

September 19, 1967

S 13207

This conference resulted in the first public awareness of the extent of the pollution problem in the Calumet area, and its effect on Lake Michigan.

The conference set Dec. 31, 1968, as a deadline for a cleanup program. What is the status of that deadline?

Small industries in the Calumet region say they can meet the deadline, said Bowden. All the municipalities are making progress toward eliminating the worst offenses, altho storm water overflows still cause great quantities of raw sewage to flow into Lake Michigan.

STEEL FIRMS ASK EXTENSION

During a follow-up conference held Sept. 11 in Chicago, the three major steel companies asked for an extension of the deadline until 1972. They were given until 1970.

But what has happened since 1965, when the steel companies agreed to start a cleanup program?

"So far, our sampling has shown it has gotten worse than it was in 1965," said Bowden.

This was borne out, he said, by weekly sampling runs covering 15 sampling stations in the Indiana harbor, the harbor canal, and the Grand Calumet river.

"They are heavily infested with wastes," said Bowden.

"The steel plants are expanding and producing more. They must have sat on their duffs quite a while after the 1965 conference. Now, 30 months later, they're getting their first engineering plans completed.

"These companies are buying a false prosperity today at the expense of our future," Bowden asserted. "And they're almost guaranteeing that it's all going to collapse because prosperity will depend on clean water and there isn't going to be any clean water left."

"There is absolutely no reason for waste pollution problems today," said Bowden. "It is technically feasible to clean it up right now. We have the technology. We merely have to apply it. Industries are not doing it because it cuts into their profits."

Federal pollution control agents are now waiting for the steel industries to meet their 1970 deadline. If they don't?

"We now have new laws and techniques to encourage them to do their duty thru court action," said Bowden. "We hope it won't come to that."

"This is the first comprehensive effort to make a large industrial area correct its waste problems. If they can tell us to go to hell now and get away with it, they always will."

"If we are successful here, we have a chance to be successful in other areas."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 18, 1967]

FIGHTS EASING POLLUTION BAN—MANN WILL INTRODUCE ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

State Rep. Robert E. Mann [D, Chicago] said that he will introduce today in the General Assembly a joint House-Senate resolution which opposes any extension of the Dec. 31, 1968 deadline for water pollution control in Lake Michigan.

United States Steel corporation in South Chicago had requested an extension of the deadline because of problems in its treatment facilities.

TWO REVERSE THEMSELVES

John E. Egan, sanitary district board president, and H. W. Poston, regional administrator of the Federal Water Pollution Control administration, each had agreed on the extension but reversed themselves Thursday, saying that the steel corporation must have its pollution control program working by the original deadline.

Mann commended THE TRIBUNE's current series of articles on water pollution in the Great Lakes for informing the public about a "critical" problem.

LAKE'S SURVIVAL NECESSARY

"The survival of Lake Michigan must take precedence over private interests," Mann said.

"The tremendous strides which have been made with regard to the scientific treatment of polluted water convince me that if an Herculean effort is made the deadline can be met.

"Lake Michigan is our state's greatest asset and while it may be true that Indiana and Wisconsin are the principal sources of pollutants affecting Lake Michigan, Illinois has the greatest stake in a healthy and viable lake.

EXPRESSION OF PEOPLE

"If the resolution passes, it will be a clear expression of the people of Illinois, thru their elected representatives, that private interests—as important and significant as they are to the economic health of the state—must be subordinated to the future well-being of Lake Michigan. It seems to me shortsighted for industry to plead economic factors as the reason for the suggested extension when the lake has been the vehicle by which commerce has facilitated and extended the growth of industry."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 18, 1967]

LAKE MICHIGAN INHERITS POISON OF A DYING RIVER

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By William Jones)

RACINE, Wis., September 17.—Dismally large amounts of polluting wastes are being dumped in the tiny Root river on its journey to Lake Michigan.

For years, this 25-mile waterway, which meanders from Milwaukee county to enter the lake here, was of interest only to those who worked and lived along its shores. It is too shallow in many places for motorboats. And so narrow in others that it resembles a creek.

