

free-roaming horses or burros on private land or lands leased from the Government, if the animals are being protected from the harassment which this bill is designed to alleviate.

Section 5 recognizes the right of an individual to prove ownership of a horse or burro on the public lands under the branding and stray laws of the State in which it is found.

Section 6 authorizes the Secretary of Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State and local governments and with private landowners, and to issue certain regulations as he deems necessary.

Section 7 calls for the establishment of an advisory board of nongovernmental experts to advise the Secretary of Interior as to carrying out the provisions of the act.

Section 8 provides penalties for those who might violate the provisions of the act or the regulations issued thereunder. In addition, it would permit the customary disposal of the remains of deceased wild free-roaming horses or burros.

Section 9 confers upon certain employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture the powers of arrest for the violation of the act.

Section 10 authorizes and directs the Secretary to undertake those studies of the habits of wild free-roaming horses and burros that may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 11 authorizes the appropriation of sums necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 12 specifically limits the power of the Secretary of the Interior to relocate wild free-roaming horses or burros to areas of the public lands where they do not presently exist.

Section 13 provides for periodic reports by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the administration of the act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for 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. 92-242), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

It is the view of the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that the wild free-roaming horses and burros presently inhabiting the public lands of the United States are living symbols of the historic pioneer spirit of the West and as such are considered a national esthetic resource.

#### THE NEED

The wild free-roaming horses and burros which would be placed by S. 1116 under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior belong to no one individual. They belong to all the American people. The spirit which has kept them alive and free against almost insurmountable odds typifies the national spirit which led to the growth of our Nation. They are living symbols of the rugged independence and tireless energy of our pioneer heritage.

During the course of this century, the wild horse population has dwindled to a minuscule fraction of the estimated 2 million that once roamed the western plains and mountains. They have been cruelly captured and slain and their carcasses used in the production of pet food and fertilizer. They have been used for target practice and harassed for "sport" and profit. In spite of public outrage, this bloody traffic continues unabated, and it is the firm belief of the committee that this senseless slaughter must be brought to an end.

Widespread concern for the continued survival of these animals and their protection from continuing depredation by man is evident from the mail received by members of the committee. In addition, testimony by witnesses during the April 20, 1971, hearing before the Public Lands Subcommittee on S. 1116 and related measures served to further emphasize the need for prompt action if the remaining wild free-roaming horses and burros are to be protected from extermination.

Estimates of the total number of animals subject to the measure are open to question. However, it should be noted that in the case of the number of horses involved on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, estimates were revised downward from 17,000 horses to 9,500. This indicates an alarming trend as well as a surprising lack of information regarding the animals and prompted the committee to include a provision in the bill for necessary studies of the habits of the animals to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior.

During the course of the hearing, knowledgeable witnesses urged that emphasis be shifted from a range or refuge concept for protection and management of the animals to consideration of the wild free-roaming horses and burros as a component of the public lands and an integral part of the multiple use management system. The committee believes that such action would be in the best interest of multiple use resource management and would best serve the overall intent of the legislation.

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

National attention was focused on the plight of the wild horses and burros of the public lands of the western United States during the 1950's. At that time, widespread objection was raised to the use of motorized vehicles or aircraft in the pursuit of the animals. The campaign against these activities was culminated on September 8, 1959, when President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed into law Public Law 86-234 which prohibits the use of aircraft or motorized vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States.

During the latter part of the 1960's, widespread publicity about the hunting of wild horses and burros served to once again focus national attention and led to increased interest in legislation at a Federal level for their protection. In the 91st Congress, legislation was introduced by Senator Frank Moss which would have designated the Spanish Barb and Andalusian wild mustangs as endangered species. The bill, S. 2166, was referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce but no further action was taken.

The first comprehensive measure to provide for the protection of all wild horses and burros on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management was introduced in the second session of the 91st Congress by Senator Clifford Hansen. The bill, S. 3358, would have placed all free-roaming horses and burros under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of management and protection. The bill was referred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee but no action was taken.

Four measures were introduced in the Senate in the beginning of the 92d Congress which were patterned after the comprehensive nature of S. 3358. Hearings on the four measures, S. 862 by Senator Gaylord Nelson, S. 1090 by Senators Mike Mansfield and Mark O. Hatfield, and S. 1119 by Senator Frank Moss, were held on April 20, 1971, before the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Following a staff study and consultation with representatives of the Department of the Interior, the committee considered S. 1116 in executive session on June 16, 1971. Following the adoption of a number of committee amendments, the measure was ordered reported to the Senate on June 16, 1971.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Many of the changes made by the committee are minor or technical in nature. However, several of the amendments significantly affect the purpose and intent of the recommended legislation and a brief explanation of the major changes is believed necessary in order that the intent of the committee be clarified.

The emphasis on specific ranges as a management tool for the protection of the wild free-roaming horses and burros as contained in the original version of S. 1116 has been eliminated by the committee. During the course of the April 20 hearing, witnesses repeatedly urged that the wild free-roaming horses and burros be considered a part of the multiple-use system of the public lands and not be placed in setaside areas for their exclusive use. Testimony by administration witnesses indicated that the animals are already given consideration when programs are formulated for resource use and allocation and the committee believes that this practice should continue. The principal goal of this legislation is to provide for the protection of the animals from man and not the single use management of areas for the benefit of wild free-roaming horses and burros. It is the intent of the committee that the wild free-roaming horses and burros be specifically incorporated as a component of the multiple-use management plans governing the use of the public lands.

A basic difficulty in determining the intended scope of the legislation is the definition of what constitutes a wild free-roaming horse or burro. Particular concern was expressed by witnesses during the hearing that the original text of S. 1116 did not recognize claims by individuals to ownership of unbranded horses or burros on public lands. Addition of the word "unclaimed" in the definition of a wild free-roaming horse or burro serves to give recognition to the valid claims of individuals. In addition, a new section 5 was added to emphasize the ability of an individual to prove ownership of a horse or burro on the public lands under the branding and stray laws of the State in which it is found. It is certainly not the intent of the committee that the right of an individual to claim and prove ownership under the respective State branding and stray laws be abrogated, nor that the appropriate State or local body should not exercise their statutory authority and obligation if the question of private ownership of a horse or burro should be raised.

The committee wishes to emphasize that the management of the wild free-roaming horses and burros be kept to a minimum both from the aspect of reducing costs of such a program as well as to deter the possibility of "zoolike" developments. An intensive management program of breeding, branding, and physical care would destroy the very concept that this legislation seeks to preserve. A recurrent theme in testimony by witnesses before the committee advocates, in effect, leaving the animals alone to fend for themselves and placing primary emphasis on protecting the animals from continued slaughter and harassment by man. It is the intent of the committee that the protection of these animals from such unlawful death or harassment be paramount in management activities.

The committee recognizes that some control over the numbers of animals may be necessary in order to maintain an ecological balance in an area. Guidelines for reducing the population of wild free-roaming horses or burros in an area are provided in the measure but it should be noted that any reduction should be carefully weighed before being undertaken. The committee does not intend that the provision for a reduction in numbers as contained in the measure be considered a license for indiscriminate slaughter or removal of the wild free-roaming horses or burros.

Careful consideration by the committee of the penalty provisions contained in the act led to inclusion of civil as well as criminal remedies for violations of the act. It is the belief of the committee that this suggested amendment would provide administrative flexibility thereby enhancing the overall effectiveness of the measure as well as relieving the burden which would otherwise be placed upon the Attorney General.

It is the expressed intent of the committee to remove the possibility of monetary gain from exploitation of these animals. However, the committee recognizes the difficulties that may be encountered when it is necessary to dispose of the remains of a deceased wild free-roaming horse or burro whether or not it is in the authorized possession of a private party. Because of this, the committee believes that it is essential that the customary methods of disposal of the remains of deceased wild free-roaming horses or burros be permitted; as long as the remains are not sold for any consideration directly, or indirectly. For example, this would not preclude an individual who has in his authorized possession the remains of a deceased wild free-roaming horse or burro from permitting the remains to be utilized in a commercial process if that is the customary method of disposal so long as the individual does not receive any consideration.

To insure that adequate provision is made for the enforcement of the act, the committee has amended the measure to confer upon certain employees of the Department of Interior and Agriculture the powers of arrest for violation of the act; such employees having been specifically designated by their respective Secretaries to receive such power. It is envisioned by the committee that such designated employees will be fully informed of the provisions of this act as well as their respective responsibilities for proper enforcement procedure.

Because of the lack of information concerning these animals the committee has included in the measure provision for needed studies of the wild free-roaming horses and burros. It may very well be that studies of the habits of the wild free-roaming horses and burros may reveal the need for additional legislation in order to provide for their protection, management, and control. The need for flexibility is recognized and provision is made for submission to the Congress every 2 years by the Secretary of the Interior a report which may include his recommendations for legislative or other actions as he might deem appropriate.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) desire to be recognized at this time?

Mr. SCOTT. President, I yield back my time.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair now lays before the Senate Calendar No. 232, House Joint Resolution 742, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 742) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution,

which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments on page 4, line 8, after "Public Law 91-672", insert a comma and "except that none of the funds provided by this or any other Act may be used to cover costs incurred in connection with the movement of refugees from Cuba to the United States"; and, after line 23, insert:

activities of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;

salaries of supporting personnel, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services;

activities in support of Free Europe, Incorporated, and Radio Liberty, Incorporated, pursuant to authority contained in the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1437); Provided, That no other funds made available under this resolution shall be available for these activities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON). House Joint Resolution 742, Continuing Appropriations, 1972, is the pending business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now recognizes the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution will serve to continue appropriations after midnight tomorrow, June 30.

The Committee on Appropriations met on Friday, June 25, to consider this joint resolution, which provides funds and authority for the continuation of those programs and activities of the Federal Government for which appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, have not been enacted, and voted to report the resolution to the Senate with amendments.

The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision to provide for interim funding for the support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty pending the enactment of legislation to provide for the open funding of these organizations. The recommended provision provides for the continuation of these activities at the fiscal year 1971 level pursuant to the authority contained in the U.S. Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1437). It is the hope of the committee that the pending legislation with respect to the open funding of these organizations will be solved in the near future.

I understand that a resolution is pending to continue this program openly. It is possible that the legislation will be enacted within the next 3 or 4 weeks.

The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision to terminate the Cuban refugee transportation program. The 1972 budget estimate contemplated continuation of this program at a cost of \$1,050,000 to bring an additional 42,000 refugees into the United States. It is estimated that from December 1, 1965 to June 30, 1971, the Government contract airlift from Havana to Miami has furnished free transportation to 240,000 Cubans. By curtailing the airlift, not only will there accrue a savings of over \$1 million in direct costs, but an addi-

tional \$4 million in related costs, for an estimated total savings of over \$5 million in fiscal year 1972 alone. These savings would rapidly multiply in future years as the demands are lessened on other programs.

Mr. President, in proposing this amendment, we had hearings before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The subcommittee is headed by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER). The committee has nothing against Cubans. They have been coming to our shores, now, for over 10 years.

What we are trying to do is to reduce the number of Cubans who are coming in. I am sure that it is not the intention of Congress to have as many as 650,000 Cubans come to our shores. When this program was first started, our unemployment situation was nothing like it is today. We had normal employment of citizens at the time.

It is rather easy at such times to absorb a few more refugees from Cuba, particularly those with trades or who are proficient in certain endeavors.

But since 1965, we have been providing free transportation for Cubans. We have or we have had a contract with certain airlines to carry Cubans from Havana at the rate of 3,200 a month. This program, as I have said, has been going on now for over 6 years. I think it is time to halt the program, not because we are against the Cubans and not because we do not necessarily want them to come here, but because they ought to come through the regular channels.

For one thing, we have high rates of unemployment throughout the country at present. In some areas the unemployment rate is 16 percent. In my area of the country, the unemployment rate is in excess of 6 percent. Yet we are taking in more Cubans—at the rate of 3,200 a month.

Mr. President, in addition to finding employment for these people, we must provide education for their children. We must also provide food and fiber for them if they are unable to provide it for themselves.

As these people come in, they are automatically taken care of by the State of Florida or by whatever State they land in. Congress provides the money to the States to pay for their upkeep and for the education of their children.

Mr. President, I am not advocating that we cut off the program at the present time, because we have a large number of Cubans who are here now. The pending amendment will not affect them at all. What I am trying to do is to curtail or taper off this program to some extent.

We have had proposed to us an increase of almost \$32 million this year over last year. That is due to the fact that we have been carrying these Cubans to our shores free of charge at the rate of about 42,000 a year.

Mr. President, we have on our shores now, as I have just stated, between 600,000 and 650,000 Cubans. I think that number is sufficient.

Mr. President, the Cuban refugees who are unemployed and need assistance receive better help than our own people,

because we provide funds for their upkeep; and under certain rules and regulations we are compelled through special appropriations to pay the State authorities of the States concerned a sufficient amount to take care of the needs of the refugees, including schooling and things of that kind.

Mr. President, I really believe that we have done enough. I am sure that no one will object to permitting Cubans to come to the United States the same as any other immigrants. My fear is that if we continue a program of this kind from a humanitarian standpoint, we will be asked to take care of many people from Peru. Many people from Argentina are seeking another place in which to live. Many people from Chile also are now seeking other places in which to live.

It seems to me that in this case we have done enough. All I am suggesting is that the program be curtailed to the extent of simply denying the right to free transportation from Havana to Miami at the rate indicated.

Mr. President, I realize that the means advocated may not be popular with some folks. It may be that the place to do this would have been in a regular bill. However, I thought the matter should be dealt with now and this program brought to the attention of the Senate. That is why the measure is before us today.

In addition, language has been included in the continuing resolution for the continuation of programs of the Maritime Administration and for salaries of supporting personnel, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is similar in content and purpose to continuing resolutions which have, of necessity, been enacted in past years so as to provide for the orderly functioning of Government.

Specifically, the joint resolution continues authority and funds available under certain prescribed conditions, until the enactment into law of the regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1972 or until the expiration of this Joint Resolution, whichever first occurs. This present resolution expires on August 6, 1971, and in the event that all of the appropriation bills will not have been enacted by that date, additional temporary authority will be considered.

Mr. President, I hope that by that time Congress will be able to enact all of the appropriation bills. That will be possible only if we can get cooperation from the House of Representatives.

As of this date, two of the regular annual appropriation bills have passed both bodies—the Office of Education appropriation bill and the legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972. It is my hope that the differences in the House and Senate versions of the bills will be resolved in conference without delay, enabling the bills to clear the Congress before the beginning of the new fiscal year.

In this connection, yesterday the House and the Senate conferees agreed on the education bill, so that bill undoubtedly will be brought before the two Houses and the conference report agreed to before midnight tomorrow.

Also we will have a conference today on the legislative appropriation bill. It is my hope that we can complete the work on that bill so that it can be sent to the President before midnight tomorrow.

With reference to the Treasury-Postal Service-general Government appropriation bill, I was first advised that it would be considered on the House floor on June 22. This was subsequently changed to June 24. Then I understood it would not be considered on the House floor until Monday, June 28. The bill was actually passed by the House last night June 28. At 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon the Senate Committee on Appropriations met, and we were advised a few minutes after 5 o'clock that the bill had been passed by the House. So yesterday I obtained permission to have the Senate receive the bill from the House and report it, so the bill that passed the House yesterday was immediately reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and is now on the Calendar. We hope to take up that bill sometime today. So I hope we will have action on that large bill concluded before midnight tomorrow.

With respect to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture-environmental and consumer protection, the bill passed the House of Representatives on Wednesday, June 23, and was received and referred to the Senate Committee on Thursday, June 24. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations is diligently working on the bill, and we are hopeful that it can be reported and passed by the Senate early in July.

That is a very complicated bill. Quite a few programs under other appropriations were transferred to the agriculture bill. So far as the Senate is concerned, we completed hearings on that bill a few days ago. More than 100 amendments are involved. That is why we were unable to consider the bill and report it to the Senate prior to June 30, as was intended.

In view of the importance of providing authority, under its reorganization, to the new U.S. Postal Service by July 1, the Subcommittee on Treasury, Post Office, and General Government in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate expedited its hearings and concluded them the middle of June. However, as I say, we have been waiting for the House to pass the bill, and if the House does so on Monday, June 28, I am very hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate will be able to report it to the Senate on Tuesday, June 29.

The committee endeavored to get some of the "must" bills through—and I include among them the Treasury-Post Office bill.

As we all know, beginning July 1 the Post Office Department will be under different management than it has been in the past, and it is necessary, I believe, that that bill be enacted before June 30.

The continuing resolution does not touch that phase of our appropriation process.

I was told it is necessary that this bill be enacted before June 30, so the committee devoted its time and energy to report-

ing it to the Senate, which we have done and we will try to pass it before midnight tomorrow.

The appropriation bill for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies passed the House of Representatives Thursday, June 24. Hearings in the Senate committee will be completed July 8, and the bill should be reported to the Senate for its attention shortly thereafter.

Under the House schedule, the housing and urban development, space, science appropriation bill will pass the House of Representatives June 30. The hearings in the Senate committee will be completed today, and the bill should be reported to the Senate shortly after the Fourth of July recess.

I am very hopeful it does pass. If it does we will have completed the hearings except for a few witnesses and, as I said, the hearings in the Senate are almost complete. The bill should be ready for action by the Senate soon after we return from the July 4 recess.

The Department of the Interior appropriation bill is scheduled for consideration on the House floor on Tuesday, June 29. The hearings in the Senate have been completed on this bill and every effort will be made to report it to the Senate as soon as possible.

The Department of Transportation appropriation bill will not be considered on the House floor until Tuesday, July 13. Hearings in the Senate committee should be completed prior to that date, and I expect no delay in reporting the bill to the Senate.

On the remaining six regular annual appropriation bills, there is no schedule of floor action in the House of Representatives, so far as I have been able to determine. The Senate subcommittee has completed all of the hearings on the Public Works-Atomic Energy Commission bill except for 1 day of hearings after the bill is received from the House, but we are unable to take any action until we do receive it from the House of Representatives.

The hearings on the District of Columbia appropriation bill have been completed for weeks, and we are waiting on the bill from the House of Representatives so that we can make decisions on the figures and report it to the Senate.

The hearings on the Department of Defense appropriation bill have been completed for some time, and we are awaiting the receipt of the bill from the House of Representatives.

The hearings on the military construction, Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and foreign assistance appropriation bills are well underway in the Senate committee, and I am hopeful that the House will soon pass them so that they can be reported to the Senate for consideration prior to the announced August 6 recess.

All of the departments and agencies financed in the bills I have just mentioned will require authority to obligate funds commencing July 1 in the absence of their fiscal year 1972 appropriations. It is necessary, therefore, that this continuing resolution be enacted before that date.

As I stated earlier, this joint resolution is similar to prior-year continuing resolutions, and it provides for the continuation of existing projects and activities at the lowest of one of three rates:

First. The current, fiscal year 1971, rate;

Second. The budget estimate for fiscal year 1972, where no action has been taken by either House; and

Third. The more restrictive authority or rate adopted by either of the two Houses, until final enactment.

To amplify:

In those instances where neither House has passed a particular appropriation bill, appropriations are provided for continuing projects and activities conducted during fiscal year 1971 at the current rate, or the rate provided in the budget estimate for fiscal year 1972, whichever is lower, and under the most restrictive authority. In addition, if there is no budget estimate for a particular program continuing from fiscal year 1971, special provision is made in the resolution for minimum continuance until the matter is resolved in the processing of the regular annual appropriation bill.

If an appropriation bill has passed only one House, or if an item is included in only one version of the bill as passed by both Houses, the project or activity shall be continued at a rate of operations not exceeding the fiscal year 1971 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is lower.

In those instances where an appropriation bill has passed both Houses, but is not yet enacted, and the amounts or authority therein differ, the project or activity shall be continued under the lesser of the two amounts and the more restrictive authority.

