Rex A. Deasy
James G. Dionisopoulos
John H. Doering, Jr.
Walter E. Domina
Michael J. Dunbar
Thomas G. Elder
Ralph F. Estey
Daniel R. Evans
Harold W. Evans, Jr.
William Farrell
Sidney Fisher
Freddie L. Franzman
Owen V. Gallentine
James C. Gasser
George A. Gibson
Thomas E. Gleason
Jerome L. Goebel
Willis L. Gore
Joseph S. Heitzler
Wilmer W. Hixson
Hardy V. Huffstutter, Jr.
Kenneth H. Huntington
Clyde R. Jarrett
Ray N. Joens
Victor A. Kleber, Jr.
William H. Lanagan, Jr.
John H. Lauck
James A. MacDonald, Jr.
Richard H. Mample
Clyde R. Mann
Lyle B. Matthews, Jr.
Alden McBarron
William L. McCulloch
Herbert E. Mendenhall
Alexander L. Michaux, Jr.
Henry H. Morgan
Robert J. Morrison
Theodore Nahow
William L. Nelson
Robert L. Nichols
Lawrence C. Norton
William R. Nowadnick
Joseph T. Odenthal
Andrew W. O'Donnell
Francis C. Opeka
Robert H. Piehl
Albert C. Pommerenk
Mark A. Rainer, Jr.
Richard S. Rash
Harry G. Robinson, Jr.
Horton E. Roeder
Edward R. Rogal
Edwin S. Schick, Jr.
Clarence H. Schmid
Adolph C. Schwenk
Robert L. Simmons
Anthony J. Skotnicki
Burneal E. Smith
Albert W. Snell
James B. Soper
Harvey E. Spielman
Bernard J. Stender
Grover S. Stewart, Jr.
John B. Sullivan
David G. Swinford
Robert W. Taylor
Alfred I. Thomas
Lyle V. Tope
McDonald D. Tweed
Sumner A. Vale
Francis W. Vaught
Earl K. Vickers, Jr.
Marvin D. Volkert
William W. Wander, Jr.
Warren C. Watson
Donald E. Watterson
Herbert L. Wilkerson
Lynn F. Williams
James F. Williams
Alexander Wilson
Robert Zeugner
Robert J. Zitnik

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald W. Anderson
Richard L. Anderton
Themistocles T. Annas
Robert O. Barnes
Robert E. Benson
James L. Black, Jr.
Billy D. Bouldin
Frederick R. Bowie
Albert R. Bowman II
James R. Bowser, Jr.
William C. Britt
Bruce G. Brown
Joseph B. Brown, Jr.
George L. Bruser
Carl E. Buchmann
Guy R. Campo
Harlan C. Chase
Charles C. Chisholm, Jr.
David A. Clark
Frederick D. Clements
Donald K. Cliff
John Colia
James K. Coody
Henry T. Cook
Alfred J. Croft, Jr.
William M. Cryan
James L. Day
Albert M. Desselle
John W. Detroy
Charles N. Dezer, III
Frank Dicillo, Jr.
Roy L. Doering
Alfred N. Drago
William C. Drumright
Raymond L. Duvall, Jr.
Robert A. Elder
Jim T. Elkins
Richard L. Etter
John E. Fahey
Martin E. Farmer
Frederick L. Farrell, Jr.
Benjamin B. Ferrell
Herbert G. Fischer
William E. H. Fitch III
John R. Fox
Samuel J. Fulton
William E. Garman
Donald L. Gaut
George H. Gentry, Jr.
James C. Gerard
Ernest H. Graham
Wallace H. Graham
Edward F. Grayson, Jr.
Mac Donald Greer
Louis A. Gulling
Bobby R. Hall
Lawrence R. Hawkins
David B. Hayes
William H. Heintz
Richard E. Hemmingway
Howard R. Henn
John A. Hennelly
John C. Hergert, Jr.
Emil W. Herich
Peter L. Hilgartner
Max J. Hochenauer
Clarence E. Hogan
Harry H. Holmberg
Delos M. Hopkins
Henry J. Huntzinger
Gerald H. Hyndman
Ronald L. Iverson
Maurice H. Ivins, Jr.
Robert D. Jameson
Paul G. Janssen
Charles F. Jones
Thomas M. Kauffman
John J. Keefe
Robert J. Keller
Warren P. Kitterman
Frank R. Koethe
Charles R. Kucharski, Jr.
William M. Kull
Dudley N. Kyle
Leo J. Le Blanc, Jr.
Eugene Lichtenwalter
George G. Long
Theodore J. Lutz, Jr.
Joseph V. Manis, Jr.
Robert E. McCamey II
Thomas A. McPheeters
Max McQuown
John J. Metzko
Edison W. Miller
Thomas R. Morgan
Roy E. Moss
Neil A. Nelson
Robert E. Nicholson
Jack L. Norman
Joseph F. Paratore
Oswald O. Paredes
Darold D. Parrish
Paul E. Pearson
John J. Peeler
Charles R. Popee, Jr.
Robert D. Purcell
Francis X. Quinn
James W. Quinn
James D. Quisenberry
Stanly H. Rauh
Robert C. Rice
William H. Rice
William R. Rice
James L. Richard
William L. Robbins
John W. P. Robertson
Henry M. Robinett
Donald G. Robison