Yet the combined problem of spring floods and the stench of its waters finally forced man to take a look at his decades of destructive ignorance. What he found was another reason why Lake Michigan is sick and large sections of the Root river are dead.

WASTES DUMPED IN RIVER

"The river system is presently being used principally for the transportation and assimilation of treated and untreated domestic and industrial wastes," according to a study completed last year by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning commission. While pointing out that in some sections the river still provides recreation areas, the study concludes that "these uses are not completely compatible."

Highly incompatible, an observer concludes, when a duck farm that processes hundreds of thousands of birds annually is ordered to provide greater treatment of its wash water before it enters the river. At one time, according to the commission, pollution from this source alone was equivalent to the raw sewage of 14,000 persons.

Farmers along the Root learned years ago that the river has turned against man. They fenced the river to prevent their cattle from drinking the water.

REACHES 100 PERCENT EFFLUENT

"During low-water months, the flow of parts of the river is 100 per cent effluent," said Lawrence Wright, chief resource planner for the commission. "Our study recommended the entire removal of several municipal sewage systems that are major pollutants. Our conclusions have not been very effective, however, and nothing has been done."

Another phase of the commission's study

included the sampling of water less than two miles from where the river enters Lake Michigan here. At this point, Wright pointed out, lake and river water begin to mix, which they should to dilute the concentrated pollutants in the river. Wright's conclusion:

"The condition of the water in every respect at this point is poor—there is no question about its dangerous and detrimental effect on Lake Michigan."

The commission's findings also serve to underline a recent statement by Wisconsin's Gov. Warren Knowles.

PROBLEM'S "COLOR": GREEN

"The color of the problem is green," said Knowles, who may have had the cost of cleaning up the route in mind. The commission has estimated that it will cost 15 million dollars to restore only a portion of the sick river. This amounts to \$600,000 for every mile of a relatively small waterway.

"Cleanup should be right now," says James Wren-Jarvis, regional director of the state department of natural resources. "But the enforcement procedures do not work that way. Our department must now go out and promote. It will be a question of time."

In stark contrast is the prospect of a deteriorating Lake Michigan. If it ever reaches the condition of the Root or hundreds of other polluted waterways the damage will be irreversible, according to water experts. No amount of money or public indignation, however large, will be able to restore it. There will be no question of time. It will be gone for all time.

POLLUTION A THREAT TO AMERICA'S LAKES

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I, too, am most interested in the recent series of articles published in the Chicago Tribune concerning the pollution of Lake Erie, articles just placed in the RECORD by the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Lake Erie is suffering a plight that is increasingly afflicting the Nation's lakes, both large and small. For generations, our closed bodies of water have been used as dumping grounds for manmade refuse. Now we are confronting the consequences of indifference and carelessness.

Along with thousands of smaller lakes in my State, Lake Michigan has been undergoing similar threats to its economic and recreational value. Effective action at all levels of government, as well as action by private users, is required to protect what remains and to rehabilitate this scarred natural resource.

THE DECISION TO BUILD AN ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, yesterday the decision to build an antiballistic missile system was announced by Secretary of Defense McNamara. I indicated my support of this decision shortly after Secretary McNamara's announcement. Under present world circumstances, we have no choice but to go ahead with an antiballistic missile system.

Regretfully, we have been unsuccessful in reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union on the deployment of antiballistic missile systems. This factor and the emerging nuclear threat of Red China make it necessary that we go ahead with

S 13208

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 19, 1967

an antiballistic system for reasons of national security.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson on January 1, 1967, stated:

We have the solemn duty to slow down the arms race between us, if that is at all possible, in both conventional and nuclear weapons and defenses . . . I realize that an additional race would impose on our people and on all mankind, for that matter, an additional waste of resources with no gain in security to either side.

I read those phrases as a strong affirmation of the President's decision to communicate to the Soviet Union that the United States desired to call a halt to the ABM race. I can only conclude from Mr. McNamara's announcement yesterday that the Soviet Union has refused to sit down as reasonable men and negotiate on a reduction of ABM systems. Such a step would have benefited the United States, the Soviet Union, and mankind.