And I assure the Senate that any obligations or expenditures incurred pursuant to the authority granted in this resolution will be charged against the applicable appropriation when the bill in which such funds or authority are contained is enacted into law.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the House will continue its hearings on the remaining bills and that the bills will be enacted by the House and sent here to the Senate. Insofar as I am concerned—I think I speak for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate—we will be ready whenever we receive the bills. I am very hopeful that the authorizing bills will be enacted, particularly for defense and foreign aid. If we can get cooperation from the authorizing committees, it is my hope that, come August 6, we ought to be able to get through with all the appropriation bills. All we need is cooperation from the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, and I am confident we will get that from the Senate.

I wish to say that the chairmen of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations have been working very diligently. My good friend from North Dakota (Mr. Young) and I have attended practically all the subcommittee hearings, whether we were on the subcommittees or not, in order to try to get the hearings through, so that, come August 6, when we will get

a little breathing spell, we will be able to have on the President's desk all of the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1972.

It is possible to do that, and, with the assistance—continued assistance, I may say—of the members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the cooperation of the authorizing committees, and also cooperation of the House side, we should be able to get through all these bills by August 6.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to compliment the very distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) on the extremely fine statement he has made, but, more than that, I want to compliment him on the splendid leadership that he is showing as chairman of the Appropriations Committee in insisting upon hearings by the various subcommittees of the committee on appropriation bills in advance of those being enacted by the House of Representatives. I think it is the most remarkable display of diligent and expeditious handling of appropriation bills that I have seen during my 13 years in the Senate.

I congratulate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The Senate owes him a debt, and, speaking for the leadership, may I say the leadership is indebted to him and grateful to him for the splendid manner in which he has handled the chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee.

If the other body will get the appropriation bills over to the Senate, as the distinguished chairman has indicated, and if the administration will promptly submit its authorizing requests and if the authorizing committees will likewise act expeditiously, I am sure that the prophetic statement by the chairman—with respect to the completion of appropriation bills by August 6—will be realized.

These are "must" bills. The Congress must pass these appropriation bills if the departments are to function and the people who are employed in them are to be paid. In past years the legislative logjams that have kept the House and the Senate in session until December have often been caused by delay in acting on appropriation bills and appropriations conference reports. I believe that, under the great leadership of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we are not going to see a repetition of those years but that, come August 6, we will have acted on the "must" bills—the appropriation bills—and most of them will have been signed into law.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator very much.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I, too, would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his excellent leadership and the hard work he has displayed. Day after

day he has urged the subcommittees to get through their hearings and get to their markups. This year, I think, we are ahead of where we have been on the appropriations bills for many years. The hearings on most bills have either been completed or are about to be completed. If we are not involved in long filibusters on authorizing bills, we could easily get through all the appropriation bills before the recess in August.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I repeat, I feel confident that, with the least bit of cooperation from the House as well as the authorizing committees, we will have all of these bills on the President's desk by the 6th of August. Then we could go home happy for a 30-day vacation. I know I would enjoy it very much if we could do just that.

I urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 742.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RISICOFF), my able colleague from Florida (Mr. CHILES), and myself, we object to the inclusion of the first committee amendment, that is, the language on page 4, beginning on line 8 with the word "except" and through the language on line 11. We object to the inclusion of that language.

And now, Mr. President, I want to talk a little about the first committee amendment and explain why we think this language should not be included in the committee amendment. I do want to say at the very outset that it does not give me the greatest of pleasure to disagree with the very able and distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), or, for that matter, with the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG).

However, I do think that here there has been a misunderstanding of the whole concept of the Cuban airlift, the so-called Cuban freedom flights.

I would like to first go back into the history of this matter. This refugee program from Cuba has encompassed four different administrations, going back to the Eisenhower administration beginning in 1959. As a matter of fact, in January 1959, when Castro first came into power in the Cuban revolution, the refugee program from Cuba began and it has almost never stopped. At first it was a trickle. At first it existed as certain refugees got on commercial airline flights to the United States, mostly to Florida.

These flights have brought in so many refugees from Cuba that President Eisenhower set up a Cuban Refugee Center as early as 1960 to handle special problems in connection with the Cuban refugee program.

When President Kennedy succeeded President Eisenhower, he transferred this Cuban refugee program into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which was then headed, as we know, of course, under the leadership of the now very able Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RISICOFF), then Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The interesting thing is that back in those years, when the Cuban refugee program first began, the actual numbers who came into the United States during the commercial airlift program was greatly in excess of the number coming into the United States now. As a matter of fact, there were some 1,600 to 1,800 Cuban refugees a week who came into the United States during that period of the refugee flights from Cuban, from the very harsh Communist regime established by Fidel Castro.

Then came the October missile crisis of 1962, when, of course, President Kennedy clamped a quarantine around the island of Cuba. He did that on October 22, and the day after he did so, Fidel Castro stopped all commercial airplane flights from Cuba to the United States; and then, of course, the ability of the refugees who wanted to get out of the island and away from the Communist regime slowed to a trickle, because they had no readily available means to leave Cuba.

However, it did not stop their desire to leave Cuba, and, as a matter of fact, they resorted to all kinds of ways of getting out of the island. They would take old, leaky boats and attempt to cross the Straits of Florida. There were even some who used rowboats to get across. Of course, this precipitated a great deal of publicity worldwide; there were drownings involved, and loss of life, and Fidel Castro was getting such a bad image in the eyes of the world, with many people beginning to suspect that his country was not the paradise he was claiming it to be, that he began to think he ought to change his program of making it hard for refugees to leave Cuba.

And so, on September 16, 1965, he announced to the world that anybody who wanted to leave Cuba could do so. He also announced that he would make one port in Cuba open to boats from anywhere, that could come in and pick up refugees from Cuba who wanted to go. President Johnson, a few days later, on October 3, also took up the matter of the Cuban refugees, accepting the challenge, if you want to put it that way, of Fidel Castro, and said all Cubans who wanted to come to the United States could have an asylum in our country and be free to come in as refugees.

This precipitated a chaotic condition. Boats left Florida and other ports in the United States and Latin America, all headed for this port to pick up Cuban refugees. Many of the boats were unseaworthy and sank, and again there was large loss of life, and something had to be done about it.

The something that was done was the entering of a memorandum of agreement between the United States and Cuba—not directly, of course, but through the Swiss Embassy representing the American Government in Cuba, but nonetheless a binding international agreement between the United States of America and Cuba.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been informed by the Parliamentarian that we are now

proceeding under limited time, and I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that I certainly will yield him such time as he may require. How much more time does the Senator require?

Mr. GURNEY. I would say not long.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the Senator 10 more minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

This memorandum of agreement was entered into between the United States and Cuba, which set up the Cuban airlift as a means of transporting Cuban refugees who wanted to get out of Cuba to the United States of America. Between 3,000 and 4,000 Cuban refugees left monthly on this airlift, to come to the United States, and that has been going on ever since December 1, 1965. Approximately 240,000 have been airlifted.

One other fact of great importance is this: After the memorandum of agreement was entered into, the Cuban Government established a list, and on this list anyone could enter his name who wanted to leave Cuba. Scores of thousands of Cubans entered their names upon the list, expressing their desire to leave Cuba on the airlift when their turn came.

Those people were obviously marked people at once. Certain steps were taken by the Castro government immediately. One was the lifting of ration cards; another was the loss of jobs on the part of these Cubans who wanted to leave Cuba. Their property was confiscated, they were given work of the most menial kind of hard labor, working in the cane fields and other agricultural pursuits. The old, the young, the sick were forced to work in this fashion in order to obtain enough sustenance to keep them alive. In other words, as soon as they registered on that list—and, as I say, scores of thousands did so—they became noncitizens in Cuba, really people without a country as far as the Castro regime was concerned, and they were arrested and persecuted.

Now, there are only about 40-odd thousands left on this list of people who want to get out, and those are the people who will be affected by this amendment if it is adopted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to point out to my friend from Florida that on March 29, 1966, when this program was changed to the way it is now being handled, a question came up in hearings before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance—page 399—as to the number of Cubans who would qualify under the new rules and regulations under which we are now proceeding. The question was asked of Mr. Wynkoop:

Mr. CONTI. Do you have an estimate of the number of Cubans presently in Cuba in the various priority categories, that you established for the movement, directly to the United States?

Mr. THOMAS. The best figure that we have got is one that the State Department received from the Swiss authorities. It numbers about 200,000.

Mr. President, that was just a few months after this new method of transporting Cubans to the United States

was put into effect; and since that time, as I pointed out a while ago, we have received not 200,000 here, but 240,000. What my good friend from Florida wishes to do is to get 42,000 more, which would be 80,000 more than the estimates made when this new method was really decided upon.

I believe we have done enough of that. In other words, the estimate, when the new method was adopted, was that there were about 200,000 Cubans eligible under the new order. But since that time, as I have said, we have received 240,000, and unless this amendment is agreed to, there will be 42,000 more to come, which will be 82,000 more than the estimate made in 1966. There seems to be no end to it.

I thank the Senator from Florida, and I take that out of my own time.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I would comment on that by simply saying that the 200,000 figure the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has mentioned is only an estimate, and that it is not at all surprising that 200,000 people wanted to leave Cuba, to get away from the Communist regime that Castro instituted. As a matter of fact, I am surprised that the figure was not 300,000, 400,000, or 500,000.

I do not see that that particular argument cuts any ice. When the President of the United States, President Johnson, instituted this program—and I certainly agree with the action he took and back him up all the way—he extended the hand of friendship and the opportunity for freedom to anyone in Cuba who wanted to come to the United States.

That is the important thing here, not that there was an estimate somewhat less than those who finally wanted to come, but the fact that we actually made a commitment to the people of Cuba who wanted to seek asylum in the United States, and extended the opportunity to all who wanted to come.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In an effort to create a safe and orderly flow of refugees, the Johnson administration, through the Swiss Embassy in Havana, negotiated a memorandum of understanding with Cuba. Under this pact, the Government agreed to provide air transportation for between 3,000 and 4,000 refugees a month to the United States. In order to reunite families which had been separated, priority was to be given to relatives of Cubans living on the mainland.

To renege on this commitment now would provide Castro with a considerable political, psychological, and propaganda victory. Would we not be accused—and rightly so—of playing politics with the lives and welfare of innocent victims of the cold war?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Connecticut makes an extremely viable point. As a matter of fact, this is what I pointed out in the beginning of my argument. What we have here is an international binding agreement; no question

about it. If we should break it, we would indeed be breaching a legal agreement and breaking our side of the bargain.

The Senator does make an extremely viable point.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I recall that one of my first tasks as President Kennedy's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was to organize and administer a program to assist the refugees as they tried to enter the mainstream of American life. Even before I had a chance to settle down to my new duties, President Kennedy asked me to personally go to Miami, and assist the local and State authorities. The President deeply believed, that we in this country had an obligation to the Cuban refugees and should make every possible effort to alleviate their burden.

I went to Miami and spent considerable time with the Federal, State, and local authorities who were trying to bring order to a chaotic situation. Florida was the natural place for these refugees to come, because of its proximity, its weather, and the large Cuban community. In order to take some of the pressure off the State of Florida and the city of Miami, we established a program to spread these refugees throughout the United States. During the 10 years, the program has been in operation some 200,000 refugees have been able to move throughout the United States.

What struck me at that time was that the flood of people we were taking in for humanitarian reasons contained some of the most able, dedicated individuals this Nation had ever seen.

Although the flow of escapees has included persons from all walks of life, the men and women have always had a higher skill level than would be found in a perfect cross section of the Cuban population. Castro's loss has certainly been America's gain.

We received accountants, doctors, dentists, nurses, businessmen, technicians, mechanics. Practically the entire faculty of the University of Havana Medical School left for America.

During the past 10 years, either as a public official or as a private citizen visiting Florida, I have noted the contribution the Cubans had made to American life. I am sure the distinguished Senators from Florida are even more aware of the contribution than any of us.

Studies made in the Miami-Dade County area have shown that the refugees who arrived virtually penniless have made dramatic economic advances.

The total annual income of families of Spanish origin—nearly 90 percent Cuban—rose from \$342 million in September 1968, to \$588 million by October 1970. During the same period, median family income rose 38 percent from \$5,200 to \$7,200. Nearly 40 percent of these families own their own homes.

Very few refugees have had to receive public assistance. Refugees who do need public assistance apply for welfare in the same manner as other American citizens and are subject to the same eligibility requirements, but unlike normal welfare programs, the Federal Government pays the States 100 percent of the welfare costs for refugees.

It is interesting to note that 80 percent

of those on welfare are 60 years of age or older.

It has not been easy for the once penniless refugees especially because of the language barrier, to join American society.

I recall setting up a program in cooperation with the University of Miami Medical School in which the doctors who came from Cuba could be trained to take the medical examination of the State of Florida on a bilingual basis.

I cannot imagine that for a million dollars, and that is all it amounts to, the United States would break its diplomatic and moral agreements.

The entire world has watched this situation. There was great skepticism as to whether Castro would allow these refugees to come to this country, as to whether he would keep his agreement. The thought was that he would just send the poorest and the sickest. But he allowed these people to come.

As of June 4, 1971, over 230,000 Cubans have been airlifted to freedom. Most of these registered for the program shortly after its inception. Many more, however, are still waiting their turn. They have become nonpersons in their native land. Many of their rights and privileges have been canceled because they expressed a desire to leave. They have been forced to forfeit all their property, possessions, and savings and are allowed to carry out only the clothes on their backs and the most meager of personal possessions. They have been removed from their jobs and forced to do heavy agricultural labor. The only reason they are willing to endure their government's wrath is the knowledge that someday they will board a plane for the United States.

The action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee last Friday deleting the Cuban airlift funds from House Joint Resolution 742 may mean that these men and women may never be able to leave a country which now considers them nothing more than pariahs.

I would hope that the Senate will reverse the decision of the Appropriations Committee. With due respect to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the agreements made by President Kennedy and President Johnson, to the people and the Government of Cuba are too important to forsake now. We should not abandon our centuries-old position as a haven for oppressed people around the globe.

Mr. President, we must not forget for one moment that this Nation is responsible for these people unlike no refugee group in history. By agreeing with the Cuban Government to take in those who expressed a desire to emigrate, this Nation placed thousands of Cubans in an untenable position—one for which the airlift is the only solution. For us to turn our backs now would be intolerable. Termination of the airlift would not only betray our historic humanitarian tradition, but would directly penalize those men and women who took us at our word and in good faith registered to leave.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the eloquent arguments made by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut.

He mentioned the Cuban refugee center in Miami. I should like to point out that he had a great deal to do with setting up that center and the extremely able work it did when he was Secretary of HEW.

As a matter of fact, this has become a showplace of freedom. People from all over the world, some in skepticism and some in suspicion about how the United States was handling this refugee problem. In many instances, press people from abroad have left the United States and—even though they were not all friends—have written favorable articles on how we have been handling the matter.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. At the time, the refugee assistance program was started we had nothing to go on. We had to start from scratch. In 1961 a program of relief loans patterned on the National Defense Education Act, was set up for Cuban refugees. Under this program, 12,000 college loans have been granted and only 147 of these loans have been declared delinquent. I would challenge any other group in American society who have had loans of any kind from Government to equal that record.

Wherever I have gone around the country, various people in the social service field who have handled similar problems speak in the most glowing terms of how the Cubans have been able to enter the mainstream of American life.

This is something this Nation should be proud of. We should continue the program—not terminate it.

Mr. GURNEY. There is no question about that. I would like to amplify what the Senator has said about the wonderful experience we have had with this immigration. The Senator mentioned the lower amount of delinquencies on student loans. One of the interesting things about the Cuban immigrants is the low unemployment rate. Only 2 percent of the Cubans coming into this country under the refugee program are unemployed. This is far below the national average. The median income for a family in the Miami area is \$7,200, which is considerably above the national average. That figure is up 36 percent in the past 2 years. The Cubans do work. The husband works. The wife works. The children work. They have made a tremendous contribution to American society. We have example after example where people who have come from Cuba with literally nothing but the clothes on their backs, and no cash, have begun at once to work hard and provide for themselves. I know one president of a bank in Miami who came from Cuba that way. There are many other success stories like that all over the United States. So they have made a tremendous contribution to American society.

One other point that is extremely interesting: Only 15 percent are on welfare, and those who are on welfare are the old and the sick. The able-bodied Cubans are out working. The rate of those on welfare is considerably lower than the national average, too.

June 29, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10131

Mr. RIBICOFF. Will the Senator from Florida yield for another thought?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. If these people had not been refugees but had always been in the United States, practically all of them would be covered by social security. The result would be that almost no Cubans would be on welfare. Those who are now on public assistance are those that did not have social security of any kind, as most people over the age of 65 in this country have.

Mr. GURNEY. That is true. While the rate of the figures I just gave may have been lower, I think that 17 or 18 percent of those coming here from Cuba are on welfare now; but they help themselves, too. Relatives give money. People coming in and friends coming in do a great deal to help in the private sector by taking care of people, helping them to get started, to buy homes, and to get jobs. They do this more than any other immigrant class we have had in this country.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) would find it interesting to note that the special services programs set up for Cuban refugees have been even more successful than the normal American welfare system. For example, at the outset of the relief program, approximately 3,700 female heads of families with children were receiving public assistance. The day care and training programs for these people were so successful that virtually none of these 3,700 women are now on welfare. The same success rate certainly does not apply to the AFDC program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The additional time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 5 more minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until 1:05 p.m., unless other amendments are called up.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield 5 more minutes to my good friend from Florida; but before I do so, I yield myself 1 minute in the period of the 5 minutes to ask the Senator from Florida to tell us how many more Cubans have been registered to come here.

When the new program was put into effect, the record shows 200,000 were eligible, but since that time over 240,000 have come in. If this amendment is not agreed to, 42,000 more will be coming in on the airlift, I would like to know how many there are now in Cuba who are eligible to come to this country. It seems there is no end to it. That is what I am fussing about, Mr. President. It is not that I am against Cubans, or anything like that, but there should be an end to it.

Let me say to my good friend from Florida, who may wish to answer this also, that in the welfare hearings, the following was stated:

Mr. PROXMIRE. What percent of Cuban refugees participating in the program are receiving welfare benefits?

Mr. PALMATER. At this time, through March 1, our assistance caseload was 78,000

which represents about 18.9 percent of the 414,000 who had registered with us as of the end of March 1971.

Mr. President, that is almost double the present national average.

Mr. GURNEY. May I answer that question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to my good friend from Florida to tell us how many Cubans are eligible to come into the United States, because I am quite certain that the good news goes out to the Cubans in Cuba from those who are here, and that encourages them to want to come to the United States.

Mr. GURNEY. In direct answer to the question, let us go back, first, to how the lists were prepared. In the first place, after the Cuban freedom flights were inaugurated by the U.S. Government, a list was opened up with the Swiss Embassy, with permission of the Cuban Government—the Castro government—to register Cubans to come to the United States where they wanted to live, and scores of thousands registered to do that. I do not know the exact number, but I do know that in May of 1966 the Castro government cut off any further registering. The reason why Castro did that was that he was so embarrassed that so many Cubans wanted to leave Cuba.

As I understand it, there are two lists today. On the first list the Castro government permitted, which was cut off in May 1966, somewhere around 40,000 Cubans wanted to come to the United States. That is all that remains, as I understand it.

There is another list that the State Department has, a list prepared by U.S. citizens for U.S. citizens who had relatives in Cuba.

That list totaled 65,000. There is probably some duplication between the State Department list and the Cuban-Swiss Embassy list in Cuba, but no one knows what the duplication is. We do know that the respective figures are 40,000 and 60,000, with the rate of people coming into the United States through the Cuban airlift being somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 a month. Thus, it is obvious that there will be no more than 2 to 2½ years more of the airlift when the whole of both lists will have been exhausted. So we are talking about 2½ years and \$2 to \$3 million being involved. That is what it would take.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator should take into consideration the fact that it is not a matter merely of the cost of the airlift, but we have to take care of those people when they come in here. The number we are cutting off here, of 1,050,000, covers only the airlift; but we also are cutting off \$4 million, which would be the cost of taking care of the people after they get to this country.