Thomas F. Rochford
Robert D. Rosecrans
Jack D. Rowley
James B. Ryckman
Edward J. Sample
Louis W. Schwindt
William A. Scott, Jr.
Lawrence R. Seamon
Roy A. Seaver
William F. Sheehan
Eugene E. Shoults
John D. Shoup
Eugene A. Silverthorn
Benjamin B. Skinner
Michael E. Spiro
Edward H. Stansel
Roderick M. Stewart
John H. Stranquist
Thomas R. Stuart
Lawrence F. Sullivan
Charles R. Swilley, Jr.
Wylie W. Taylor, Jr.
Frank D. Topley
Oliver W. Van Den Berg, Jr.
Larry R. Van Deusen
Archie Vanwinkle
Gerald W. Vaughan
Carroll R. Vorgang
Anthony W. Waite
John J. Walsh, Jr.
Vonda Weaver
Morgan W. West
Paul H. Westenberger
James B. Wilkinson
Bobby R. Wilkinson
Theodore J. Willis
Rondell K. Wood
Robert L. Zuern

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Roger L. Clawson
Jerome T. Hagen
Raymond C. Kargol
Thomas F. Meehan
Harry E. Sexton
John V. Tizio
Richard L. Upchurch
Willard W. Warfield
Warren H. Wiedhahn, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ronald D. Bonnett
Douglas A. Crowe
Barry W. Ferich
John G. Fitzgerald
William H. Ganz
Arnold T. Lawson
John H. Messick
John K. Payne
Michael E. Popelka
Eugene A. Smith

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George E. Allen, Jr.
David W. Cleeland
Charles J. Conlon, Jr.
Daniel J. Coonon
William M. Dale
Daryl D. Dalrymple
Edgar J. Easton, Jr.
Arturo E. Flores
Joe B. Green
Garratt W. Greene
Howard M. Hoffman
Anthony L. Keyfel
Robert G. Lathrop
Terrence D. Lewis
Anthony A. Lopez
Bruce F. Marrs
Thomas H. Meurer
Edward R. Miller, Jr.
Michael W. Murphy
Russell G. Nelson
Frank S. Phillips
Jimmy M. Ray
Charles R. Stichter, II
Robert W. Warner

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ashton D. Asensio
Michael D. Ashworth
Sam R. Baker
John D. Bank
John L. Barry
Allen C. Bartel
John M. Basel
Mark C. Bunton
James A. Burns
Douglas Caldwell
Carl P. Campbell
Floyd D. Campbell
Evert E. Cannon
Donald F. Carey, Jr.
Robert B. Casey
Vaden L. Cobb
George W. Coleman
Gary E. Colpas
James C. Crockett
John H. Daly
William L. Daugherty
Elmer H. Davis, Jr.
Gene F. Davis
William P. Davis
Samuel C. Decoteau
John R. Dempery
Conrad Dogil
Thomas E. Edwards, II
Carl H. Ertwine
Michael G. Evinrude
Marcus G. Fiebelkorn
John J. Folan, Jr.
Robert W. Fout
Toby R. Gritz
Donald L. Gustafson
Samuel J. Hannah
Robert W. Harris
Michael T. Hart, III
James P. Hartneady
Jon E. Hass
David M. Hauntz
Paul Hayes
Howard L. Helms
Richard L. Herrington
John M. Holladay
Richard E. Holt
Paul B. Hugenberg
Floyd W. Hunter, III
James W. Hust
Nathan D. Jacobs
Ralph M. Jeide
William J. Johnston, III
Anderson Jones
Barry T. Jones
Lorenzo G. Jordan
William W. Kastner, III
Lee G. Kinney
Robert L. Lanham
Richard D. Letts
Robert W. List
Lonyer M. Little
Thomas E. Little
Gerald E. Martin
Douglas L. Bash
William R. Blair
Robert J. Boardman
George J. Bolduc
Joseph A. Boyle
George M. Brooks, III
Thomas M. Brown
Justin M. Martin II
Steven R. Matulich
Billy R. Matzke
Russell J. Mazzola
James W. McCabe, Jr.
Charles C. McCorkel
George R. McKay
David E. Melchar
Fred L. Migliorini
John W. Mohr
Ronald H. Morgan
Mation W. Neighbors
Robert R. Nelson
Linn B. Peterson
Gerald B. Plant
Henry P. Purdon
Rockne C. Rhoda
Clyde A. Riley
Joe D. Robinson
Jimmie L. Russell
James R. Ryan
Michael D. Ryan
Andrew R. Sargent
James P. Scott
Michael M. Sheedy III
Michael W. Shepard
Michael R. Shuttleworth
David P. Shiles
Keith T. Soukkala
Deforest D. Spindler
Jonathan B. Stad
Ted A. Steiner
Jack E. Steury
Dale M. Tarbet
Robert Tait
Wayne P. Tichenor
Benedict J. Tisa
Ernest M. Trominski
Sterling D. Udell
Howard R. Vanwinkle
Gerald J. Villano
Bob C. Walker
Charles G. Weaver
Richard F. Webb
Harry R. Weber III
Richard A. Weber
Garrit L. Wiescamp
Thomas D. Willson
Stephen M. Wistrand
Terry L. Wojcik
Charles E. Wolff
Allen P. Woods
Alin C. Worley
Eugene O. Wright
Ronald J. Wroblewski
Randall D. Yeary
Lawrence R. Zinser