The emergence of Red China as a nuclear threat also had to be considered in reaching the decision. As indicated in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy July report, Red China is developing a nuclear and missile delivery capability which will shortly constitute a threat to our security.

I believe that the Soviet Union has proceeded to build and deploy one and probably two ABM systems—a decision that until yesterday the United States has refrained from making. I regret that we could not reach agreement, but under the circumstances, I applaud the decision to go ahead with the building of an ABM system.

In proceeding with this step, I fully appreciate the additional financial commitment we assume. The decision has been made that we need an antiballistic missile system. This Nation can afford to pay for all its needs whether they are in the field of national defense or other vital fields essential to the maintenance of our position of preeminence.

There are other needs vital to the maintenance of our position of leadership which to some are not as readily apparent as those immediately related to our national security. These needs, since they are not directly—or at least not obviously—connected with our national security, are at times overlooked. There have been and undoubtedly will be additional shortsighted moves to sacrifice the support of other national needs based upon our assumption of the burden of an ABM system. We must guard against such moves. One specific area I have in mind concerns our Nation's space program. Space is a new frontier which any nation of preeminence must pioneer. It is a technical challenge second to none, and the mantle of world leadership will be worn by the nation which is first in space. Man's security and freedom will depend on the nation which leads in space. Our Nation leads at the dawn of the space age. Our Nation can and must forge ahead to assure leadership in space for the future. As a nation with a gross national product of about \$750 billion a year, we can afford to assume the burden of all of our needs—in space, in Vietnam, in building an ABM

system, and other programs needed to preserve and maintain our Nation's primacy in a turbulent world.

We must insure that our progress in space is not inhibited nor deterred by any shift in budget allocations which may result from the decision on the development of an ABM system. I believe that our Nation's objectives must include and our economy can sustain a vigorous space program and at the same time provide for the cost of an ABM system. I strongly believe that we should tighten our belts and proceed with both our space and the ABM programs.

There should be no slackening of our programs in space. We should and must be the first to reach the moon. This phase of our space effort cannot be our ultimate objective. Reaching the moon can only be viewed as a step in a dynamic new world. Our objective must go beyond the initial exploration of the moon. Here is where vision is vitally needed. We cannot put off developing the technology and hardware we need for the ultimate leadership in space. One specific area in which there is no scientific disagreement is the need to develop the ability to use nuclear energy in space. For meaningful leadership in space there is no alternative to nuclear energy. One of our nuclear energy development efforts which is being considered by some for sacrifice is the nuclear propulsion rocket program. Here is a program our scientists have, over the past few years, been outstandingly successful in. We have already run rocket power reactor experiments on the ground which have met or exceeded our performance objectives. We cannot afford to cut back or delay our progress in this field. I am very concerned that if we even place the nuclear rocket program in a "hold" position for a short while we will never regain our position in this vital field. As I have said before, this takes vision. We must provide this vision by supporting our efforts in our nuclear rocket program.

The United States faces many difficult days. Our country is threatened from without and has growing pains from within. We must proceed in a logical and orderly way to insure that our Nation continues to maintain its primacy in the world. Our Nation's security will be strengthened by an effective ABM system. Supremacy in space, which will come about from the very important development programs which are underway, has every indication of increasing the strength of our Nation—and perhaps our efforts on the space frontier will lead us to the one goal that now seems so distant—peace.

In connection with Secretary McNamara's decision to proceed with development of a "thin antiballistic missile system" I would like to pay tribute to the foresight of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on assuming the chairmanship of the Joint Committee for the 90th Congress. Last January, Senator PASTORE began holding hearings in executive session on the nuclear capability of Red China. These hearings resulted in a joint committee print published in July entitled "Impact of Chinese Communist Nuclear

Weapons Progress on U.S. National Security."