I might add that still later estimates have indicated that the amount to be saved in fiscal 1972 alone could run as high as \$15 million. If we continue this program, as I pointed out awhile ago, the proposal is to raise the amount by over \$32 million over last year, and this amount will be increased from year to year as we permit more and more Cubans to come in.

Mr. President, we have spent on this

program \$583 million. We are now spending at the rate of \$144 million a year. This amount will increase as the number of Cubans who come into this country from here on out is increased.

Mr. GURNEY. In rebuttal to that argument, I would say that, of course, we have spent a great deal of money on this program, the whole encompassment of it and all the facets of it, but that is what our commitment is. That is what we agreed to. That is exactly what we proposed to do when we established the program in the first instance.

So far as concerns the additional number coming in from Cuba—40,000 to 60,000, or whatever it is—actually the increase in cost which will result from that as compared with what we are spending now will probably be a rather small amount, because of the small portion of people who come in who will actually go on welfare and because of the expenditure of dollars in that regard.

Mr. ELLENDER. How about schooling? We have got to take care of their schooling, have we not?

Mr. GURNEY. Finally, I would say that the economic figures I have seen have meant a tremendous increase in the amount of welfare which has come from the Cuban community itself, integrating business-economics-workwise, not only in Miami, which has half of the program living there—but also from the Cubans who have emigrated to the 49 other States. This has contributed enormously to the economy of this country.

There is no question in my mind that the work product of those people will mean more than the pay for themselves in the end, in terms of what they have put into the economy of this country and what we will get back in taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I want to make one additional point. It is an extremely important point. I know that some Senators will say, "Well, this costs \$1.05 million. Why does not the Cuban community carry this burden themselves? They would be able to do this."

The point is that if we interfere with the airlift that is now operating, there is every likelihood that Castro will cut it off completely. Obviously it will be interrupted if this authority expires in a few days.

If the Cubans within the United States try to establish an airlift, they will have to communicate with Castro themselves or through the State Department or some other means. I would say that Castro would not agree to that. He cut off those who were going to come here immediately in a pronouncement of May 1 of this year to the effect that no person, after May 1971, who indicates for the first time that he wants to come to America can come to America.

The best thing we could do for Castro would be to cut off the airlift and avoid further embarrassment to Castro by eliminating the airlift. I would bet that there would be no more people coming out of Cuba after tomorrow. I refer to the people to whom we made a commitment.

Believe me, the nonpersons, as the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) described them, would indeed be nonpersons and noncitizens and subject to persecution and harassment. I suppose that they would have little more status than the status of slaves in Cuba.

We made a legal international agreement of a binding nature to go ahead with this program. In addition, we have a moral commitment. We cannot leave those persons at the mercy of Castro.

I hope that the U.S. Senate will not turn its back on the good things that have gone on for almost 300 years, from the first day that people set foot in this country from other areas of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an article from the newspaper *Diario Las Americas* dated June 2, 1971, an article from the U.S. News & World Report dated May 31, 1971, and an article from *Business World* dated January 11, 1969.

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

#### THE FREEDOM FLIGHTS AND THE HONOR OF THE U.S.A.

In the Washington Capitol are now taking place events tending to the drastic end of the Freedom Flights between Cuba and the United States of America, which have been coming since December 1965, in line with the offer made by President Johnson at that time.

As it is known, when in behalf of his government and of his country President Johnson offered the Cuban people the facilities of the Freedom Flights, and this was negotiated through the Swiss Embassy in Havana with the Castro regime, there were thousands of Cubans who, relying on Washington's official word, registered in accordance with procedures set up to leave Cuba fleeing from the communist terror. All those who registered until the registration period was closed in May 1966, have not yet left Cuba. But, from the very moment in which their names were included in the corresponding lists, they began to suffer, in one way or another, the consequences of the communist persecution. This persecution goes from the loss of their jobs to the withdrawal of the ration booklet to buy food. The Cuban communist dictatorship interpreted that all those persons who registered not only were not communists, but were against the regime. And for several years those persons have suffered, with the hope of leaving, the measures taken against them by the communist tyranny.

If the appropriations for the Freedom Flights are eliminated by Congress, as unfortunately it seems is going to happen, those thousands of persons who were already officially registered to leave Cuba will remain marked as enemies of the dictatorship, with all that this implies, and without any possibility of leaving Cuba, because what it seems would be offered to those Cubans is exactly the same that is available for other immigrants. And it is well known what this means. Those persons who believed in the official promise of the President of the United States will feel deceived and despondent. And this involves the prestige and the dignity of the United States of America, whose given word will not be kept in this case.

Let's make clear that what damages the moral position of the United States of America is the fact that individuals who officially registered for the flights when the promise was in force, will not be able to leave the country. Therefore, it is not a question of indefinitely and at any time allowing the registration of Cubans who may want to

abandon the communist inferno. It is a question of fulfilling what could be considered as a right of those who, before the registration was closed, had complied with the requisites.

Though everything seems to indicate that much has been advanced towards the elimination of the Freedom Flights, it is to be hoped that in the last stage of the discussions an honorable rectification takes place.

(From U.S. News & World Report, May 31, 1971)

#### FLIGHT FROM CUBA—CASTRO'S LOSS IS U.S. GAIN

In the 12 years since Fidel Castro came to power, nearly 650,000 Cubans have sought refuge in the United States.

Most have found far more than refuge. They have found homes, jobs—and opportunities. Thousands of refugees, in only a few years, have launched new careers in professions and business.

The story of this big wave of immigrants is a success story seldom matched in this country's long history of immigration. Few other nationality groups have taken root so quickly or progressed so rapidly.

#### WARM WELCOME

Some of this rapid progress can be credited to the aid given by the U.S. Government. No other group of immigrants in history has been accorded such a helpful welcome.

Much of the Cuban success, however, is generally attributed to the efforts and ability of the Cubans themselves.

Talk to the Cuban refugees and you get still another explanation.

"What we have found in America is the land of opportunity—the greatest nation on earth," says Carlos Arboleya, who in nine years rose from an almost penniless refugee to be president of a Miami bank.

The mass migration of Cubans to the United States is still continuing. Each month about 3,600 stream in on an airlift financed by the U. S. Government. These are people Castro let go with the contemptuous remark that they were the "worms" of his Communist society.

In America, however, they are proving, by and large, to be capable, hardworking people who are making major contributions to American life.

#### A CROSS SECTION

The Cuban refugees are scattered widely around the country. But about half of them have settled in south Florida. Nowhere else is the Cuban success story so visible as it is in this area.

Wherever you turn, the Cuban influence can be seen and felt. The new mechanic at the corner garage may not speak English fluently—but he can fix your car. The Cuban bus boy in the restaurant, the record suggests, may soon be running that restaurant.

Whole hospitals are now staffed by Cuban doctors. A prime example is the 300-bed Pan-American Hospital in Miami. In all, about 2,000 Cuban doctors have settled in the Miami area.

These refugees, records indicate, are good credit risks. Those who have borrowed money have, for the most part, paid it back. Cubans on relief are generally too old or too ill to work.

The Cuban impact on the U.S. is felt at many levels. There is a growing and articulate Spanish-language press. Movie houses in Washington, D.C., in Newark, in New York and in dozens of other cities show films in Spanish for tight-knit Latin-American communities. Across the land, restaurants with Cuban food and entertainment are opening.

Dade County, Florida, which includes Miami, is the hub of Cuban life in the United States.

Mayor Stephen P. Clark of Miami estimated that 350,000 Cubans now live there. Nobody can be positive about the number—but it is

known that some Cubans, after resettling elsewhere, return to Dade because of the mild climate and the proximity to other Cubans and the homeland. Cubans tend to dislike the cold North American winters.

#### TRADE CENTER

Because of the bilingual pool of talent in the Miami-Dade area, more and more American companies have set up their Latin-American trade headquarters there—33 in Coral Gables alone.

Among those companies are Alcoa, Dow Chemical, Chicago Bridge & Iron, Coca-Cola, Goodyear, Atlas Chemical, International Harvester, Johns-Manville and Bomis. Many of these trade headquarters are run by Cubans.

Of course, it's not all clear sailing for the refugees, but in the main their story is one of astonishing achievement.

President Arboleya of the Fidelity National Bank of Miami explains the success formula of his Cuban compatriots in these words:

"They work. The man works, the wife works, the children who are old enough work."

Mr. Arboleya has shown what a refugee can do. In 1960, at age 31, he arrived with his wife, an infant son and \$40 in cash. Banking was his field, but banks were not bidding for the services of refugees. He started as an inventory clerk in a shoe factory at \$45 a week. Eighteen months later he was the office manager. Eventually, he got a bank job. By 1966, he was executive vice president of Fidelity National. In February of 1969 he became an American citizen—and president of the bank.

#### RETAINING OLD TIES

Mr. Arboleya, whose son became an Eagle Scout at 13, likes to tell of the special camps for Cuban Boy Scouts in Miami, where the Cuban flag is flown alongside the American flag.

"Our Boy Scouts salute the Cuban flag with respect for our homeland," he says. "But," he adds, "they not only salute the American flag—they pledge allegiance to it."

Tully Dunlap, president of the Riverside Bank in Miami, credits Cuban business with lifting his bank out of the doldrums in the mid-'60s.

Deposits started to move up in 1965, breaking a steady downward trend which set in with the flight of American customers to the suburbs in 1961, Mr. Dunlap says, and "Cuban deposits now total over 16 million dollars and we have 18,000 Cuban accounts."

The New York-New Jersey area is another place where Cubans congregate. Some 75,000 are estimated to be living in New York and 52,000 in New Jersey. One of them is Dr. Carlos Marquez Sterling, who was a candidate for President of Cuba in 1958.

Today Dr. Sterling is professor of Spanish literature at C. W. Post College of Long Island University at Greenvale, N.Y. He says this:

"Most of the people who have come to the United States from Cuba have succeeded. Their success has been outstanding in many fields—business, medicine, university teaching, accounting, law and transportation."

Oscar Rodriguez was 16 and his brother, Omar, was 20 when they came to New Jersey as refugees in 1960. Their first jobs were as sweepers in a garment factory. Today they run their own garment factory, employing 75 people.

#### A DOCTOR'S STORY

Dr. Ramon Rodriguez-Torres walked away from his own private hospital in Cuba after Castro took over. The doctor, his wife, two small children and his parents arrived virtually penniless in Puerto Rico. A year later he was in Brooklyn's Downstate Medical Center as an instructor in pediatrics. From there, his advancement was swift.

Dr. Rodriguez-Torres studied for and passed



June 29, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10133

several State medical examinations. He is now a full professor and director of the center's pediatric cardiology department. He also started an intensive-care unit for children at Kings County Hospital—said to be the first of its kind in the U.S.

"My family and I are very proud and happy to be in this wonderful country where we have seen all our work and effort rewarded," he says.

At Milledgeville, Ga., 68 Cubans are among the 113 physicians on the staff at Central State Hospital, the big complex for mental patients. Five of the 10 directors are Cubans, each heading units with 700 to 1,000 patients.

Central State's top heart specialist is a Cuban, Dr. Sergio C. Alvarez-Mena. He is chief of cardiology at the hospital and also associate clinical professor of medicine at the Medical College of Georgia.

Dr. Addison M. Duval, director of Georgia's mental-health division, declares: "We just couldn't have made the improvements that we have without the help these people gave us; it was a mutually beneficial thing."

In Atlanta, where most of Georgia's 5,000 Cubans live, assimilation has been no problem. Cuban leaders estimate there are 100 of their countrymen in various businesses, while about 50 per cent of the adults hold positions as college or university professors, doctors, engineers, accountants or business executives.

## A HOUSTON GROCER

Typical of the Cubans who have made good as tradesmen—there are thousands of them—is Hector Cardet, 41, who owns a grocery store in Houston. The store specializes in Cuban foods and is a gathering place for the Cuban community.

Before fleeing Cuba in 1963, Mr. Cardet owned a grocery store in Havana. Like so many others, he reached the U.S. without funds or knowledge of the English language. He found work as a stockman for a chain of convenience grocery stores.

"At night," Mr. Cardet says, "I would load up the back of my car with Cuban-type groceries and sell them door to door to Cuban families in Houston."

In two years, he saved enough to open his own grocery store—and later a restaurant which employs Cubans as waiters and cooks.

Mr. Cardet calls the U.S. "the greatest country on earth." But given the chance, "I'd go back home," he says.

The Cuban population of Ohio has been estimated at 2,300. There are 3,000 Cubans in Michigan. Concentrations of these refugees are found in major cities of both States—especially in Detroit and Cleveland.

Occupations are varied, ranging from the pastor of Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Church in Flint, Mich.—Father Eduardo Lorenzo—to an assembly-line worker for the Ford Motor Company in Ypsilanti—Jose A. Cabrera. Mr. Cabrera is also president of the Cuban association of Michigan.

David Caveda, a manufacturers' representative in Columbus and president of the Cuban refugee group there, says he knows of only three Cuban families on welfare, all of them aged. He adds:

"There are no able-bodied Cubans on welfare. We belong to a society where people take care of one another. There is a pattern—the ones established here help the newcomers."

A Cuban refugee in Detroit, Reinaldo Gonzalez, is now an executive for an auto-parts supplier. In 1961, he joined the company as an export clerk. Now, 10 years and eight promotions later, he is responsible for manufacturing schedules for Federal-Mogul Corporation in Western Europe and Latin America.

Mr. Gonzalez explains his attitude toward America and Cuba:

"I feel . . . the way I feel about my mother and my wife. I love both, and my love for one does not interfere with my love for the other."

As the only Spanish-speaking person in his suburban neighborhood, Mr. Gonzalez has a standing joke with his next-door neighbor: "I'm better off than you are—I don't have a Cuban living next door to me!"

## THE CHICAGO SCENE

Between 20,000 and 30,000 Cuban refugees are estimated to be living in the Chicago area. About 500 of these are doctors and there are approximately 100 Cuban lawyers.

One Cuban in Chicago makes this appraisal: "Some have done well, some not so well, depending mainly on how they did in Cuba."

Another refugee took a more positive view, pointing out that a Cuban had to be highly motivated to leave his homeland—overcome the obstacles to getting permission to depart—and then buckle down to work in a strange land. Motivated people, he explained, generally succeed. And, he said: "We were prepared, whether we knew it or not."

In Columbus, Cuban Orlando Alonso, made himself so valuable that he ended up taking over the business when the owner died in 1969.

When Mr. Alonso left Cuba in 1962, he went to work as a truck driver for Columbus Pest Control Company. In a few months, he was chosen to run the business whenever the owner was away. The business had its most profitable year in 1970—under Mr. Alonso's management. He and his wife and three children live in a Columbus suburb. The 18-year-old daughter will soon marry an American.

Cuban family ties, traditionally close, account in part for the low number of failures among the refugees.

A newly arrived refugee often will receive money by mail from relatives and close friends who preceded him. A contribution may be \$1.50, or it may be \$50—whatever the donor can afford.

The established Cuban will give up something he needs and uses every day to help a relative get a foothold. For example, one head of household returned to his Miami home one night to find the table and chairs missing from his kitchen. His wife had given them to a relative just moving into the area.

These close ties, a willingness to help one another and a fanatical belief that hard work is the key to success lie behind the Cuban experience in America.

Few success stories are more dramatic than that of Mr. and Mrs. José Torres and their daughter, Norma. The Torres family arrived in New Orleans in 1967 with nothing but the clothes they wore—and the Braille ruler Mr. Torres had fashioned from wood. Both he and his wife were blind.

But José Torres was also a skilled cabinet-maker and before long he was hard at work, learning English and setting up shop with borrowed funds.

Business is slow at the moment but he keeps going with sales of doll houses, jewelry cases, candlesticks and liqueur cups. His daughter is an outstanding student in the nursing school at Louisiana State University.

## RECORD AS SCHOLARS

In the field of scholarship loans, young Cubans have been especially responsible in meeting their obligations. Congress recently heard testimony that of the 12,800 loans granted to Cubans for college education, only 147 were delinquent—a performance which outstrips the national average.

The Cuban experience in the U.S. is not an unbroken string of economic miracles. Many old persons find they cannot learn English, or that ill health keeps them from working. There are problems of assimilation in some areas—and complaints of discrimination.

In Los Angeles, the Cuban is in a particularly strange situation—he is a minority within a minority, and thus, in effect, invisible to the indigenous community.

There are some 1.1 million Spanish-speaking persons in this area. The presence there of perhaps 50,000 newcomers from Cuba makes scant impression on people in general.

These Cubans appear to have little interest in becoming part of the Mexican-American scene. They have settled instead in a variety of small pockets throughout the city.

## MASS TRANSPLANTS

Organizations like the International Rescue Committee and the Cuban resettlement division of the Catholic Welfare Bureau have helped some 35,000 Cubans go from Miami to Los Angeles. It is estimated that an additional 10,000 to 15,000 went to southern California on their own.

About 11,000 Cubans in the area are on welfare. Los Angeles County officials say the relief bill for Cubans comes to a million dollars a month—which is refunded by the U.S. Government.

Observers report a lack of rapport between Cubans and other Spanish-speaking persons there. The Cubans seem to identify more with the "Anglos," whereas Mexican-Americans tend to cling to their old Mexican culture.

There is another big difference. The militant Mexican-American sometimes leans leftward politically. Cuban refugees aren't buying anything that smacks of Communism. It's hard to find a Cuban with a Castro-type beard.

Even in Los Angeles, however, there are bright spots for Cubans. A community spirit, for a time dormant among them, has begun to develop. A Cuban Chamber of Commerce now has 100 members. About 300 Cuban-owned businesses have been established. A biweekly tabloid newspaper—"La Prensa"—has a Spanish-language circulation of 15,000, predominantly Cuban.

And like every other area, Los Angeles has its successful refugees.

## A GROWING RESTAURANT

Eddemio Lopez came from Cienfuegos, Cuba, nine years ago—penniless he says, "like everybody." He sold Bibles and encyclopedias door to door. He and his brother saved enough to open a little restaurant. It seated 25. Then the brothers bought an adjoining building and enlarged their operation. Today the prospering restaurant seats 110—and employs 13 Spanish-speaking persons.

In San Francisco, some of the Cubans complain about discrimination, especially when it comes to getting good jobs and job training. Some have had difficulty in finding any jobs at all.

And a discouraged high-school student said: "Florida is the best place for Cubans; there are enough others there to help you, to support your business."

Cubans admit—and express gratitude—that U.S. Government programs help them get started in this country.

On their arrival in Miami on the U.S.-financed airlift, they are welcomed by U.S. officials and given temporary housing in "Freedom House" at the airport. There they register with the Cuban Refugee Program of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also with a volunteer agency of their choice.

The volunteer agencies arrange transportation for refugees to homes of relatives, with the cost met by the Federal Government. Refugees also receive checks from the Florida welfare department—\$100 for a family, \$60 for a person. Washington repays Florida for this.

As soon as they reach their relocation city, refugees are eligible for public welfare, with Washington again reimbursing the States.

All told, from the time the Cuban Refugee Program began in February, 1961, through the end of this fiscal year on June 30, the U.S. Government's obligations for aiding Cuban refugees will total 583.8 million dollars.

## A GOOD INVESTMENT

Federal officials regard this as a good investment. Howard H. Palmatier, director of HEW's Cuban Refugee Program put it this way:

"We cannot overlook the Cubans' incalculable contribution to our nation. They have paid millions of dollars in local, State and federal taxes. Their presence and efforts have created, directly or indirectly, literally thousands of jobs throughout the United States—which generate even more tax revenues. And perhaps most important, they are still making this contribution."