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 10, 1968:

POSTMASTER

The nomination sent to the Senate on April 3, 1967, of Edward Klimowich to be postmaster at Montville, in the State of New Jersey.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CONGRESSIONAL MESSAGE OF THE SUPREME COURT ABOUT CONFESSIONS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Evening Star of May 28, 1968, contained an excellent editorial by Mr. James Kilpatrick which succinctly states the message from the Senate, and now the House, on the need "to see a balance restored between the rights of a defendant and the rights of society" in the matter of admitting confessions as evidence in criminal proceedings.

Mr. Kilpatrick said:

The United States Senate dealt the Supreme Court the strongest rebuke that has been officially hurled at the Court in more than 30 years.

When the Senate adopted the provisions of title II of S. 917, we intended to override the Miranda and other decisions which had established artificial and highly technical rules pertaining to right of counsel and the right not to be compelled to incriminate oneself.

Mr. President, I trust that the Supreme Court will accept this sincere effort by Congress to restore the much needed balance in this area of law enforcement. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks in the RECORD following my comments.

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

SUPREME COURT GAVELED DOWN ON CONFESSIONS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The United States Senate last week dealt the Supreme Court the strongest rebuke that has been officially hurled at the court in more than 30 years. Not since the days of Roosevelt's court-packing proposal has a co-equal branch of government spoken in such unmistakable terms.

Roosevelt's scheme failed of adoption, of course, but it had its effect nonetheless. Chief Justice Hughes got the word. Many Americans, deeply concerned at the trend of Supreme Court decisions over the past ten years, will pray that Chief Justice Warren and his majority bloc prove equally attentive this time around. The Senate has said bluntly that it wants to see a balance restored between the rights of a defendant and the rights of society. The step is long overdue.

Specifically, the Senate approved section 3501 of the Crime Control Act of 1968. The section says that in Federal criminal prosecutions, a confession shall be admissible in evidence "if it is voluntarily given." Trial judges are to review the circumstances in the absence of a jury. If a judge determines that a confession was in fact voluntary, according to conditions laid down in the act, he is to admit the confession and instruct the jury to give it such weight "as the jury feels it deserves under all the circumstances."

Under the Senate bill, the presence or absence of a lawyer would be merely one factor, and not necessarily a conclusive factor, in determining the issue of voluntariness. Manifestly, this provision of the act is intended to override the high court's 5–4 decision in the famed Miranda case two years ago. The court then laid down such sweeping requirements for the advice of counsel that the use of confessions in evidence was rendered almost impossible.

As you might expect, the Senate's refusal has evoked moans of anguish from knee-jerk liberals who bleed for the rights of rapists. The Washington Post, which goes into hysterics whenever Earl Warren sneezes, has been regaling its readers with horror stories of confessions obtained by the third-degree. You would suppose that police routinely exact confessions by thumbscrews and rubber hoses.

Sure enough, instances of coerced confessions have occurred. Too many of them. But there is not one line in the Senate bill that would condone the abhorrent practice. It is an insult to the whole of the Federal trial bench to imagine that such confessions would be received in the future.

The more applicable horror stories go in precisely the other direction.

Two months after the Miranda decision, a Brooklyn housewife came on trial for the murder of her four-year-old son. She had taped his mouth and beaten him to death with a broomstick. She freely confessed. She had not had a lawyer. She went free. Miranda.