On September 9, in a major policy speech at the launching of the Navy's latest nuclear submarine the *Narwhal* in Groton, Conn., Senator PASTORE called for "full speed ahead" on building an antiballistic missile system. The full text of his incisive and lucid argument for the development of an antiballistic missile system deserves the attention of Congress and the American people. I congratulate Senator PASTORE on his statement and ask unanimous consent that his speech of September 9 be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE NUCLEAR SUBMARINE "NARWHAL" IN GROTON, CONN., SEPTEMBER 9, 1967

I have come to this day and moment with pride—pride in the workers whose skills have made this splendid nuclear submarine possible.

Pride in the nobility of purpose of the crew—men of courage who will guide this ship through the silent depths of the ocean—alone and unafraid.

This ceremony which marks the launching of the *Narwhal*, the SSN671, is a milestone in the annals of our submarine history. Just thirteen short years ago the world's first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*, designated SSN571, was launched from this same shipyard. Here we are a hundred submarines later, and of these, ninety-two have been nuclear powered. Only men of great foresight would have envisioned this tremendous accomplishment.

I can think of no other important technological advancement which has progressed as rapidly as has the use of nuclear propulsion for naval vessels.

It was not too long ago from this shipyard that the forty-first and last Polaris missile firing submarine was launched, marking the completion of this program. There is little doubt that the Polaris submarine represents our most formidable deterrent to an all-out war.

I must say that these achievements would not have taken place except for the persistent and aggressive support of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—with the help of Admiral Rickover and his associates—and I would want you all to know further that if world conditions persist in the way they are today, the Joint Committee expects to see many more nuclear submarines launched from these and other ways throughout this great Nation.

Now, however, we have come to the crossroads in the development of nuclear-powered submarines. With the present authorized Polaris program completed, we must give serious consideration to a further expansion of this program and we must intensify our efforts to develop new and more advanced nuclear attack submarines to meet the expanding challenge of Soviet naval power and the new Chinese threat. I also believe that we should actively pursue the replacement of all our conventional submarines with nuclear submarines of advanced design.

We have developed an irreplaceable reservoir of highly skilled men, such as I see before me today, who have been largely responsible for the clear supremacy the United States holds over any nation in the world in the development of nuclear submarines. Many of you workers, I might add, are friends from Rhode Island who journey here each day to join in this great endeavor to strengthen our national security.

September 19, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 13209

We should insure that the great skills and capabilities of the men who design and build our nuclear warships should not be dissipated.

But this is only one aspect of the continuing fight for American nuclear propulsion supremacy.

The nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise* has just returned from its second deployment in action off Vietnam. The *Enterprise* has proven so effective in battle in Vietnam that the Secretary of Defense requested a new nuclear-powered carrier in last year's defense bill and has told Congress that he intends to ask for one more next year and another in a future year.

The nuclear-powered carrier approved by Congress last year has been named the *Nimitz* after the late Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. You might be interested to know that about fifty-five years ago Lieutenant Nimitz was Commanding Officer of the first United States submarine *Narwhal*, the predecessor of the nuclear submarine we are launching today.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is proud of the active role it has taken and is taking to bring into being a Nuclear Navy.

Our reward has been to see the Polaris nuclear submarine emerge as our first line of defense—and the *Enterprise* and its nuclear escort vessels perform admirably in support of our limited objectives in the Vietnam conflict.

The world into which the *Narwhal* will sail is a world of conflict and contradictions.

We are engaged in a military struggle against the forces of communism in Southeast Asia. At the same time we are working with communist nations at Geneva to produce a treaty banning the spread of nuclear weapons—a treaty which will lessen the possibility of a nuclear holocaust.

Our hopes and prayers are for a non-proliferation treaty and agreements—agreements to halt the arms race—and, indeed, agreements to eliminate all conflicts.

But we must understand military power and constantly be aware of the capabilities of our potential enemies. We must stay in tune with changing events.

A dramatic and upsetting event has recently taken place in the Far East. In less than three years Red China has become, not only a nuclear power—but a *thermonuclear* power.

I suggest that they have made amazing and astonishing progress in this brief span of time. Their accomplishments in the field of nuclear weaponry are all the more significant because the internal strife within China has apparently had little or no effect on their nuclear and missile programs. In light of these factors, it appears that Communist China presents a clear-cut threat to the free world.