## CUBAN REFUGEES WRITE A U.S. SUCCESS STORY—IN THE 10 YEARS SINCE CASTRO CAME TO POWER, THE NUMBER OF EXILES WHO HAVE MADE IT IN MAJOR COMPANIES OR IN NEW CAREERS HAS STEADILY GROWN, MANY HAVE STARTED SUCCESSFUL NEW ENTERPRISES

Miguel Amézaga, 64, who fled his native Cuba shortly after Fidel Castro's takeover, on Jan. 1, 1959, took to the complexities of U.S. corporate life like many executives once took to Havana cigars. Today he is a vice-president for the commercial products division of St. Regis Paper Co. "If there's been any problem at all," says Amézaga, "I'd have to say it's been difficult to adjust to the Chicago weather and the lack of domestic service."

In Cuba, Amézaga had a one-third interest in a company that did business exclusively with U.S. companies selling in Cuba, including St. Regis. When he came to this country, he didn't have to search for a job—he was offered one by St. Regis.

Amézaga's experience is typical of that of other Cuban emigres who have done well in U.S. corporations. Those who have made it typically have been well-educated. Most attended U.S. universities (Amézaga went to M.I.T.), and hence were fluent in English. They knew U.S. corporations first-hand because most major corporations operated in pre-Castro Cuba.

Roberto Golzueta, a Coca-Cola vice-president in charge of the corporate technical division, worked for Coke in Havana long before arriving in Atlanta, where Coke transferred him after Castro nationalized its facilities in 1961. Felipe Silva, 49, export manager of American Tobacco Co., worked for a subsidiary in Cuba before coming to the U.S. in 1960; six other Cubans with American Tobacco are veterans of its pre-Castro subsidiary.

## WAVE

More than 300,000 Cubans have arrived in the U.S. in the decade since Castro came to power. The majority have been women, children, and students. But in the first two years of the immigration wave, those who came were mostly the propertied elite and the professional and managerial people who were the first to feel the growing Communist assertiveness of the Castro regime.

"We call ourselves the Cuban Mafia," says Alberto Luzarraga, of the early emigrants. Luzarraga, 31, is vice-president and zone executive for Mexico and Central America at Chase Manhattan Bank. Most of the Cubans who fled knew each other, and many were related, he says.

Like any other kind of pioneer, the Cubans who first reached freedom tended to regard themselves as special. Henry Fanjul, 51, vice-president and Latin American area manager of Marsh & McLennan International, Inc., says: "The ones that came in 1960 were the cream of the crop."

Few Cubans can be found in the top echelons of management, but many are in important positions with companies doing business with Spanish-speaking countries.

"We were skeptical about taking on Cubans at first," says an executive of one U.S. company doing business internationally. "We had

the idea they were playboys. But now when we think of sending someone to Latin America, somebody asks, 'Isn't there a Cuban for the job?'"

The result has been an unusually strong concentration of Cubans in international business, particularly in banking and related fields. Says Jose A. Maruri, 43, assistant treasurer of the International division of the Bank of New York: "There are so many Cubans involved in international business that it's easy for us to communicate. We have a lot in common." His boss is vice-president Victor R. Zevallos, 54, a Cuban.

"When I want to know something about another company," says Luzarraga of Chase. "I call on any Cuban in that company. It helps a lot."

## NEW VENTURE

Businessmen who have been able to integrate effortlessly into corporations or banks have had it easier than their professional brethren, who frequently have been frustrated by the requirements of medical or bar examinations. "The law was a dead end," says Ernesto de Zaldo, 48, a lawyer in Cuba. But the contacts he made while majoring in economics at Yale made it easier to land a job at PepsiCo International, where he is now area vice-president for Southern Europe.

Not all Cuban refugees came here. Some 20,000, for example, landed in Puerto Rico. Elsewhere in Latin America, Cuban exiles frequently run U.S. subsidiaries. In Argentina, for instance, Sherwin-Williams, Seagram, and New Chemical subsidiaries are run by Cubans. Ralston Purina's top man in Caracas, Venezuela, is former Havana lawyer Fernando Macia who lost a brother in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

## NEST EGGS

The corporation is not the only opportunity for Cuban emigres. Quite a few of the refugees had sizeable stakes which they managed to salvage from fortunes accumulated or inherited before the Castro takeover. Manuel Fernandez Blanco, 75 had his \$10-million slaughter-house and packing business confiscated. But he used holdings maintained outside Cuba to start a bakery business in Miami with his son-in-law, Eduardo Sardina. Today, their Wayjay Bakery—specializing in Cuban-style crackers sold in Cuban communities throughout the U.S.—has annual sales of over \$475,000.

Some engines have made it without back-up funds. Jorge de Quesada, an architect, left behind his own architectural and construction company when he fled Cuba in 1960. Arriving in the U.S. without a dime and unable to speak a word of English, he got a job with a small San Francisco architectural firm headed by a fellow Cuban. Three years ago, he struck out on his own and since then he has designed over \$10-million worth of structures, including a \$2-million office building for Owens-Illinois.

José Zorrilla, who ran a plastics plant with 40 employees when Castro took over, took a plastics company production job in Los Angeles in 1961 for \$165 a week. A year and a half later, with \$700 of savings and a \$1,300 loan, he made a down payment on a blow mold and was back in business. Today, his Liberty Plastics Co. turns out \$1-million worth of plastic turtles, ducks, and other toys a year.

## AMBITIOUS

If there is a common thread uniting most Cubans who have embarked on new careers in the U.S., it is their determination and capacity for hard work. A case in point is that of Justo P. Garcia Du-Quene, assistant manager of Francis I. du Pont's brokerage office in Miami. For over a year after arriving in Miami on Jan. 1, 1960, he held a variety of jobs, from a night clerk in a hotel to bedding salesman, all the while refusing financial assistance available to needy refugees. "I don't think a young man of 25 ought to be on relief," he says.

Eventually, Garcia signed on as a trainee with Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith in New York before going to work in the company's Miami office. He switched to Francis I. du Pont in 1962 and began selling sugar futures to his Cuban friends. The commodities market boomed, and Garcia soon became one of the company's top salesmen.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, for whom I have the deepest respect. I know that it is not because of any lack of compassion that he raises this question.

Mr. President, I feel compelled to join with the Senator from Florida, my own native State, in saying that, for the thousands of Cubans who reject Communist rule, the United States is a refuge, a haven, a hope, just as it has been a refuge, haven, and hope for so many millions from all over the world. Those of us whose forebears came to this country to embrace freedom cannot now turn our backs on the Cubans who seek our shores.

When one considers that the cost of this program is less than \$17 per passenger, can we say that this is too high a price to pay for a man's freedom?

In a report published in the Washington Post of March 28, 1971, the distinguished correspondent, Haynes Johnson, wrote that the Cubans have written one of the most notable American success stories. Coming to Miami with "nothing but their abilities, and often without knowledge of English," they have made their way well in this alien culture. It is estimated that 83 percent of them are fully self-supporting, and their income level is rising steadily.

According to Mr. Johnson's research, the average income of the Cuban family is about \$8,000 a year, while in the higher educated and professional groups it exceeds \$18,000 a year. Half of the Cubans own their own homes, and 22 percent more are in the process of buying one. Thousands are teaching in public schools and working in hospitals.

I am sure that the American people will not turn back the Cubans who wish to share our freedom. I support the continuation of funding for the Cuban airlift program, and I call on Senators to join in keeping the bridge to freedom open.

Today, 65,000 Cubans are on the waiting list. Their yearning for freedom need not be denied. Many of these people can contribute as much as the fine Cubans who have in the past come to the State of Illinois and are working in hospitals, in professional areas, in the mental institutions, and in many other areas where we have a shortage of personnel. These fine people have contributed much to our society.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I wonder

if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana would yield for a question before I proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHILES. I notice that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana, said in his presentation that perhaps this matter could have been considered in the regular bill, but that it is his feeling that the problem did need to be brought to the attention of the Senate and should be brought to the attention of the Senate. He said, therefore, that he thought he would offer his amendment at this time.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator, having brought this matter to the attention of the Senate very forcefully by virtue of the amendment to the continuing resolution, would consider withholding the amendment and allowing the matter to be considered in a regular bill. At that time we could get all of the information and bring it into focus.

I think that the distinguished Senator has presented some valid points. He asked whether there are too many people on welfare who are refugees and if so, why; whether there are some malingerers; or whether it is because of the age of the refugees, the young or the old people, who are coming out of Cuba.

I think the points he raises as to how many remain, whether it is an open list that is available for anyone who desires to come, or whether it is limited in number could all be answered through regular hearings.

In a letter of June 2, I requested the right to appear before hearings that were held by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire). The Senator from Wisconsin told me that I would be entitled to appear and that I could present witnesses before his Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. That would be the way to focus attention on this matter and determine whether we are dealing with an unlimited number or are dealing with a question of establishing when the cutoff time could be.

Could the distinguished Senator respond to that inquiry?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Florida, as I stated awhile ago, I did not want to take the Senate by surprise, but I felt that I would not inasmuch as we held hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and the matter was fully covered.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I asked for the privilege of appearing before those hearings. I was told that I was going to get the right to do so. My request was prior to that time. I am sure that the Senator from Wisconsin was thinking of the hearings on the regular bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the continuing resolution would affect the program only until August 6.

There will be ample time to provide more funds if the Senate desires to do so upon the introduction of new evidence. I am awaiting information from those who propose that we continue the airlift as to how far we are going to go with this program. As I pointed out a while ago, in 1966 when this matter was being seriously considered by both Houses and when the so-called agreement—with

which I am not familiar—was made with Castro, about 200,000 Cubans were entitled to come under the new rules and regulations.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I know that the Senator pointed out that an estimate was made at that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that. But we have gone over and above that number by over 44,000. Some want to go over and above that by another 42,000. I want to quit now if it is possible.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Miami Herald of June 11 be reprinted at this point.

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

FROM THE SENATE: STOP THE AIRLIFT

Again, a practical question on whether the Cuban Airlift should continue has come up in Congress. This time Sen. Allen Ellender (D., La.), powerful chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has called for an end to the airlift.

Last year, U.S. Rep. William Clay (D., Mo.) pressed the issue and was narrowly defeated in the House when it came to a vote.

This is one of those questions that has been cussed and discussed for nearly three years. It remains our view the airlift is contradictory of U.S. policy toward Cuba; that it benefits Fidel Castro more than the United States; that it sets up a situation of special federal privilege for Cuban exiles that is denied others in this hemisphere who wish to make their homes in the United States and offers an umbrella of help that exceeds that available even to underprivileged U.S. citizens; that the continually rising cost of the program cannot be justified in light of this country's severe economic strains.

We think that there should not be a separate welfare program for Cubans, but one program under which they and all the other needy in this country receive the same concern and care.

This view is no reflection on the Cubans among us who have distinguished themselves in business and have made contributions to the community in many ways. The fact is simply that the original purpose of the airlift as an emergency humanitarian gesture has been fulfilled. It has developed into a permanent relief program for Cuba.

This year the Congress is being asked to provide an additional \$32 million over what it gave last year—a total of \$144 million. As long as the airlift continues, the costs will keep going up.

We note that Howard Palmatier, director of the refugee program, told the Senate subcommittee that "a very good resettlement program" is in the national interest.

It always has been, Mr. Palmatier, but the rate at which the Cuban population has grown in the Miami area raises doubts about whether we have one.

Those excellent resettlement percentages so often cited by the program's officials do not seem to match that growth rate.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, one of the problems we are trying to pinpoint here is the shock and the reaction of those, not just in Cuba, but really in Latin America and perhaps in other countries in the world, if we go back on a commitment that we made that we will get out anyone that signed up. If people did sign up and as a result of signing up and saying they want to go to the United States they lose their jobs, their ration cards, and their property, and if they have been in the canefields or working since the time, the shock of our saying that we are going to cut off these flights, without

phasing them out, or establishing some date, or determining how many are going to come out, is going to hurt the image of this country.

That is why we should consider this in a regular bill so we can see the impact of it. Should there be a cutoff date? Should the cutoff be by date and number? That is how we should determine how we should attack this problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say that can be decided when the bill is taken up on the floor later this year.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator is correct, but I think by then we would have had the shock of this decision. I appreciate the chairman's indulgence in allowing me to present this matter because I wanted to know if there was any way that we could have hearings on the regular bill.

In January a year ago, when I was first getting my campaign for the Senate underway, I visited Miami International Airport on the West Side. What I saw there has left an impression with me that I have never been able to shake.

Streaming off an airplane were hundreds of Cuban refugees, men, women, children. They were dressed as one would expect any refugee to dress. They had old clothes for the most part, ill-fitted and nonstylish according to American standards, and carried all of their possessions in a sack. But it was not their clothes that got my attention, it was their hands.

Their hands were raw. Many of their hands were still raw as if they had been hustled straight from the canefields to the airplane, and that is exactly what had happened to them. These people, for the past several years, had spent their time at hard labor. When they signed their name on the list of those wanting to come to the United States, their ration cards, their homes, and their jobs were taken away from them. Their entire lives centered around the fact that someday they would climb aboard an American airplane and leave their Cuban prison.

It was not an easy decision for them to make, because it meant poverty, inhumane treatment, and the scattering of their families. It was their price for freedom.

Mr. President, we have a commitment to uphold today, a commitment made on October 3, 1965, when President Johnson offered asylum for Cuban refugees. He said:

I declare this afternoon to the people of Cuba that those who seek refuge here in America will find it. The dedication of America to our traditions as an asylum for the oppressed is going to be upheld.

I think it is significant that the President made this statement on Liberty Island, beneath the Statue of Liberty, the mother of exiles.

Reflect back for a moment. When the earliest settlers poured into an American wild continent, there was no one to ask them where they came from. And so it has been through all the great testing moments of American history. And in Vietnam men are dying, men named McCormick, Swartz, and Fernandez. No one asks where they came from.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

June 29, 1971

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the Senator 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CHILES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, earlier this week I received a telephone call from a 16-year-old girl, a Cuban, who had taken a freedom flight 3 years ago. She told me her father was still in Cuba, working in the cane fields. She said she would never see her father again if the airlift was terminated. She said we had promised to keep the airlift going and did not understand what was happening.

What this little girl wanted is what is before us today. We are talking about our commitment to this girl, and thousands of other Cubans who still live under prison conditions. There is an obvious moral obligation on the part of the Congress of the United States to fulfill this commitment.

There is an impression left that those who flee from Cuba, the majority of them, end up on the welfare rolls. This is not so. In fact, it seems remarkable, when we consider that these refugees arrive here with nothing but their skills and abilities, 83 percent are fully self-supporting and only 17 percent require any kind of Federal assistance. These figures are quoted by Mr. Howard Palmatier, director of the Cuban refugee program.

Mr. Palmatier also said:

Cubans know more about the American dream than we do. They really believe that this is a country where you can do anything and be anything . . . so they do it.

We see this day after day in Miami where many of these people have become presidents of banks and hold some of the best jobs in the area.

If the action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee is upheld, the Cuban freedom flight program will be terminated less than 3 years before it has completed its mission. We cannot, under any circumstances, allow this to happen. The program means just what it says, Cuban freedom flight. We are not talking about a vacation or business flight from one small nation to the United States, we are talking about the freedom of people, freedom we have promised them.

When President Johnson offered his asylum for Cuban refugees, he also said while standing at the foot of the Statue of Liberty:

Now, under the monument which has welcomed so many to our shores, the American Nation returns to the finest of its traditions today.

I intend to vote today to uphold this tradition. I urge each Member of this distinguished body to oppose the committee amendment calling for an end to the Cuban freedom flights.

Mr. President, it seems to me it could be said that this is the way we reward anticommunism. It could be said we reward anticommunism in this way. Where people have signed their names on the list and signified they would give up their rights to property, their rations,

for freedom in this country, we would seem to reward all of that by ending these flights. I do not think we can do that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Freedom Flights and the Honor of the U.S.A." statements by President Johnson on October 3, 1965, on signing of the immigration bill, and on November 6, 1965, following the reaching of an agreement on procedures and means, and a letter addressed to me by Stephen P. Clark, mayor, Metropolitan Dade County, Fla.

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

THE FREEDOM FLIGHTS AND THE HONOR OF THE U.S.A.

In the Washington Capitol are now taking place events tending to the drastic end of the Freedom Flights between Cuba and the United States of America, which have been coming since December 1965, in line with the offer made by President Johnson at that time.

As it is known, when in behalf of his government and of his country President Johnson offered the Cuban people the facilities of the Freedom Flights, and this was negotiated through the Swiss Embassy in Havana with the Castro regime, there were thousands of Cubans who, relying on Washington's official word, registered in accordance with procedures set up to leave Cuba fleeing from the communist terror. All those who registered until the registration period was closed in May 1966, have not yet left Cuba. But, from the very moment in which their names were included in the corresponding lists, they began to suffer, in one way or another, the consequences of the communist persecution. This persecution goes from the loss of their jobs to the withdrawal of the ration booklet to buy food. The Cuban communist dictatorship interpreted that all those persons who registered not only were not communists, but were against the regime. And for several years those persons have suffered, with the hope of leaving, the measures taken against them by the communist tyranny.

If the appropriations for the Freedom Flights are eliminated by Congress, as unfortunately it seems is going to happen, those thousands of persons who were already officially registered to leave Cuba will remain marked as enemies of the dictatorship, with all that this implies, and without any possibility of leaving Cuba, because what it seems would be offered to those Cubans is exactly the same that is available for other immigrants. And it is well known what this means. Those persons who believed in the official promise of the President of the United States will feel deceived and despondent. And this involves the prestige and the dignity of the United States of America whose given word will not be kept in this case.

Let's make clear that what damages the moral position of the United States of America is the fact that individuals who officially registered for the flights when the promise was in force, will not be able to leave the country. Therefore, it is not a question of indefinitely and at any time allowing the registration of Cubans who may want to abandon the communist inferno. It is a question of fulfilling what could be considered as a right of those who, before the registration was closed, had complied with the requisites.

Though everything seems to indicate that much has been advanced towards the elimination of the Freedom Flights, it is to be hoped that in the last stage of the discussions an honorable rectification takes place.

MOVEMENT OF CUBAN REFUGEES TO THE UNITED STATES

(Statement by the President following the reaching of an agreement on procedures and means, November 6, 1965.)

[As read at the Press Secretary's briefing]

"I am pleased with the understanding which has been reached. It is an important forward step in carrying out the declaration I made on October 3 to the Cuban people. I said that those who seek refuge here will find it. That continues to be the policy of the American people."

NOTE: The statement was read by the Press Secretary to the President, Bill Moyers, at his news conference at 10:04 a.m., c.s.t., on Saturday, November 6, 1965, at Austin, Tex. It was not made public in the form of a White House press release.

For the President's declaration of October 3, made at the ceremony for the signing of the immigration bill on Liberty Island, see 1 Weekly Comp. Pres. Docs. 364 attached in following material.

MOVEMENT OF CUBAN REFUGEES TO THE UNITED STATES

(Announcement of exchange of diplomatic notes establishing procedures and means, November 6, 1965.)

The President announced today that at 9 a.m., c.s.t., the Swiss Embassy in Havana, representing United States interests in Cuba, and the Cuban Foreign Ministry had exchanged diplomatic notes establishing procedures and means for the movement of Cuban refugees to the United States. The arrangements for the movement were set out in a memorandum of understanding incorporated in the notes.

SWISS EMBASSY TO CUBAN FOREIGN MINISTRY

The full text of the note from the Swiss Embassy to the Cuban Foreign Ministry follows:

"The Embassy of Switzerland presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Relations and, in its capacity as representative of the interests of the United States of America in Cuba, has the honor to refer to recent conversations which have taken place between the Embassy and representatives of the Government of Cuba with respect to the movement to the United States of Cubans who wish to live in the United States.