At the beginning of the 90th Congress, as Chairman of the Joint Committee, I initiated hearings on Red China's nuclear capability. One of the most significant findings contained in the Joint Committee report that followed was the statement based on CIA and Defense Department testimony that "... The Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971."

Add to this new threat the fact that the Soviet Union's offensive nuclear striking power is increasing in comparison to our own—while at the same time they are developing one and probably two anti-ballistic missile systems to defend their country—which we are not doing—I repeat—which we are not doing.

While for the moment we can find comfort and a certain amount of security in the ideological schism that exists between Red China and the Soviet Union, we cannot discount the possibility that this breach could

be healed and thereby greatly affect the balance of nuclear power in the world.

Which brings me to the important point that I want to make here today, and that is this—that the time has come for us to give serious and urgent thought to a reappraisal of our defense posture.

We cannot live in a world of atomic energy and discount completely the possibility of "surprise attack" on our Nation.

The Senate has just recently approved a budget of over seventy billion dollars for defense, the largest single appropriations bill in our history—and yet we have no effective anti-ballistic missile system.

I realize the cost to do this is high—indeed staggering—however, if we can afford to spend twenty-four billion dollars a year in defense of a neighbor, and I mean Vietnam, we can certainly spend as much to insure the life and security of our American society.

Our offensive weapons are second to none—but it has been our announced and continuing policy for generations never to strike first.

Today—in effect—we are asking the American people to be prepared to accept near nuclear annihilation because our strategy calls for absorbing the first nuclear strike.

We are not an aggressive people. We do not covet other nations' territory. We only ask that those who desire to be free—stay free. I merely point out that we must be as strong in defense to preserve our society as we must be strong in offense to discourage and deter an attack.

With all our offensive power, our defense posture could be our Achilles' heel.

We cannot sit back and let ourselves be lulled into a sense of false security, relying only on the hope that fear of retaliation will deter potential aggressors.

Development of an ABM system is, I repeat, extremely expensive but, indeed, necessary. In this kind of a world, the alternatives are few.

The security of our country—the ultimate in its defence—deserves the highest national priority.

An affluent America—with so much to lose—must not face this mortal challenge cheaply.

We should move full speed ahead on building an anti-ballistic missile system. In this connection, I am happy to say that Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Application of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and one of the Senate's leading experts on military affairs, will soon hold hearings on the ABM question.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will pursue the development of an ABM system with the same vigor that it pressed for the development of the H-Bomb and our first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*.

Both endeavors were successful and greatly increased the security of this great Nation.

This new submarine, the *Narwhal*, represents another link in the chain of undersea security so necessary in this turbulent world.

It is into this difficult and dangerous world that you—the officers and men of the *Narwhal*—will soon sail.

Your task is vital to our security.

Your mission will be difficult.

Your dedication is unsurpassed and our pride in you is unbounded.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Mr. President, the United States is second to none as a nuclear power. We have a nuclear weapon stockpile and delivery systems, which guarantee that any Nation foolhardy enough to attempt a nuclear attack upon us, will be utterly and completely destroyed.

In both Republican and Democratic administrations it has been the announced policy of the United States that our nuclear strategic weapons will not be used on a first strike. The United States has made it clear to the world—to friend and foe alike—that our ICBM's and strategic bombers are for the purposes of deterring war; that we are prepared to, and are capable of, absorbing a first strike and thereafter retaliating with a force sufficient to utterly destroy the attacking Nation.

Notwithstanding our capability to absorb a first strike and successfully counter with our own nuclear missiles, any nuclear attack on the United States will cause great destruction of property and, more important, the death of untold numbers of people. It is for this reason that many of us have believed it essential that an effective antiballistic missile system should be developed and deployed within the United States. It is for this reason that many of us in the Congress have for a number of years supported the necessary research and development work to develop an antiballistic missile system. President Johnson and the Defense Department for a number of years have recommended development of an antiballistic missile system.

Mr. President, I was pleased by the announcement yesterday of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara of the decision to move ahead with deployment of the ABM. I was particularly pleased because, together with other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I for some time have believed it essential that we move full speed ahead on building an anti-ballistic-missile system.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has held extensive hearings in executive session on the Chinese nuclear weapon capabilities. One of the most significant findings set forth in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy report, issued July 19, 1967, was that:

The Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971.