"The Embassy also has the honor to set forth below the text, in English and Spanish language versions which shall be equally authentic, of the memorandum of understanding agreed upon in those conversations:

"Memorandum of understanding between the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana, representing the interests of the United States of America in the Republic of Cuba and the Foreign Ministry of the Government of Cuba concerning the movement to the United States of Cubans wishing to live in the United States.

"1. The Government of Cuba agrees to permit the departure from Cuba of, and the Government of the United States agrees to permit the entry into the United States of, Cubans who wish to leave Cuba for the United States, in accordance with the provisions of this memorandum of understanding.

"2. In recognition of the prime importance of the humanitarian task of reuniting divided families, the two Governments agree that persons living in Cuba who are immediate relatives of persons now living in the United States will be given, as a group first priority in processing and movement. The two Governments agree that the term "immediate relatives" is defined to mean parents of unmarried children under the age of 21, spouses, unmarried children under the age of 21 and brothers and sisters under the age of 21.

June 29, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10137

"3. The two Governments agree that they will include as members of this first priority group other close relatives living in Cuba of persons now in the United States who reside in the same household as the immediate relatives when such inclusion is required by humanitarian considerations. In order to protect the integrity of the agreed principle of first priority for immediate relatives, the two Governments agree that it will be necessary to verify the relationship and the actual existence of the humanitarian considerations referred to. The two Governments agree that this task of verification will be carried out by the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana and that the judgment of that Embassy will be accepted by the two Governments as final.

"4. The Government of Cuba agrees to present to the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana as soon as possible a list (hereinafter called 'Cuban Master List A') of immediate relatives living in Cuba of persons now living in the United States, and of other persons living in Cuba described in paragraph 3 above, who wish to live in the United States. The Embassy of Switzerland in Havana will transmit Cuban Master List A to the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States for its part, will have prepared a list (hereinafter called 'US Master List A') based on information supplied by persons now living in the United States who have immediate relatives living in Cuba and who are prepared to receive and are interested in receiving such relatives. It is understood that the lists provided for in this paragraph may be prepared in installments and shall be supplemented from time to time.

"5. Those names which appear on both Cuban Master List A and US Master List A will be incorporated by the Government of the United States in a single list (hereinafter called 'Joint Consolidated List A'), which will be transmitted by the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana to the Government of Cuba. With respect to Joint Consolidated List A, there will be a presumption that the persons on the list will be permitted by the Government of Cuba to depart Cuba and will be permitted by the Government of the United States to enter the United States, but final permission will be granted in the form of approval by both Governments of embarkation lists for each flight from Cuba to the United States.

"6. The cases of persons whose names appear on Cuban Master List A or on US Master List A but not on both (and therefore not on Joint Consolidated List A) will be the object of further examination by the two Governments, utilizing the services of the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana as required, with a view to the inclusion of such persons in addenda to Joint Consolidated List A, or, in any case, in the second priority group described below in paragraph 8.

"7. The two Governments agree that from Joint Consolidated List A, and its addenda, embarkation lists for each flight from Cuba to the United States will be drawn. The two Governments agree that they will make every effort to ensure that the following categories of persons appearing on Joint Consolidated List A are transported in the order of priority indicated: First, parents and unmarried brothers and sisters under the age of 21 living in Cuba of children living in the United States under the age of 21; second, unmarried children under the age of 21 living in Cuba of parents living in the United States; and third, spouses living in Cuba of persons living in the United States. Families and other members of the households will be permitted to travel together in accordance with the principles of paragraph 3 above.

"8. When both Governments agree that the persons appearing on Joint Consolidated List A and its addenda no longer require full utilization of the transportation provided, the movement of other persons living in Cuba who wish to live in the United States will begin. First consideration will be given to

relatives living in Cuba of persons living in the United States who do not fall within the definition of immediate relatives.

"9. The Government of Cuba agrees to present, in due course, to the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana, for transmission to the Government of the United States: a list (hereinafter 'Cuban Master List B') of all such persons who will be permitted to depart from Cuba. The Government of Cuba agrees to consider, in preparing Cuban Master List B, names of persons living in Cuba submitted by the Government of the United States on the basis of information supplied by friends and relatives living in the United States.

"10. The two Governments agree that Cuban Master List B will form the basis of the preparation of embarkation lists for each flight from Cuba to the United States, in accordance with procedures described below.

"11. The Government of Cuba agrees that, with respect to persons on either Joint Consolidated List A or Cuban Master List B, it will prepare, in consultation with the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana, prospective embarkation lists for individual flights from Cuba to the United States. Such lists will be provided the Government of the United States at last seven days prior to the date of the flight.

"12. The Government of the United States agrees in turn to inform the Government of Cuba without delay, through the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana, or persons on the embarkation lists approved for entry into the United States, with the understanding that final formalities will be completed at the point of embarkation by officers of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and Public Health Service.

"13. The Government of Cuba agrees to assemble such persons at the airport at Varadero.

"14. The two Governments agree that such persons will be subject to a final departure inspection by officials of the Department of Immigration and the Ministry of Public Health of Cuba and to an entrance inspection by officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Public Health Service of the United States, at the airport in Varadero. Persons found to be ineligible for departure from Cuba by Cuban officials in accordance with the laws and regulations in force in Cuba or those found by American officials to be ineligible for entrance into the United States under laws and regulations in force in the United States will not be permitted to embark.

"15. The Government of the United States agrees to provide air transportation to carry persons permitted to depart Cuba and to enter the United States from Varadero to a convenient point in the United States.

"16. The Government of the United States agrees to provide air transportation with such frequency and capacity as to permit the movement of between 3,000 and 4,000 persons per month.

"17. The two Governments agree that the first movement under the terms of this memorandum of understanding will begin not later than December 1, 1965.

"18. The two Governments agree that any problems that may arise in the implementation of this memorandum of understanding will be considered jointly by the Embassy of Switzerland in Havana, representing the interests of the United States of America in the Republic of Cuba, and the Government of Cuba.

"In the course of the conversations which led to the memorandum of understanding set forth above, the Government of Cuba stated its position concerning the departure of technicians and men from 15 to 26 years of age in Cuba who are obliged to perform compulsory military service. The Government of Cuba also stated that it would set forth its position on these matters in a separate note.

"The Government of the United States

stated that it would reply, through the Embassy of Switzerland, to the note of the Government of Cuba referred to in the preceding paragraph and would set forth its own position on these matters as it had been expressed in the course of the discussions. Furthermore, the Government of the United States stated it would transmit to the Government of Cuba, through the Embassy of Switzerland, a separate note concerning the position of the Government of the United States on the matter of the inclusion in the movement from Cuba of persons imprisoned in Cuba for offenses of a political nature as that position had been expressed in the course of the discussions.

"The Government of Cuba stated that it would reply to the note of the Government of the United States concerning the inclusion in the movement to that country of persons imprisoned in Cuba for offenses against the revolution and would set forth its own position on this matter as it had been expressed in the course of the discussions.

"The Embassy has the honor to propose that, if the understandings described in the memorandum of understanding set forth above are acceptable to the Ministry of Foreign Relations, this note and the Ministry's reply concurring therein shall constitute an acceptance by the Government of the United States and the Government of Cuba of the terms of the memorandum of understanding, which shall take effect on the date of the reply."

(Spanish language version omitted)

A concurring note from the Cuban Foreign Ministry to the Swiss Embassy completed the exchange and put the memorandum of understanding into effect.

In addition to these main notes, there were four other notes exchanged separately at about 9:30 a.m., c.s.t. The first of these, from the Cuban Foreign Ministry to the Swiss Embassy, reads as follows (complimentary introduction and close omitted):  
CUBAN FOREIGN MINISTRY TO SWISS EMBASSY

"The Government of Cuba, in accordance with the statement in the note containing the memorandum of understanding, and in order to prevent errors in interpretation on the part of, or in relation to, certain persons who, by reason of the social function they perform or because of legal obligations from which they cannot be excused, are subject to certain restrictions in regard to their departure or who do not have the right to leave the country, considers it useful to confirm in writing, and also to publish, what was stated orally in the conversations with the Swiss Embassy which preceded the said (memorandum of) understanding, in reference to priorities, form and manner of departure of Cubans who wish to join their relatives or live in the United States, namely that in the case of technicians or skilled personnel whose departure from the country may cause a serious disturbance in a specific social service or in production, because a replacement for such person would not immediately be available, the Government of Cuba will authorize the departure of such person within the period during which the trips will take place, but will postpone it until the time when such person may be replaced in the duties which he performs.

"Likewise, and in conformity with the statement in the Cuban note containing the memorandum of understanding, and for the same reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph, the Government of Cuba considers it desirable to confirm hereby, and at the same time to publish, what it clearly stated during the course of the negotiations; namely that no citizen who under the law is included in the first call-up for compulsory military service, that is, between 17 and 26 years of age, or who will be included in the call-up in the next two years, that is to say, who is at present 15 years of age, has the right

to leave the country and therefore will not be authorized to leave."

#### SWISS EMBASSY REPLY

The Swiss Embassy replied to this note as follows (complimentary introduction and close omitted):

"During the recent discussions which led to the memorandum of understanding of November 6, 1965, the Embassy of Switzerland made clear that it had been the understanding and hope of the Government of the United States that the statement by the Prime Minister of Cuba on September 30, 1965, would encompass persons in these categories who wished to leave Cuba to live in the United States. Thus, for example, there was no suggestion in that broad statement that any technicians who wished to leave Cuba for the United States would be prevented from departing, even temporarily.

"The Government of the United States regrets that at this time the Government of Cuba has not permitted men subject to military service and certain technicians to be included under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding. The Government of the United States expresses the hope that the Government of Cuba will be willing to reconsider this position expressed in the course of the discussions mentioned above and repeated in the note of the Ministry. The Government of the United States wishes to stress the particular importance which such reconsideration would have in permitting the reunion of many families.

"For its part, the Government of the United States reaffirms its readiness to grant entry to the United States of the persons who are the subject of this note through procedures consistent with those established in the Memorandum of Understanding of this date."

#### SWISS EMBASSY TO CUBAN FOREIGN MINISTRY

The third separate note was from the Swiss Embassy to the Cuban Foreign Ministry (complimentary introduction and close omitted):

"As the Embassy of Switzerland made clear during the course of the recent conversations which led to the Memorandum of Understanding on the movement of persons from Cuba to the United States, accepted by both Governments on November 6, 1965, the Government of the United States regards with special humanitarian concern the cases of those persons imprisoned in Cuba for offenses of a political nature. It had been the understanding and hope of the Government of the United States that the statement by the Prime Minister of Cuba on September 30, 1965, would encompass persons in this category who wished to leave Cuba to live in the United States.

"The Government of the United States regrets that at this time the Government of Cuba has not permitted political prisoners to be included under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding. The Government of the United States expresses the hope that the Government of Cuba will be willing to reconsider this position. The Government of the United States wishes to stress the particular importance which such reconsideration would have in permitting the reunion of many families.

"For its part, the Government of the United States reaffirms its readiness to grant entry to the United States of such political prisoners through procedures consistent with those established in the Memorandum of Understanding of November 6, 1965."

#### CUBAN FOREIGN MINISTRY REPLY

The final separate note, a response by the Cuban Foreign Ministry to the note initiated by the Swiss Embassy, read as follows:

"The Ministry of Foreign Relations presents its compliments to the Embassy of Switzerland, representing the interests of the United States of America in Cuba, and in acknowledging receipt of its note dated November 6, has the honor to inform it that the Cuban position on the matter is that ex-

pressed in its note of October 12 of the present year."

Note: The announcement was released at Austin, Tex.

#### SIGNING OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL

The President's Remarks at the Ceremony on Liberty Island, With His Offer of Asylum for Cuban Refugees, October 3, 1965

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ambassador Goldberg, distinguished members of the leadership of the Congress, distinguished Governors and mayors, my fellow countrymen:

We have called the Congress here this afternoon not only to mark a very historic occasion, but to settle a very old issue that is in dispute. That issue is, to what congressional district does Liberty Island really belong—Congressman Farstein or Congressman Gallagher? It will be settled by whoever of the two can walk first to the top of the Statue of Liberty.

This bill that we sign today is not a revolutionary bill. It does not affect the lives of millions. It will not reshape the structure of our daily lives, or really add importantly to either our wealth or our power.

Yet it is still one of the most important acts of this Congress and of this administration.

For it does repair a very deep and painful flaw in the fabric of American justice. It corrects a cruel and enduring wrong in the conduct of the American Nation.

Speaker McCormack and Congressman Celler almost 40 years ago first pointed that out in their maiden speeches in the Congress. And this measure that we will sign today will really make us truer to ourselves both as a country and as a people. It will strengthen us in a hundred unseen ways.

I have come here to thank personally each Member of the Congress who labored so long and so valiantly to make this occasion come true today, and to make this bill a reality. I cannot mention all their names for it would take much too long, but my gratitude and that of this Nation belongs to the 89th Congress.

We are indebted, too, to the vision of the late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and to the support given to this measure by the then Attorney General and now Senator, Robert F. Kennedy.

In the final days of consideration, this bill had no more able champion than the present Attorney General, Nicholas Katzenbach, who, with New York's Emanuel Celler, and Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Congressman Feighan of Ohio, and Senator Mansfield and Senator Dirksen constituting the leadership in the Senate, and Senator Javits, helped to guide this bill to passage along with the help of the Members sitting in front of me today.

This bill says simply that from this day forth those wishing to immigrate to America should be admitted on the basis of their skills and their close relationship to those already here.

This is a simple test, and it is a fair test. Those who can contribute most to this country—to its growth, to its strength, to its spirit—will be the first that are admitted to this land.

The fairness of this standard is so self-evident that we may well wonder that it has not always been applied. Yet the fact is that for over four decades the immigration policy of the United States has been twisted and has been distorted by the harsh injustice of the national origins quota system.

Under that system the ability of new immigrants to come to America depended upon the country of their birth. Only three countries were allowed to supply 70 percent of all the immigrants.

Families were kept apart because a husband or a wife or a child had been born in the wrong place.

Men of needed skill and talent were de-

nied entrance because they came from southern or eastern Europe or from one of the developing continents.

This system violated the basic principle of American democracy—the principle that values and rewards each man on the basis of his merit as a man.

It has been un-American in the highest sense because it had been untrue to the faith that brought thousands to these shores even before we were a country.

Today, with my signature, this system is abolished.

We can now believe that it will never again shadow the gate to the American Nation with the twin barriers of prejudice and privilege.

Our beautiful America was built by a nation of strangers. From a hundred different places or more, they have poured forth into an empty land, joining and blending in one mighty and irresistible tide.

The land flourished because it was fed from so many sources—because it was nourished by so many cultures and traditions and peoples.

And from this experience, almost unique in the history of nations, has come America's attitude toward the rest of the world. We, because of what we are, feel safer and stronger in a world as varied as the people who make it up—a world where no country rules another and all countries can deal with the basic problems of human dignity and deal with those problems in their own way.

Now, under the monument which has welcomed so many to our shores, the American Nation returns to the finest of its traditions today.

The days of unlimited immigration are past.

But those who do come will come because of what they are, and not because of the land from which they sprung.

When the earliest settlers poured into a wild continent there was no one to ask them where they came from. The only question was: Were they sturdy enough to make the journey, were they strong enough to clear the land, were they enduring enough to make a home for freedom, and were they brave enough to die for liberty if it became necessary to do so?

And so it has been through all the great and testing moments of American history. This year we see in Viet-Nam men dying—men named Fernandez and Zajac and Zelinko and Mariano and McCormick.

Neither the enemy who killed them nor the people whose independence they have fought to save ever asked them where they or their parents came from. They were all Americans. It was for free men and for America that they gave their all, they gave their lives and selves.

By eliminating that same question as a test for immigration the Congress proves ourselves worthy of those men and worthy of our own traditions as a Nation.

#### ASYLUM FOR CUBAN REFUGEES

So it is in that spirit that I declare this afternoon to the people of Cuba that those who seek refuge here in America will find it. The dedication of America to our traditions as an asylum for the oppressed is going to be upheld.

I have directed the Departments of State and Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare to immediately make all the necessary arrangements to permit those in Cuba who seek freedom to make an orderly entry into the United States of America.

Our first concern will be with those Cubans who have been separated from their children and their parents and their husbands and their wives that are now in this country. Our next concern is with those who are imprisoned for political reasons.

And I will send to the Congress tomorrow a request for supplementary funds of \$12,600,000 to carry forth the commitment that I am making today.

June 29, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10139

I am asking the Department of State to seek through the Swiss Government immediately the agreement of the Cuban Government in a request to the President of the International Red Cross Committee. The request is for the assistance of the Committee in processing the movement of refugees from Cuba to Miami. Miami will serve as a port of entry and temporary stopping place for refugees as they settle in other parts of this country.

And to all the voluntary agencies in the United States, I appeal for their continuation and expansion of their magnificent work. Their help is needed in the reception and settlement of those who choose to leave Cuba. The Federal Government will work closely with these agencies in their tasks of charity and brotherhood.

I want all the people of this great land of ours to know of the really enormous contribution which the compassionate citizens of Florida have made to humanity and to decency. And all States in this Union can join with Florida now in extending the hand of helpfulness and humanity to our Cuban brothers.

The lesson of our times is sharp and clear in this movement of people from one land to another. Once again, it stamps the mark of failure on a regime when many of its citizens voluntarily choose to leave the land of their birth for a more helpful home in America. The future holds little hope for any government where the present holds no hope for the people.

And so we Americans will welcome these Cuban people. For the tides of history run strong, and in another day, they can return to their homeland to find it cleansed of terror and free from fear.

Over my shoulder here you can see Ellis Island, whose vacant corridors echo today the joyous sounds of long-ago voices.

And today we can all believe that the lamp of this grand old lady is brighter today, and the golden door that she guards gleams more brilliantly in the light of an increased liberty for the people from all the countries of the globe.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:08 p.m. on Liberty Island, New York City, N.Y. As enacted, the Immigration bill is Public Law 89-236.

HON. LAWTON CHILES,  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHILES: Before leaving for Tel Aviv, Israel, to dedicate a South Florida wing to a hospital in Beersheba, I, as Mayor of Dade County, Florida, would like to go on record as requesting of you the good use of your honorable office by interceding on behalf of keeping the Cuba-Miami airlift open. Due to the fact that Western Union continues on strike, I am sending my message to you in the form of this letter.

I firmly feel that to halt the Cuba-Miami airlift is to negate the history and basic principles of the United States of America. The decision taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee, presided by Senator Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana, is extremely unfortunate and is not in keeping with our country's heritage.

Our nation has traditionally maintained its doors open to the suppressed, the persecuted and to those who came to seek brighter horizons in our United States. It is conceivable, in these turbulent times, the Cuba-Miami airlift could be the only means by which our nation can demonstrate to the world that America is, still, a refuge to the persecuted. To stop the freedom fight would be to forsake the principles of our forefathers and to deny that the grandeur of our country is founded upon their quest for liberty and freedom. The Cubans who arrive through the airlift to our shores come, not because they wish to migrate to the United

States, but—because they are persecuted by a barbaric, totalitarian, communist-oriented regime—they come to seek the liberty which was found by so many of our ancestors.

As Mayor of Dade County, Florida, where more than 325,000 Cubans reside, I am chief witness to the drama and tragedy of those Cubans who have come to our shores; I am witness to the contribution they have made to our country; and I am witness to and affirm that this contribution more than compensates for the \$5 million allocated toward the operation of the freedom flights.

I sincerely hope that the liberty and hope symbolized by the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor will not be defrauded by the Senate nor the House, in spite of the fact that there are some in our country who have, indeed, lost sight of what is represented by this statue and instead measure the price of liberty in dollars and cents.

I wish, today, to reaffirm the position I have taken in the past and declare myself unequivocally in favor of the Cuba-Miami air-lift and say that never before has a migration contributed so much to our culture and economy as the migration of those who are suffering from communist persecution just 90 miles from our shores.

Respectfully submitted.