As I have previously pointed out, we cannot live in a world of atomic energy and discount completely the possibility of "surprise attack" on our Nation. We must be prepared during the 1970's to protect our citizens from an irrational nuclear attack from the Chinese Communists. We cannot—we should not—sit back and let ourselves be lulled into a feeling of false security. We should not—we cannot—rely on hope that the fear of retaliation will deter potential aggressors. We must be prepared for possible irrational action on the part of those nations who have already demonstrated their irrational conduct in dealings with not only other nations but even with their own people. As I have also pointed out in the past, if we can afford to spend \$24 billion a year to defend an ally—to protect South Vietnam from Communist aggression—we certainly can afford an effective anti-ballistic-missile system to protect the lives of our own people.

I applaud President Johnson and Secretary McNamara for supporting, during

S 13210

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 19, 1967

the past several years, the necessary research and development efforts required to make possible the decision and for having decided in favor of an ABM deployment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I commend President Johnson for his decision to move ahead immediately on a "thin" ABM defense system. The funds to initiate production and deployment are in the budget and have been approved by the Congress. Secretary McNamara's statement today assures release of the money.

The Atomic Military Applications Subcommittee, which I chair, will hold public and executive hearings in October on ABM defense and the problem of deterrence.

The President's decision points up the growing problem of strategic weapons and deterrence for the years ahead. Red China will have the capability to deploy ICBM's in the early 1970's. The Soviets have started deployment of an ABM defense and, according to published information, have increased by 50 percent in 1 year the number of their operational ICBM's. Despite the appealing notion that technology stands on a "plateau" and that the "scientific military revolution" has been "stabilized," in fact missile technology is advancing in almost all fields of offense and defense—payload, accuracy, guidance, maneuverability, and multiple warheads.

In matters affecting the East-West nuclear balance safety first should be the rule. Deterrence depends not only on forces in being; it also depends on the state of mind and will of the contestants. An ABM defense in Soviet hands lends itself superbly to bluffing and blackmail. Would an undefended United States maintain its resolve to act strongly if a defended U.S.S.R. appeared willing to risk a move against Berlin or any part of Western Europe? As the Soviet planners "war game" with the forces of the 1970's they are certainly asking themselves that type of question. It is the kind of question we need to ask ourselves.

GASOLINE PRICE INCREASES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the July-August 1967 issue of The Drilling Contractor, the magazine published by the American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, contains an important statement by R. J. Moran, president of the American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, with respect to gasoline price increases.

A constituent of mine, R. W. Stubbs, of Moorcroft, Wyo., has called the article to my attention, and I wish to share it with other Senators.

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

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

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

For the second time within a scant period of just five months, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has admonished the U.S. petroleum industry to avoid gasoline price increases. In addressing the National Petroleum Council on July 19, Mr. Ackley urged oil companies

to absorb the increased cost of supplying Western Europe due to partial disruption of Middle East and North Africa shipments.

As usual in instances of this nature, the statement by a government official was widely published in the press. In his dissertation, Mr. Ackley asserted that the service station price for gasoline, exclusive of taxes, had risen 12%, or 2½ cents per gallon, since 1964.

It was not fair, or quite honest, of Mr. Ackley to single out 1964 as the basis for comparison. This gave the general public an erroneous picture of substantial gasoline price advances. It did not present a true picture because Mr. Ackley did not tell the public that gasoline prices in 1964 were abnormally depressed to the lowest level since 1948, or during the last 18 years.

Mr. Ackley also neglected to mention that, in contrast with 1964 service station price of 19.98 cents per gallon, over the last 18 years gasoline prices were in the 20-cent per gallon range during 9 years; were in the 21-cent per gallon range during 7 years; and in the 22-cent per gallon range in 1957 and so far in 1967. In addition to the foregoing facts, it would have been easy for Mr. Ackley to have mentioned that gasoline prices today are just 2½ cents per gallon (about 10 percent) higher than in 1949, and only one-quarter of a cent above 1957 levels.