STEPHEN P. CLARK,

Major, Metropolitan-Dade County, Fla.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of continued funding of the Cuban refugee airlift. In doing so, I speak also in support of the continued adherence by the United States to its international commitments, to its humanitarian traditions, and to its strong moral commitment to all of those Cubans who have lost everything because, in good faith, they registered to leave Cuba on an airlift that we established to allow them to do just that.

Over 235,000 Cubans have come to the United States on the airlift since it began on December 1, 1965. Over 100,000 are still awaiting their turn. Who are these people? What happens to them when they get here?

I would recall that the guiding principle of the memorandum of understanding between the United States and Cuba which established the airlift is "the humanitarian task of reuniting divided families." As such, the airlift is, in fact, a family reunion scheme. Almost 65 percent of those who have come on it are the wives and children of Cuban males already in the United States or who are coming to the United States with their families. Of the remainder, over 26 percent are professional and managerial people, clerical and sales personnel, and skilled workers.

It is said that the costs of bringing these people to the United States, and of caring for them when they get here, are too much for the United States to bear. It costs about \$17 each to bring them here. Soon after arrival, eight out of 10 become fully self-supporting. They bring valuable and needed skills. They are known as hard workers throughout the United States. The businesses they have established provide employment not only to fellow refugees but to native Americans as well. And most important and relevant, the estimated taxes paid by Cuban refugees in the United States far exceed the cost of this program.

It is also said that we are doing Castro a favor by continuing the airlift—that we are taking all of the people he wants

to get rid of. But he himself has been complaining that we are getting many of the people he wants to keep. Over the past year and more he has been complaining that Cuba's shortage of technically qualified people is holding back its economic progress toward communism. He has complained that a lack of qualified teachers has contributed to the problems caused by a poorly staffed educational system. The airlift has brought over 61,000 persons of this kind, including over 2,000 physicians, and countless dentists, architects, nurses, and other professional people.

I submit that abruptly cutting off the Cuban refugee airlift is not the way to deal with a people who give more to us than they receive from us. It is not the way to "punish" Castro—we would merely be providing him a way out of an embarrassing situation. And, most importantly, it is not the way to reward the hopes and dreams of the many thousands of people who, literally at our invitation, signed up for the airlift years ago and have been patiently waiting for their turn on the airplane—waiting while working in the fields, after having been dispossessed of their jobs, homes and belongings because they choose our way of life rather than that offered to them in their own homeland by Castro and his Communist cohorts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to indicate my support for continuing the airlift of refugees from Cuba. To do otherwise would be unconscionable, unless viable alternative arrangements are immediately available to permit the exit of Cubans wishing to leave their homeland to join their family members in this country.

The able Senators from Florida have fully outlined the situation, so I will not burden the record with lengthy comment at this time. Let me just say that I feel very strongly that our country has a very heavy moral obligation to welcome those Cubans, whose names remain on the active waiting lists for airlift to Miami. To abandon them—when they have waited for so many years in an atmosphere of hostility and harassment—would grossly violate a national commitment and the humanitarian traditions of our people.

I fully understand and appreciate the rationale of those who would end the airlift. As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, I share their deep concern over the escalating costs of the Cuban refugee program, especially those costs involving welfare. Over the past year the subcommittee has made a definitive inquiry into the program and there appears to be a number of areas where savings could be made. The findings of this inquiry are currently under review, and I anticipate that a subcommittee report will be issued soon.

But this is really an issue separate from what is at stake today. At stake today is a national commitment to welcome refugees—who in good faith added their names to a list some 5 years ago, with the assurance of two Governments that they would be able to join relatives elsewhere.

To snatch away this hope would be unjust and inhumane.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, one of our country's oldest and most honored traditions is that of providing shelter to the oppressed. We all recall the storm of indignation which arose when this tradition was violated last year in the case of the Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka, who was tragically refused safe haven on a U.S. Coast Guard ship. I fear that this tradition would suffer if the freedom flights from Cuba are terminated.

We have a sacred commitment to the Cubans who have risked their lives and fortunes by stating their intention to come to the United States to reunite with their families. They have lost their jobs and have been persecuted because of their decision to leave Cuba. They have been waiting to come for more than 5 years, and during this time the indignities they have been forced to endure at the hands of the Cuban Government have been eased only by the promise of their eventual departure to the United States. To deny them this hope and to renege on our pledge would be a tragic abrogation of our ideals and a violation of our given word. It would discourage the hopes of men everywhere who look to the United States as the land of the free.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the United States, from its founding, has enjoyed a reputation throughout the world as a place of refuge and asylum for the persecuted and the dispossessed. I believe it would be a grievous error now to reverse this proud humanitarian policy by abruptly eliminating the transportation program for persons who wish to leave Cuba.

I am advised that there are now, in Cuba, from 40,000 to 65,000 persons who have made known their intention to leave their homeland—many of them having done so as long as 5 years ago—and to emigrate to the United States. In most cases, these people have either given up or been deprived of their possessions and their jobs. They are in limbo, awaiting clearance and transportation. By ending the transportation program abruptly and without notice, as the committee amendment proposes, the United States would break faith with these thousands who have looked to our country with hope.

Ending the transportation program would be a cruel act—an act that would, without exaggeration, deprive these people of their future.

If the transportation program is ended, I believe the result might well be a renewal of the efforts by Cubans to leave their country illegally, by whatever means are possible, including hijacking of aircraft and stealing of vessels, at great danger to themselves, and at the risk of international incidents in and over the Florida straits.

I hope very much that the Senate will vote to continue the transportation program and to uphold this country's enviable humanitarian reputation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished chairman if he would like to ask unanimous consent at this point that the committee amendments beginning on page 4, line

24, extending through line 8 on page 5 be adopted, inasmuch as there seems to be no opposition to these amendments?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand it, I do not know of any opposition to the resolution except the subject we are now discussing.

I further understand that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished Senator from Maryland are going to offer an amendment to cut back on defense by about \$8 billion dollars. They are about ready to begin their remarks. That will consume some time.

As I understand the agreement, we will not vote on any of these amendments until the end of the 4 hours allotted. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct. In view of the agreement, the Senate would not be voting on the first committee amendment until immediately following the vote on the amendment which is to be called up by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE).

Owing to the fact, as I understand it, that there is no opposition to the second committee amendment, I wondered if the distinguished chairman would like to ask unanimous consent that that amendment be agreed to so that the only thing remaining so far as committee amendments are concerned would be the first committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment on page 4, ending on page 5, be adopted, since I do not know of any opposition to it. Therefore, the only remaining amendments to vote on will be the pending one, that is, the committee amendment we are now discussing, and the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator is speaking of the amendment beginning on line 24, page 4; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is beginning on line 24 page 4, and ending on line 8 on page 5.

Mr. GURNEY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, the second committee amendment is agreed to by unanimous consent.

The amendment agreed to reads as follows:

On page 4, after line 23 insert:  
activities of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;  
salaries of supporting personnel, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services;

activities in support of Free Europe, Incorporated, and Radio Liberty, Incorporated, pursuant to authority contained in the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1487): *Provided*, That no other funds made available under this resolution shall be available for these activities;

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk. This is a modification of the amendment that we had printed earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read the modified amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I will explain it.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, line 2, before the semicolon at the end thereof insert a comma and the following: "except that such amounts for all military functions administered by the Department of Defense shall not exceed a rate equal to \$68,000,000,000 a year."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH).

The amendment proposes that during the life of the continuing resolution a ceiling be placed on the amount the Pentagon can spend for Department of Defense military functions at the annual rate of \$68 billion.

In fiscal year 1972, the budget proposes outlays for the Pentagon of \$75 billion. Congress has since added \$1.7 billion in pay raises. Our amendment, therefore, if effective for the full year, would reduce the rate of spending for the Pentagon from a \$76.7 billion rate to a \$68 billion rate. This is a cut of 11 percent, or \$8.7 billion at an annual rate.

It represents a smaller cut from fiscal year 1971 spending. This year the Pentagon spent \$73.4 billion. Our amendment would cut \$5.4 billion from the 1971 rate. This is a 7-percent cut. And, of course, it is this rate which the continuing resolution authorizes until August 6.

What this amendment does is provide for this reduction until August 6—only for the period from July 1 to August 6, which is about 37 days. Actually this would amount to about \$435 million during that period.

The effect of the amendment is simple. It would limit military spending between July 1 and August 6 to an annual rate of \$68 billion. It is as simple as that.

MILITARY SPENDING UP—VIETNAM SPENDING DOWN

There are many reasons why this amendment should pass. First and foremost, why should military spending go up while Vietnam spending and the Vietnam war are being wound down?

Who stole the peace dividend?

The incremental costs of the Vietnam war have been cut from \$24 billion, at the peak in fiscal year 1969, to \$8 billion for fiscal year 1972—or by \$16 billion.

Personnel in the military services are being reduced from 3.5 million at the peak of the Vietnam buildup, to 2.5 million at the end of next year. That is a cut of 1 million in military personnel. At \$10,000 per person, this should save \$10 billion. That would add up to a \$26 billion saving. But I am not talking about that much. Because it is true that some of this is overlapping, that is, that the cut in the Vietnam war is tied to some extent to our reduction of military spending, but taking that into account, some \$20 to \$22 billion in gross military cuts have occurred. But where has that sav-



June 29, 1971

ings gone? Even generous estimates for inflation and pay raises leave \$8 to \$10 billion unaccounted for. And next year the Pentagon proposes to spend from \$75 to \$77 billion, and is asking for \$77 billion in new obligational authority—the key to future spending.

Thus, in fiscal year 1972 the Pentagon is asking for the same \$77 billion it spent in fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970—the peak years of the Vietnam war.

The purpose of this amendment is to give the hard-pressed American taxpayer a share in the Vietnam savings which up until now the Pentagon has usurped for itself, and which it intends to usurp for itself next year as well.

THE PRIORITIES AMENDMENT

There is a second reason why this amendment should pass. This is the priorities amendment.

If we are going to have any opportunity to devote our Federal revenues to meeting the very serious problems of this country, they must come largely from some slowdown in military spending.

Former Budget Director Charles Schultz has told us that existing programs will use up every dollar of new revenues generated by an increase in the gross national product through fiscal year 1974 even if unemployment is reduced to 4 percent.

Unless we are prepared for huge deficits, for rigid economic controls over prices and wages, or gigantic tax increases, there is no other major way, except by cutting the military budget, to pay for the needed programs now proposed or enacted.

Unless we cut the military budget, there will be no funds to pay for new health programs, to enlarge the fight on pollution, to meet our national housing goals, for a Federal assumption of State and local welfare costs, or to put a floor under family income.

It is time the Congress and the Senate faced that hard, cruel, objective fact.

And, unless we relieve the pressure on the budget and on spending, the deficit will rise, inflation will increase, and our economy will remain in a condition which has been dubbed stag-flation—inflation and stagnation at the same time.

In this sense, this is the fiscal responsibility amendment.

THE PENTAGON OBJECTS

The Pentagon opposes this amendment. That is to be expected. In doing so they have brought up their heavy weapons. In a letter to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Secretary Laird claims that this small amendment would require "reductions up to 50 percent of our planned military and civilian manpower at the end of fiscal year 1972."

Secretary Laird also says it would require action of "up to a 40 percent cut-back in on-going weapons systems and 30 percent in operational levels."

That is a very artful expression by Secretary Laird. He is a brilliant man and he knows how to use language and how to persuade Congress and the public.

Note the words "up to 50 percent" and "up to 40 percent." That is ambiguous

language. Is he talking about 1 percent or 2 percent? And is he talking about all weapons systems or just up to 40 percent of one weapon?

It is obviously impossible that an 11-percent cut in proposed spending could bring a 50-percent cut in military and civilian manpower.

The fact is that the Secretary's language in opposition to this amendment is a form of "rhetorical overkill." It is political blunderbuss.

What we want is for the Pentagon to return to the taxpayer some of the \$10 billion in personnel cuts already made.

They can save money and improve efficiency by reforming procurement. What about reducing the \$33 billion in overruns the General Accounting Office reported for some 61 weapons systems?

IRRESPONSIBLE CHARGE

The Secretary charges that the amendment would create "a crisis in national security." That is an irresponsible and outrageous charge.

Last year—fiscal year 1971—the President initially proposed a military budget of \$71 billion—only \$3 billion above the \$68 billion we are proposing today. But last year we were spending \$13 billion in incremental costs in Vietnam. This year—the new fiscal year—we will be spending only \$8 billion. That is a cut of \$5 billion. How then can our proposal, which is only \$3 billion below what the President himself proposed a year ago, create a crisis in national security when Vietnam costs alone have been cut by \$5 billion?

But there is more proof than that. The National Urban Coalition this year proposed a \$60 billion military budget. Their estimate was based on detailed studies by former Pentagon experts, including Mr. Robert Benson, formerly in the comptrollers' office in the Defense Department, and the former comptroller of the Pentagon, Mr. Robert Anthony. This was a constructive, detailed, objective job done by those who have worked in the Pentagon. They proposed a \$60 billion budget this year. This could be done without endangering national security, according to these Pentagon experts. Thus, our modest \$68 billion ceiling, or a cut about half the size they propose, cannot possibly endanger national security. That is nonsense.

SCARE TACTICS

What we find here are scare tactics, not facts. These small cuts, with intelligent planning, could be put into effect without disruption. By cutting back the fat, the frills, and the waste, we could increase our military strength while reducing costs.

Look at the record. At the end of World War II, we cut military spending by over \$60 billion in 2 years. Some 10 million men and women were discharged from the military. That was a cut some 15 to 20 times bigger than we propose here. There was no mass unemployment. No economic catastrophe. Unemployment in 1947 stood at only 3.4 percent.

What we are really being told is that military spending is a form of welfare or a gigantic WPA project. Instead of re-ordering our priorities and providing for

an orderly reconversion from the Vietnam war, we are told we must continue a wasteful procurement system, which the Deputy Secretary of Defense called a "mess," an Army of a million men where less than one in 10 is a combat soldier, an emergency Reserve force and National Guard of almost 1 million men at an annual cost of \$2.4 billion, which was not even called up in the Vietnam emergency, and to continue funding many redundant overseas bases numbering some 400 major and almost 3,000 minor ones scattered in 30 countries throughout the world 25 years after the end of World War II.

That is where the money can be saved. Instead of threatening a blunderbuss, the Pentagon should start a major efficiency drive.

Our amendment could start the Pentagon down the road to military efficiency, combat readiness, and reform in procurement.

There is another reason why this amendment should go into effect. In the last 4 fiscal years, Congress has appropriated almost \$8 billion less than the Pentagon has spent. How can they spend more than we appropriate? The answer is that they have a backlog of almost \$40 billion in obligated and unobligated funds to draw from. When Congress cuts their funds, they dip into this multibillion-dollar kitty to help make up the difference. Here is the size of the kitty.

The Pentagon has \$27 billion in their procurement backlog—about a year and a half's supply. But they are asking for \$19 billion more this year.

They have a \$3.9 billion backlog in R. & D. funds. That is more than half the \$7.88 billion they want in new funds in fiscal year 1972.

They have a \$2.7 billion construction backlog—more than double the \$1.2 billion spent in fiscal year 1971.

They have a \$2.8 billion backlog in operation and maintenance, \$892 million of military personnel funds, and \$2.2 billion in "other" balances.

Altogether the Pentagon has stashed away in its obligated and unobligated balances almost \$40 billion backlog.

That is why, like Old Man River, even when we cut the budget, Pentagon spending just keeps rolling along.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record two tables, one showing the Federal fund obligated balances and the other an analysis of Federal fund unobligated balances.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 1. Federal fund obligated balances  
 [In millions of dollars]  
 Obligated balances end of fiscal year 1972

Department of Defense—Military:	
Procurement .....	\$16,992
Research and development .....	3,896
Operation and maintenance .....	2,816
Construction .....	1,314
Military personnel .....	892
Other .....	1,185
Total .....	27,095

SOURCE: Special Analyses G, Table G-3, Budget of the United States, 1972 p. 103.

TABLE 2. Analysis of Federal fund unobligated balances

[In millions of dollars]  
Unobligated balances end of fiscal year 1972  
Department of Defense—Military:

Procurement .....	9,030
Construction .....	1,421
Research and development .....	956
Other .....	1,042

Total .....	12,349
Total: Obligated and unobligated Department of Defense balances, end of year 1972 .....	39,444

SOURCE: Special Analyses G, Table G-2, Budget of the United States, 1972, p. 99.

## NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. We offer our amendment now, on this bill, because now is the time to act. The fiscal year is just beginning. And the only way Congress has to control military spending is by placing a ceiling—a limitation—on the Pentagon.

Some will say, wait for the authorization bill. Wait for the appropriations bills.

We did that last year. And we offered a similar amendment to the authorization bill, the manager of that bill argued that it came too late in the year for the Pentagon to make plans to cut the budget. He waxed eloquent about how a cut in September would not be effective until even more of the fiscal year had passed, making it impossible for the Pentagon to absorb the cuts in an orderly way.

We offer this amendment now, on this bill, as a specific response to that argument. I hope Senators will not now argue that it comes too early in the year.

## REASSERT CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

In addition, there is exact relationship between appropriations, on the one hand, and outlays or actual spending, on the other. Outlays are determined by the Pentagon. Unless we place a limit on them, we lose control over military spending.

That is the reason why the more than \$13 billion Congress has cut from Pentagon requests in the last 3 years has resulted in a drop in outlays of only \$3 billion.

This is the "Return Control Over Pentagon Spending to the Congress" amendment.

Finally, there are those who say, I favor specific cuts but I am against imposing ceilings as a matter of principle. There are two answers to that.

First, a large number of those who say this, did not vote for the specific cuts to military weapons systems when they were offered. It was argued that the Pentagon experts were the ones who knew where to cut and that we should leave the cuts to them. If those who in the past made that argument will vote for this amendment, it should carry overwhelmingly.

Second, most Senators who have been Members of this body throughout the past 4 years have, in fact, voted at one time or another to impose a ceiling on expenditures of one kind or another. When a Senator says he is against "ceiling" amendments, look at the record. In almost every case one can say to him, "But Senator, you voted for the Cotton

amendment in 1970 or the Williams amendment in the same year."

For all of these reasons, this amendment should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The time for the quorum call will be taken equally from both sides.

The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. 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. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the original amendment that was to be proposed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished Senator from Maryland dealt, as I understood it, with expenditures. I wonder—and I do not see them in the Chamber—whether the amendment as now proposed by them affects expenditures or appropriations. I am assuming that the original intent is still there, which is to impose a limitation on Department of Defense expenditures for military functions.

The reason why I am asking that is simply this: We have a backlog of several billion dollars subject to expenditure in the Defense Department. For instance, we are building today two large nuclear powered aircraft carriers, for which the money was appropriated several years ago. We have a lot of other programs going on for which the moneys have been appropriated, and they are subject to existing valid contracts that involved fiscal year 1972 expenditures of about \$20 billion.

Mr. President, my position on reduction of expenditures by the Department of Defense and all other Government agencies, I am sure, is well known to Senators. However, I think the proper way to accomplish this is through the appropriation process, which requires Congress and the Committees on Appropriations to make a thorough review of the appropriations requested by the various agencies, and to make reductions based on this examination of the requirements.

The Department of Defense subcommittee has held extensive hearings on the requests totaling \$73.2 billion that will be considered in the regular Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1972. For the most part we have completed our hearings and are in a position to report the bill shortly after it passes the House.

I have in mind certain areas where I believe substantial cuts can be made. However, I cannot support this more or less meat-ax approach for cutting expenditures for military functions. Furthermore, I do not think we should give to the executive branch the right to

allocate such a reduction without any guidelines.

The appropriations for military functions involve about 50 different accounts, and if the pending amendment is adopted a system for the control of expenditures for each of these accounts will have to be set up. Of course, this cannot be accomplished by July 1.