It would have been a whole lot fairer and more ethical for Mr. Ackley to have given the consuming public all the facts, than to have erroneously indicted an industry which is due so much credit for the way it has held its retail prices in line. Very few other industries can match petroleum's record.

RECORD OF THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, few of us, I believe, realize how important the operation of the Farmers Home Administration is to the farmers of rural America. I have asked South Dakota's State director, Arlo Swanson, an exceptionally vigorous and able administrator, to prepare for me a compilation showing the recent activities of the administration in South Dakota, together with a composite score from the inception of the administration in 1946 through December 1966. Of particular concern to me is the fact that the interest earned and collected is 45.3 times greater than the losses or writeoffs. Put another way, the Government has collected in South Dakota since 1946 \$27,288,286, while suffering principal writeoffs and judgments in the amount of \$601,881. In many areas of FHA authority, there has never been a single dollar of writeoff in the loss column.

I feel that this impressive record should be of interest to other Senators and ask unanimous consent that the record of the South Dakota Farmers Home Administration program be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Huron, S. Dak., September 14, 1967.
Hon. GEORGE McGOVERN,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: Regarding your request for information of the loan activity of this agency in South Dakota pertaining to the dollars advanced and loans made in the

various loan programs, the attached chart will give you the activity from the inception of the program through December 31, 1966. The total interest earned and collected is 45.3 times greater than the writeoffs.

The following is a report on the activity in the State during the past fiscal year—July 1, 1966 through June 30, 1967:

	Number	Amount
Operating.....	2,418	\$11,996,269
Emergency.....	360	1,013,150
Economic opportunity, individual.....	215	485,530
Rural housing.....	522	4,120,610
Rural rental housing.....	7	127,950
Soil and water, individual.....	2	181,530
Farm ownership.....	655	15,557,680
Economic opportunity, cooperative.....	13	95,820
Association development grants.....	7	244,370
Soil and water, association.....	38	3,740,890
Sewer and water planning grants.....	2	26,190
Total.....	4,259	37,589,989

The total loans advanced during the 1967 fiscal year amounted to \$37,672,279, serving some 54,000 South Dakota farm and rural people. This compares with \$10,000,000 loaned through the Farmers Home Administration in South Dakota during 1961. A total of \$107,747,400 has been loaned out to South Dakota farmers and rural residents during the past six years.

The total applications on hand as of August 31 were as follows:

Operating and emergency.....	96
Farm ownership.....	471
Soil and water, individual.....	12
Rural housing.....	389
Senior citizen housing.....	7
Rural rental housing.....	10
Labor housing.....	1
Domestic water.....	71
Waste disposal.....	8
Combination of water and sewer.....	16
Grazing associations.....	23
Rural recreation.....	12
Domestic water development grants.....	11
Waste disposal grants.....	7
Comprehensive area sewer and water planning grants.....	6
Watershed and flood prevention.....	4
Economic opportunity, individual.....	59
Economic opportunity, cooperatives.....	6
Resource conservation and development.....	4

Total applications on hand as of Aug. 31, 1967..... 1,213

The outstanding caseload by types of loans as of June 30, 1967 showing our loan and technical assistance to farmers, ranchers and rural residents is as follows:

Operating loans.....	2,952
Farm ownership loans.....	2,819
Rural housing loans.....	1,873
Soil and water individual loans.....	111
Emergency loans.....	408
Economic opportunity loans.....	406
Grazing Association loans serving 380 farm and ranch families.....	63
Water and/or sewer facility loans and grants serving 2,263 rural families.....	19
Recreation facility loans with 2,786 rural members.....	18
Economic Opportunity Cooperative Association loans serving 147 farm, ranch and rural families.....	25
Resource Conservation and Development loans serving 25 farmers.....	3
Comprehensive planning grants—one to Turner County and one to Fall River-Shannon Counties.....	2
Senior Citizen or Rural Rental Housing loans with 67 rental units.....	11

Very sincerely,

ARLO G. SWANSON,
State Director.

(Attachment.)