The total of \$75 billion for military functions expenditures involves appropriations for "military personnel," "Reserve personnel," "National Guard personnel," "retired pay," "operation and maintenance," "procurement," "research and development" and "military construction."

Of this total of \$75 billion, about \$20 billion is required for going programs under contract. A large amount is required for fixed charges for the support of military and civilian personnel. As I recall there is only about \$15 billion for expenditures for new programs.

When you consider that about \$60 billion is required for personnel support costs and contracts for going programs it is clear that this meat-ax approach is not a good one. I think it would be a fatal mistake, so far as our security is concerned, for us to adopt the pending amendment.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will leave this matter in the hands of the Appropriations Committee. As I have indicated, we have held hearings on the subject for weeks; and it strikes me that we would be in a better position, as members of the Appropriations Committee, to tell where the cuts should be made in respect to the appropriations for fiscal year 1972.

For fiscal 1971, as I recall the figures, expenditures for military functions exceeded appropriations by \$1.9 billion, and this difference came from appropriations previously made. Are we going to cut back on that? Are we going to renege? Are we going to stop contracts that have been in effect for a long time on the construction of many ships, aircraft and other weapons that are now being constructed? Are we going to stop repairing certain ships that we now have under contract? Are we going to stop programs that have been in effect for 4 or 5 years?

If we make a meat-ax approach, as is contemplated under this amendment, I repeat that either some of these on-going programs will have to be terminated, and this would involve substantial sums for contract termination costs.

As I said earlier, it is our hope to have the Department of Defense appropriation bill before the Senate soon—I hope before August 6, if the required authorizations are enacted by that time.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, I have had the full cooperation of the entire committee, particularly the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. We sat day after day, listening to many witnesses on the fiscal 1972 appropriation requests, and it is my sincere belief that we are in a better position to say what ought to be done as to the appropriation bill for 1972 than to simply take an amendment such as the one now pending.

Before the debate is over, I would like to find out from the sponsors of this amendment what is going to become of all the programs that we now have in effect—the procurement and construction programs. Will this cut apply to those programs? How will this amendment affect the moneys necessary for our defense—that is, to pay the men and women in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. It is bound to affect them.

This amendment has been changed from its original text, and it now applies for only 5 weeks. That would involve a large amount of work in the Defense Department, where there are about 50 different accounts, and each of these accounts would have to be made subject to expenditure controls. It would mean, in my opinion, the hiring of many more clerks to do this work.

We do not know where this cut is going to be made. The amendment is not specific as to where it is to be made. It will be something that will be left in the hands of the executive, and with the executive it might be pure guesswork as to which of these 50 accounts must be charged with what. It offers a tremendous job which may entail the work of a few more thousand clerks, in order to get the figures straight and in order for the Department of Defense to do a job in keeping with what the amendment contemplates.

The Department of Defense subcommittee has held extensive hearings—running for 6 weeks—on the requests totaling \$73.2 billion which will be considered in the regular Department of Defense appropriation bill. I can assure the Members of the Senate that the Committee on Appropriations will recommend some substantial reductions in these requests, but these recommendations will not endanger national security, as, in my opinion, will be done now if the amendment is adopted.

The proposed amendment providing for a ceiling of \$68 billion on fiscal year 1972 expenditures for military functions of the Department of Defense represents a reduction of \$6,975,000,000 in the estimated \$74,975,000,000 expenditures for these purposes as set out in the President's budget. Furthermore, the House of Representatives has approved one version of a military pay increase that will cost about \$1.7 billion during fiscal year 1972, and the Senate has passed a different version of a military pay increase which would cost about the same amount. For our discussion of this amendment, I think we have to assume military pay increases coming out of conference on the draft extension bill that will increase fiscal year 1972 expenditures for military functions by \$1.7 billion. Therefore, the proposed amendment represents a reduction of \$8,675,000,000 in the adjusted planned expenditures.

I regret that we did not have time to hold hearings on the proposed amendment. As I stated, we have spent 6 weeks in hearings on the request for appropri-

ations of \$73.2 billion. A comparable period would be required to review fully the impact on national security of an \$8.7 billion reduction in military functions expenditures.

In considering the proposed amendment, one has to take into consideration the fact that the estimated fiscal year 1972 expenditures for military functions are based on the availability of \$77.8 billion in new appropriations requested for fiscal year 1972 and \$37.7 billion provided in prior fiscal years, as I indicated a moment ago. In other words, the planned expenditure program of \$75 billion for military functions during fiscal year 1972 is based on a total available for expenditure of \$115.5 billion.

This is the amount of money, as I said a moment ago, that will be available for expenditure during fiscal 1972. It has been appropriated and when it will be expended will depend largely on progress made on programs previously funded as well as fiscal 1972 funding.

The source of the appropriations on which the planned \$75 billion expenditure estimate is based is another important factor. The total Department of Defense planned expenditures of \$76 billion, which includes approximately \$1 billion for military assistance programs, will come from the following appropriation sources: fiscal year 1972 funds, \$55.1 billion; fiscal year 1971 funds, \$13.6 billion; fiscal year 1970 and prior year funds, \$7.9 billion; budget concepts adjustments, minus \$0.6 billion.

Mr. President, these are the types of factors that need to be thoroughly reviewed in extensive hearings before we vote on an amendment such as we are now considering.

I did request Secretary Laird to review the proposal as it was transmitted to me by its sponsors on June 18. Secretary Laird replied by letter dated June 24, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1971.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
Chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations,  
U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the opportunity to furnish comments on the proposed Proxmire-Mathias amendment to the Continuing Resolution, in response to your request for our views on this very important matter.

The amendment would limit Defense expenditures for military functions to \$68 billion. In support of the amendments, the proponents claim that the Department of Defense is spending \$73.4 billion when only \$68.7 billion was appropriated and further, that expenditures in excess of appropriations is a consistent practice of the Department.

The attached statement outlines the erroneous basis upon which the proponents attempt to support the amendment and the very serious impact it would have on our national defense posture.

The supporting data furnished by the proponents contain very significant errors: Appropriations for FY 1971 are misstated.

The amount appropriated was \$71.4 billion—not \$68.7 billion. After adding the \$2.0 billion the Congress directed Defense to use from prior year balances, Defense expenditures programmed at \$73.4 billion are equal to the program approved by Congress. Apparently the proponents of the amendment overlooked the Second Supplemental Appropriation of 1971.

The \$10.4 billion claimed expenditures FY 1968-71 above appropriations is incorrect. The correct figure is \$7.4 billion and this is derived only by using the years selected. If you compare the period FY 1966-72, which more accurately covers the cycle of war spending, Defense expenditures are \$7.6 billion less than appropriations.

The proponents failed to understand the control your Committee and the Congress exercise over the use of prior year fund balances.

Defense has been required by the Congress to apply billions of such balances over the years to fund current programs, thereby reducing the appropriations enacted. A review of the record by the proponents would have shown the steady decrease in Defense unexpanded balances since the fiscal year 1967 peak, reflecting the actions of the Congress to reduce these balances.

The above factors are serious; but the impact of the amendment on Defense programs would be so extreme as to create a crisis in national security. In summary, the amendment would require unacceptable actions involving:

Reductions up to 50% of our planned military and civilian manpower at the end of fiscal year 1972.

Up to a 40% cutback in on-going weapons systems and 30% in operational levels.

Reductions would be far in excess of the percentage dollar cut because of necessary phasing, transportation, terminal leave, severance pay, etc. The attached statement provides the detailed computation underlying these required reduction actions.

Your Committee has made a detailed review of the planned force structure and operating levels and is aware that significant progress is being made to increase the cost effectiveness of Defense programs and to improve management throughout the Department. This review has emphasized the fact that in dollars of real buying power, the Defense budget is back to the pre-war level while still financing almost \$8.0 billion of war costs. Personnel are 133 thousand below pre-war levels indicating the progress being made in eliminating unnecessary overhead staffing as well as force reductions consistent with the Nixon Doctrine.

The Proxmire-Mathias proposal would endanger the national security posture of the United States and should be defeated. Your support in opposition to the amendment is urgently requested.

Sincerely,

MELVIN R. LAIRD.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—APPROPRIATIONS AND OUTLAYS, MILITARY FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FIGURES PRESENTED WITH SENATOR PROXMIRE'S LETTER OF JUNE 18, 1971  
(Dollars in millions)

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Outlays	Excess of outlays over appropriations
1968	76.4	77.4	1.0
1969	76.1	77.9	1.8
1970	74.3	77.2	2.9
1971	68.7	73.4	4.7
Total			10.4

CORRECT FIGURES  
(Dollars in millions)

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Outlays	Excess of—	
			Outlays over appropriations	Appropriations over outlays
1966	61,839	54,178		7,661
1967	71,935	67,457		4,478
1968	76,332	77,373	1,041	
1969	76,221	77,877	1,656	
1970	74,386	77,150	2,764	
1971	71,449	73,370	1,921	
1972 (request)	77,804	74,975		2,829
Totals	509,966	502,380	7,382	14,968

Note: Net excess of appropriations over outlays, fiscal year 1966-72, cumulative (7 years), 7,586. The table does not include figures for military assistance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in this letter, the Secretary points out that there is no direct relationship between the total appropriated for military functions and the expenditures for military functions for a given fiscal year. This is true because of the fact that the major portion of the appropriations provided for procurement, R.D.T. & E., and military construction do not result in expenditures during the year in which appropriated. However, more importantly, the Secretary goes on to state:

... the impact of the amendment on Defense programs would be so extreme as to create a crisis in national security. In summary, the amendment would require unacceptable actions involving:

Reductions up to 50 percent of our planned military and civilian manpower at the end of fiscal year 1972.

Up to 40 percent cutback in on-going weapons systems and 30 percent in operational levels.

What I was talking about a while ago. As I said, if such an amendment is adopted, there is no telling the effect it will have on our national security.

Based on 6 weeks of hearings on the planned defense programs for fiscal year 1972 and Secretary Laird's letter, I am convinced that the adoption of the proposed amendment would have a disastrous effect on our defense posture.

Mr. President, I do hope that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILES). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from Wisconsin and Maryland (Mr. PROXMIRE and Mr. MATHIAS).

As the ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, I cannot help but resent to some extent the offering of an amendment that would cut \$8.7 billion from fiscal year 1972 Defense Appropriations when neither of the sponsors even bothered to attend the approximately 2 months of hearings. And when our subcommittee, which listened carefully to both the proponents and opponents of the Defense Appropriations request, has not even had a chance to take any action as yet.

Naturally, action by the Senate Appropriations Committee itself cannot come until after the House sends their appropriations bill to the Senate. This amendment is so out of the ordinary that it is subject to a point of order under the rules of the Senate, unless the amendment has been corrected in the meantime, or changed. The Proxmire-Mathias amendment would be more properly offered to the forthcoming Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. President, what we are asked to consider today amounts to a reduction of \$7 billion in the fiscal year 1972 planned expenditures for the military functions of the Department of Defense. When the expenditure impact of the \$1.7 billion in the military pay raise proposals that have recently been passed by both the House and Senate are considered, we are actually considering a reduction of \$8.7 billion in the adjusted total of \$76.7 billion in estimated expenditures of the Department of Defense.

There are a number of reasons for my opposition to this amendment.

The first of these is its effect on the defense posture of our Nation. I am certain that the authors of this measure do not wish to strip us of the means of adequately defending ourselves. To a degree, at least, this is what it would do.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird in a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator ELLENDER, stated:

The Proxmire-Mathias proposal would endanger the national security posture of the United States and should be defeated.

Actually, the Defense budget request for fiscal year 1972 will provide approximately the same level of expenditures for defense as we had in 1964, prior to the Vietnam war. This results from inflation which has added \$25 billion to the Defense budget since 1964. Without adding a single man or piece of new equipment, the 1964 Defense program would cost about \$76 billion in 1972.

For military personnel, for example, costs have increased by 85 percent since 1964 as a result of pay raises necessitated by inflation. For civilians in the Defense Department, this equals about 56 percent. Between 1968 and 1972 alone civilian salaries have increased by 37.7 percent.

Retired pay costs have tripled since 1964 because of increases related to the cost of living and especially the greater number of personnel now on the retired rolls. During the same period, the cost of living has risen by almost 28 percent.

Since the peak of the war in 1968 the Defense Department has made marked reductions in both manpower and contract spending. Unfortunately, these reductions have not had the dollar impact that one would normally associate with rather widespread reductions because inflation has eaten up the planned savings.

Since 1968 civilian and military personnel have been reduced by 1.2 million. At the same time total personnel costs have sharply increased by over \$7 billion.

In a like manner total purchases have been reduced by almost a third from the peak war spending of over \$45 billion—\$6 billion of this cut, too, has been eaten up by rising prices.

Thus, although our Defense strength

is well below the wartime peak, inflation has escalated costs tremendously.

During the last 9 years, the Department of Defense has experienced a cumulative inflation of 49.2 percent. This means that each dollar we appropriate or spend this next fiscal year will produce just about half the defense we obtained from a dollar 9 years ago. As a matter of fact, in a general sense, the cost overruns on such items as the F-14, and the C-5A that have plagued the Department of Defense in recent years can be largely attributed to the unforeseen effects of inflation.

This amendment, therefore, would have a far more serious effect on our military strength than the 10-percent cut in spending which the proposal would impose. The Defense Department has stated that such action would require tremendous cuts in both military and civilian personnel, extensive contract termination, a greatly reduced operating level for our ships, aircraft and land forces, as well as extensive base closures. In today's world I do not believe that we can afford to decimate our military forces, put huge numbers of civilians out of work, and jeopardize our national security.

Disregarding all of these comparisons, the Defense Department today, measured in terms of aircraft, ships, and personnel is at the lowest strength we have had in 20 years. For this reason alone, I strongly oppose the amendment.

But there is another reason why I oppose this amendment, a reason that involves the very nature of our work in the Senate. This amendment is not good legislative procedure. Although I am sure that the sponsors of the amendment do not so intend it, the amendment makes a mockery of all the work of the Appropriations Committees and Armed Services Committees on the budget and authorization requests of the Department of Defense.

The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee has conducted many weeks of hearings on the Defense Department budget for fiscal year 1972. Its members have conducted a searching scrutiny into every important aspect of Defense appropriations. I have attended every one of these hearings and I can unequivocally state that never in my experience has there been a more painstaking review of military requests.

Last year substantial reductions were accomplished. I hope and believe that sizable reductions will be made in this year's requests and without harming our vital defense posture. But this amendment would profoundly affect the orderly and studied recommendations of the committee.

We are asked to accept this proposal without hearings and without consideration of its effect.

Some Members might question why expenditures presently are expected to be above requested appropriations. Let me explain. In the first place, there is little direct relationship between appropriations and expenditures for a specific fiscal year. Appropriations that are made in 1 year, particularly in the areas of procurement and research, are translated into expenditures not only in that year but for several years thereafter.

June 29, 1971

For example, an aircraft carrier for which funds are provided in a given year will have an expenditure impact over a period of about 5 years. Unless we were to go back to the contract authorization method of appropriating, which was largely discarded years ago, research and production money must be provided several years in advance of its use. This is the normal procedure. To change this so that expenditures and appropriations are roughly comparable at this time would mean a reversal of recent past decisions of the Congress.

There is another reason why expenditures, particularly in recent years, have exceeded appropriations. Congress in the last 3 fiscal years has provided four pay raises for the military and civilian personnel of the Defense Department. This amounts to a 43.9 percent pay increase for military personnel and a 33.1 percent increase for civilian personnel in the DOD. The total amount of money added to the Defense appropriations bill by these actions for solving increases is \$10.5 billion. Subsequent to these pay raise authorizations by Congress, the appropriations committees have had to increase Defense appropriations to pay for them. Two of these pay increases occurred during the present fiscal year. No doubt, we may have two or three more next year.

Mr. President, these are just two of the many examples that could be given as to why expenditures currently exceed appropriations.

History provides us with a warning. At the end of World War II the United States disarmed unilaterally. Let us not repeat this without being fully aware of the possible consequences of unchecked aggression.

For these and many other reasons, Mr. President, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from North Dakota yield briefly?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I point out that I think the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Louisiana have made excellent statements and very persuasive statements. However, the Senator asks why we offer this amendment to this particular resolution. He says that it would be much better if we wait for the military procurement bill to come up, possibly in the coming month.

Mr. President, I quote from a statement by the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) when we tried to do this last year. The Senator from Mississippi said:

If we impose a strong reduction now of, say, over \$2 billion, it would have to be absorbed within the last six months of the calendar year. It is just a fact of life that we have already cleared July and August. We are operating on a continuing resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I continue reading:

This bill cannot possibly be passed and signed by the President in less than a month from now. And that will be three months gone.

If we put this amendment in the bill that is coming before the Senate later, we will have the same problem as we had last year. There is no satisfactory vehicle into which to put this provision. All this does is provide that it will be for the life of the continuing resolution, until August 6. Then we can take another look at it.

So I submit to the distinguished Senator that I understand his point. I think it is a good point. We would have preferred to wait for many reductions, but if we are going to limit spending for fiscal year 1972, we have to make an effort to do it before fiscal year 1972 begins.

Mr. YOUNG. The example the Senator gave is not apropos. The Senator was talking about the statement by the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) with regard to an appropriation after about one-half of the fiscal year had expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It was in August.

Mr. YOUNG. Now, we are considering a continuing resolution which provides an extension to August 6, or for only about a month. Certainly the Senator should give some consideration to the Committee on Appropriations and let them have a chance to look over the cuts.

Undoubtedly Senators should have an opportunity to propose cuts, but to do this on a resolution that is only effective until August 6, is bad procedure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is only for the next 35 days and it does give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to decide what to do at that point. If we do not accept it at that time the Department of Defense is in a position of moving ahead on the \$73.4 billion expenditure during the first part of the fiscal year.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator weakened his own case by trying to impose reductions of this magnitude for only 35 days.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The reduction would be \$435 million for the 35-day period.

Mr. YOUNG. How does the Senator expect the Department of Defense to apply the reduction? Would the Senator have them cancel some production contracts? They could reduce personnel but personnel has already been reduced by over 1 million since 1968, and this reduction is continuing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are many ways, as the Senator knows, that they could apply it. A reduction in personnel would be the big way. That covers a little more than one-half of the expenditure. They could cut personnel more. In addition, they could cut back on bases. Or they could speed up the withdrawal of men from Europe and Vietnam. They could make some hard, tough choices in procurement.

This is only about a 7-percent reduction at the rate at which they would be allowed to spend under the continuing resolution. So it is not the immense cut the Department of Defense officials have said it would be.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think that there is a corporation in the United States with a worth of a billion dollars that would be able to effect a 10-percent cut in expenditures in a month or 35 days, much less a huge department of the Government, like the Department of Defense. It involves intricate procedures, military personnel, and even the war in Vietnam.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment by the Senators from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) and Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) which would set an aggregate ceiling of \$68 million on funds to be expended for Department of Defense military functions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. I do so for the following reasons:

A reasonable ceiling on defense spending has as its principal purpose an overall reduction in defense spending to create a more efficient use of the Nation's material and human resources. Billions of defense dollars are wasted annually through excessive layers of civilian and military staffs, inordinate coordination and duplication, impractical, overlapping and unneeded weapon system, and wasteful stockpiling of nuclear armaments. Such crippling and unproductive defense spending is a major cause of inflation that consumes the taxpayer's earnings.

By curbing overall military expenditures, the amendment will force the President and Department of Defense to restructure defense priorities within the imposed dollar ceiling and undertake significant economy changes of a nature that will not be offset by increased spending in other areas. The ceiling will impose moderate cuts which can be absorbed on a timely basis without endangering national security.

Moreover, the amendment gives the Congress power not just to appropriate funds but to control spending. The Department of Defense consistently spends amounts in excess of congressional appropriations. A ceiling allows Congress to reduce overall military spending by setting a limit, but leaves the specific determination of where to restructure to the President and the Department of Defense with their substantially greater access to information. Once Congress's authority over all spending is established, Congress can deal with specific expenditures without fear that these saving programs will be offset by increased spending in other areas.

In Vietnam, for example, the annual incremental costs of the war have been cut back over \$16 billion from the war's peak. Military manpower will be down 1 million men by the year's end. These significant reductions are not reflected in defense spending, however, as the military budget is increasing. The new budget's estimated \$4 billion savings due to continued winding down of the Vietnam war will more than be consumed in other areas.

Over the years, military programs have had first call on our Nation's resources. Overall military cost reductions are desperately needed if we are to reorient our national priorities and provide for domestic programs aimed toward overcoming social and economic deprivation, waste of our Nation's resources, urban decay, pollution, and many other domestic problems which need improvement to make our industrial automated societies fit for human existence. Unless excessive defense spending is constrained, revenues and resources generated from increased economic growth will be consumed by the military with serious consequences to human development.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the above reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, once again we are debating the significant issue of military spending and national priorities.

There is no Senator in this Chamber who wishes to jeopardize our national security or the vital interests of this Nation. Every Senator knows that we must be equipped with a strong and viable national defense posture in our lawless world.

The question, however, of spending billions of dollars for our military needs must be approached in a rational and realistic manner. As Richard Barnett has stated in his fine book "The Economy of Death":

The greatest danger of making a religion of national security is that it discourages the application of either reason or experience to human affairs.

For over a generation the American people have been confronted with a continual buildup of our massive military arsenal. We must question ever more closely and ever more seriously, the real needs of our society and the true needs of our national defense. There have been many careful studies by many highly qualified individuals, committees and groups concluding that for far more drastic reduction called for in the pending amendment are in order.

For example, the National Urban Coalition, in its exhaustive, detailed counter budget, recommends a cut of \$24 billion—making a strong case for the view that with the military budget conservatively down to \$50.4 billion we would have a stronger, more secure Nation than we do under the current far higher military budget with its many wasteful and inefficient programs.

Although we do not in this amendment purpose the major changes recommended by the National Urban Coalition we should take every safe and sound step we can to eliminate costly military programs which do not really enhance our national security.

The Proxmire-Mathias amendment would limit military outlays to approximately \$68 billion. This is clearly adequate for our national defense needs.

The effect of this amendment is to avoid imposing specific cuts on the ex-

perts in the Department of Defense. They are not, by this amendment, required, for example, to eliminate the B-1 bomber, while I and some other Senators happened to support, while other Senators oppose it, nor are they required to eliminate the AEM which I and some other Senators happen to oppose, while other Senators support it.

The amendment simply tells the Pentagon: Sharpen your pencils, think this through with all the experience and expertise at your command, eliminate duplication, waste, and cut away at those programs of the least proven and most dubious value, and provide us with the most secure defense you can at a cut of \$68 billion.

Finally, Mr. President, we must keep in mind that we are not only discussing the needs of our national defense. In a broader, more significant sense, we are really discussing the critical issue of a deep and fundamental reordering of our national priorities. We must pass this amendment so the process of altering our priorities can begin in a meaningful manner.

In the ultimate analysis our national security does not depend alone on our weapons and our military might. It depends also, to a very, very great degree, on our internal strength, solidarity and security—on our ability to provide for all Americans adequate food, clothing and shelter, and a true equality of opportunity to live a life of one's choosing. It is the hope and faith that this will give to every American in our way of life that will, most of all, make our Nation a secure nation.

That is truly our real security and that is what this amendment attempts to provide. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) 10 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the long debate on military spending once again leaves me somewhat perplexed. As last year, I find I agree with most of the serious arguments made by the opponents of this amendment to cut the Defense budget. I agree that the Soviet Union has made massive gains in recent years in the quantity and quality of their weapons. I agree that in many respects their posture is now comparable to ours. I agree with my distinguished colleague, Senator JACKSON, that—

Those politicians who downgrade national security and denigrate national defense are mistaken. Too many of them fail to recognize what is really going on in the world—and some of them seem to care less . . .

Senator JACKSON said:

Those who say we must take risks for peace by cutting the meat from our military muscle are not proposing risks for peace, they are unwittingly proposing policies that would heighten the risk of confrontation and war . . .

I agree with Senator JACKSON. National security and deterrence must be paramount national priorities. Any politicians who downgrade these indispensable objectives—who urge cutting the sinews of our national strength—indeed reveal a twisted view of international realities. For it is clear that the Soviet Union will

not become less belligerent as the balance of power shifts in its favor.

I agree, moreover, with the seven members of President Nixon's Blue Ribbon Defense Panel who declared that—

The consequences of becoming a second rate power, even if national survival is not threatened, could be seriously detrimental to U.S. interests. They are right in contending that the road to peace has never been through unilateral disarmament . . .

As I said last year at this time, only a strong America can insure a safe world—if the military strength of the United States is in jeopardy, so is the global balance of military power that has preserved peace among the great powers since World War II.

In fact, it is because I agree with these principles, asserted by Senator JACKSON as well as by the President and his Secretary of Defense, it is because I agree that world peace will depend in coming decades on the maintenance of American military power, it is because I agree that the American lead in the arms race is threatened for the first time since World War II, it is because of our new security problems—not in spite of them—that I advocate this amendment to set a ceiling of \$68 billion on military outlays for fiscal year 1972. I believe this move is urgently needed as a first step toward a thoroughgoing reappraisal and reorientation of our defense policies—a first step to halt the current deterioration in our long-range national security.

And may I say I am perplexed by those who believe that advocates of this amendment "fail to recognize what is going on in the world." How, may I ask, after a decade when the United States spent nearly twice as much money on defense as the Soviet Union, approximately 60 percent more on strategic systems, and perhaps 50 percent more on research and development—all in constant dollars—how, I ask, after such a decade can we seriously suppose that our problem is inadequate spending? The fact is that the deterioration in our national security position has little to do with how much money we have spent—except to the extent that the availability of relatively unlimited funds has cultivated improvident and undisciplined military spending policies.

These policies might have been tolerable during a period when the Soviet Union was far behind. But today, as Soviet strength significantly grows, we can no longer afford any but the most coldly realistic view of "what is going on in the world" and what new strategies and weapons systems are truly responsive to changing world conditions. I submit that an attitude of cold realism toward our national security will not sustain the notion that we have been spending too little money on the military.

In order to understand what went wrong it is necessary to appraise the changing nature of the arms race at a time of accelerating technological progress.

Since World War II, the modes of strategic war have been transformed roughly every 5 years. Bombers were supplanted as the key offensive force by several generations of liquid fueled missiles, which in turn were replaced by

June 29, 1971

S 10147

solid fueled Minutemen and by mobile Polaris submarines. Strategies depending upon immediate response to enemy attack preparations—and thus on often unreliable intelligence reports—have given way to a policy of waiting out an attack before retaliating. Now the development of multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles—MIRV's—is working another transformation of the criteria of deterrence. The Poseidon missile—a submarine based MIRV system, placing 10 independently aimed warheads on each launcher—seemed until recently the ultimate in mobile, invulnerable retaliatory power. But the Navy is now proceeding with development of ULM's—an underwater long-range MIRV system with much longer reach and greater accuracy.

This pace of change, which has affected conventional capabilities to an only slightly lesser degree, means that most existing military technology is obsolescent. That is, in most cases, more effective alternative or countervailing weapons are already required. Under these conditions, heavy investment in multiplying and embellishing current systems—or implementing current strategies—or responding to current threats—is often wasteful. The real arena of competition has moved ahead to new technologies which dictate changing strategies. In this arena the side that concentrates its resources on obsolescent weapons and strategies may be at a disadvantage, even if it spends more than its opponent on advanced research and development. For scientific genius and technical expertise are limited. If a country employs its best manpower refining old systems, designed to carry out obsolete strategies, it may not be able to compete as well on the technological frontiers no matter how much money it spends. Only long run investments directed at scientific achievements 5 and 6 years from now can redeem a side falling behind in a qualitative arms race.

Research on new systems, moreover, is much cheaper than deployment of old ones. In a qualitative race, therefore, the criterion for success is not chiefly money; it is our resourcesfulness in using scarce scientific and technical resources in tandem with changing strategies. Again, spending money in the wrong places will actually retard a side's performance if it diverts scarce manpower. Such are the special constraints of a qualitative arms race.

Although for many years the United States was so far ahead technologically that it could afford to ignore these new realities, that time has now passed. The Pentagon, however, has yet to recognize it. The proposals for new bombers, carriers, redundant fighters, new air defense, and other traditional systems necessitate enormous commitments of resources to strategically obsolescent weapons. The fact that they are embellished with the most formidably advanced new technology just means that the waste of resources is compounded by diversion of scarce personnel.

One of the prime examples of this mistake is ABM, used to protect Minutemen. Minutemen in fixed bases are already a

technology of predictable obsolescence, for they are ultimately vulnerable to refinement in offensive missile accuracy. ABM, for all its redoubtable intricacy and ingenuity, is also of little usefulness in the strategic environment of the 1970's. It is a system of the 1960's that we wisely refrained from deploying in different forms earlier in this decade despite repeated demands from the military. The Pentagon, in effect, now is putting together two obsolescing technologies in the hope of getting one useful system. And the result is a vast wasteland of money and personnel.

Technologically advanced and conceptually retarded, ABM symbolizes the American defense posture. We overreact to current or impending threats by purchasing, elaborating, and multiplying any technology which lies at hand. Thus we greatly reduce our flexibility in preparing for future exigencies.

Apart from the same \$28 billion spent on unnecessary prototypes of missiles that were not deployed, billions have been spent on repeatedly replacing our land-based missiles with new models as soon as they were developed—from successive forms of Atlases and Titans to Minutemen I, II, and III. We have spent many billions trying to maintain our surface naval fleet at near World War II levels—and protecting it with expensive and sometimes ineffective new defenses—despite the increasing vulnerability of all surface systems to Soviet submarines, missiles, and other offensive weapons. Over \$15 billion has been spent on air defense against the minimal Soviet bomber threat.

It would be possible, of course, to contrive the nightmare catalog of unpromising weapons we have acquired, in our resolve to deploy every novelty we develop in response to every possible threat, despite our overall superiority—and without any overall strategic plan or scale of priorities. Suffice it to say that the total exceeds \$100 billion.

Meanwhile, John Foster, the Defense Department Director of Research and Engineering, suggests that we may be falling behind in some facets of research and development, the one arena that matters most and costs least. In Dr. Foster's own words:

In the next five years breakthroughs in military technology will tend to occur in the Soviet Union rather than in the United States.

Foster's statistics, showing a Soviet lead in military R. & D. spending, have been challenged by the Federation of American Scientists. And it may be that we are not in fact vulnerable to the kind of technological surprise he envisages. But there is no doubt that the Russians have massively increased their investments in R. & D. Combined with their heavy programs of scientific and technical education, this effort portends danger for the United States.

Foster, however, does not propose new investment in American education. Nor does he advocate new Federal programs of basic research to prevent technological surprise. Instead, he urges continuation of the same mistaken pattern that has brought us to our present position

of extravagant futurity. He demands more money to multiply and embellish the obsolescent systems in our arsenal; employing new technology not to produce more cost-effective and useful systems but to redeem old modes of thought and outmoded hardware: New ICBM's, bombers, and carriers—with often futile new defenses for them—redundant fighters and tanks, raised to egregious cost with unnecessarily sophisticated accessories. Even though some of these systems may well be supportable for the moment, they are irrelevant to our problems of technological surprise—except again to the extent they divert valuable manpower from work on the frontiers of development.

It is because the Soviet Union is greatly improving its strategic panoply—greatly expanding its efforts in R. & D.—that we cannot afford to continue our present pattern. It is because Dr. Foster and Secretary Laird and Senator JACKSON are generally right about the long-term Soviet threat that they are hopelessly wrong in their proposals for short-term deployments.

Let me repeat. Even Secretary Laird acknowledges that the threat to our security is not immediate. It resides in the long-term impact of Soviet programs. The persistent problem of our defense policy has been over-reaction to current and sometimes spuriously anticipated threats. The Soviet Union digs some holes; Marshal Grechko makes a speech; and we are provoked into wasting billions. In effect, we have let our adversaries dictate our defenses. And our overreaction to immediate threats has undermined our ability to meet our long-term security problems.

The result has been an erratic course of spending that summons whole defense industries into being—and then dissolves them, when our initial alarms are disproven. We make little effort to promote conversion of valuable facilities to civilian purposes. We demoralize valuable manpower. And for all our expensive effort we never seem to have enough.

I believe that we will have to maintain high levels of defense spending for years to come. If we continue in our current manner, however, there is a real danger that at some future day, we will direly need some form of armament and will not be able to produce it in time. Our huge Military Establishment would then indeed be a pitiful, helpless giant. For if we are really subjected to technological surprise—or to a truly menacing enemy program—we cannot meet the threat by spending more on last year's novelties, or by expanding our maginot lines on ABM's. We will have to have a stable and productive economy; we will require a reservoir of scientists and technicians prepared to work effectively; we will need an industrial base ready to produce new systems; and we will need a society that is eager to support the effort. If we continue on our currently erratic course, we will have an increasingly large Defense Establishment superbly prepared for last year's illusory threat, last year's questionable gap; a society unwilling to believe the new alarms; and an industrial base in disarray. In making these cuts,

therefore, I urge, as I did last year, that the Pentagon take a special effort to assure that scientific and other technical manpower are not permanently lost to our national security programs. Over the last few years, our defense procurement programs have been cut by a total of nearly one-third without close attention to the long-term effects. Our future mobilization base has been jeopardized. It is crucial that current retrenchments—like current expenditures—be designed with our long-term security in mind. Conversion of our defense industry for peaceful purposes should not be considered as a part-time concern. Conversion is a necessary instrument of intelligent defense planning, preserving our mobilization base for a future crisis.

In the future our defense spending should be maintained at a relatively steady and balanced level. We should not allow uncertain new appraisals of Soviet intentions and capabilities to panic us into erratic splurges of investment in untested systems. A balanced approach would prevent literal crash programs for new aircraft—and titanic new efforts in divining and forging—that bring public disillusionment and abrupt retrenchment.

There is another point which should be considered as we approach a decision on this amendment. Last week the joint committee on internal revenue taxation estimated that the deficit for this year's budget will reach \$23.3 billion. As programs are currently planned, the same report indicates a deficit next year, fiscal year 1972, of around \$23 billion again. This report does not include in its estimates many major programs in health, transportation, environmental protection, education, housing, and in other fields which are of vital concern to many members of this body.

The hard fact is that we must make a decision. If we are serious and responsible about our attempts to alleviate these desperate needs at home, we may have to accept a substantial tax increase or an increasingly larger budget deficit with all its accompanying inflationary consequences. I submit that both these alternatives are unacceptable.

There is a third choice. We can and must undertake a basic reevaluation of our defense posture and policies and the national treasure which is expended upon them. For the reasons which I have been discussing, such a step is mandatory to insure our future national security. It is also mandatory for the future security of our citizens, our cities, and our society.

I would like to close by saying that retrenchment of the defense spending is squarely in the Republican tradition. Senator Robert A. Taft in his last public speech appealed for "severe scrutiny of the defense budget." And President Eisenhower, perhaps our most knowledgeable recent President on national security policy, and a man whose wisdom looms greater as time passes—summed up the problem in now famously prophetic words, which I would like to quote again today. For we should never forget them:

No matter how much we spend for arms, there is no safety in arms alone. Our security is the total product of our economic, intel-

lectual, moral, and military strengths . . .

Let me elaborate on this great truth . . . It happens that defense is a field in which I have had varied experience over a lifetime, and if I have learned anything, it is that there is no way in which a country can satisfy the craving for absolute security—but it easily can bankrupt itself, morally and economically. In attempting to reach that illusory goal through arms alone. The military establishment, not productive of itself, necessarily must feed on the energy, productivity and brainpower of the country, and if it takes too much, our total strength declines.

Beyond all the issues raised in this debate, this fundamental principle still stands firm.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

We had quite a discussion awhile ago on the Cuban refugee problem. Last night I discussed the matter with my counterpart from the House side, Representative MAHON. He said that the House of Representatives has had no hearings on the Cuban refugee problem, and that, if the Senate insists on its amendment, there may be difficulty in having the resolution enacted before midnight tomorrow night.

I know the time is short, Mr. President, and personally I do not want to take any steps that would delay final action on the continuing resolution. I have discussed this matter with my good friend from North Dakota, the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Young, and other Senators, and I am prepared now to withdraw that amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language on page 4 of the joint resolution, beginning on line 8 with the comma after the figures "91-672" and ending with "United States" on line 11, be stricken from the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the language will be stricken.

The language of the committee amendment referred to reads as follows: " , except that none of the funds provided by this or any other Act may be used to cover costs incurred in connection with the movement of refugees from Cuba to the United States".

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman for this action. I know I speak for my colleague from Florida (Mr. CHILES), who is not now able to speak for himself, because he is occupying the Chair as Presiding Officer, but we do indeed appreciate this action and the compassion and understanding of the chairman.

I am sure that as hearings develop later on other bills, we can look into the matter and come up with some solution that will be fair and equitable to all of us.

I thank the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is my purpose to get more information on the matter, and the subject matter will be taken up when the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act of 1972 is considered.

(Mr. PROXMIRE assumed the chair as Presiding Officer at this point.)

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) who is now presiding is the chairman of that subcommittee. It will be my purpose, and I am hopeful his purpose, to go more thoroughly into detail about this matter, and to try to fix some definite date and find out the number who can come in under the present setup.

As I said awhile ago, it strikes me that we have gone too far with this Cuban refugee program. It was never contemplated that we would have as many as 850,000 Cubans enter this country under the program. As I pointed out, when the subject was discussed after Castro decided to permit so many to come in, the estimate made then was around 200,000, and it seems that that number increases from year to year.

I believe that subject matter can better be dealt with, and we will get more facts and be in a better position to present it to the Senate, when the bill to which I have referred comes before us for consideration.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I believe this is the way to get at it, in a full fledged hearing that develops all the facts.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have heretofore stated, I had discussed the matter with Mr. MAHON, and he made a good point. Last night before I went to sleep I thought about it, and I hinted this morning that I would take that action, because I do not wish to delay the passage of this continuing resolution. The joint resolution must be passed by midnight tomorrow night; if we do not do so, many departments will be without money, and I do not want that to happen. I am willing to wait 5 or 6 more weeks until we can go into more detail and have more facts, so that we can deal with the subject matter more intelligently next month.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I also commend the chairman for taking this action. He has now called the matter fully to the attention of the Senate, and the hearings should be able to determine what number of people we have made a commitment to, and whether it is a commitment that we are obligated under or should be bound by, what are the reasons for these people being on welfare, and we can get all the facts in the hearing. I certainly commend the action of the chairman in withdrawing that amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Have I used my 5 minutes?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I take 5 more minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. President, with respect to the amendment that is now pending, as I pointed out earlier, I do not know whether the amendment applies to appropriations or to expenditures. Last year, Congress appropriated for fiscal year 1971 \$71.449 million for military functions, and we spent \$73.370 million plus.

I am informed by the Defense Department that of the estimated \$75 billion for military functions about \$40 billion



is required for personnel-related costs—this will be about \$41.7 billion when we consider the additional military pay increase.

To support on-going programs that are now in the under contract, that have been authorized by Congress in prior years, would require \$20 billion, in round figures; and for new programs that will be authorized and that Congress will make provision for, or some of which we will make provision for, \$15 billion will be required, for a total of \$76.7 billion, including the \$1.7 billion for the additional military pay increases.

If we simply conclude now that we will spend at the rate of only \$68 billion, as this amendment provides, I say to the Senate that our security would certainly be in trouble. Therefore, Mr. President, I am hopeful that this amendment will be rejected.

Earlier I referred to the \$20 billion required for many programs for which no new appropriations are requested. Let me cite a few examples.

The Navy's nuclear-powered aircraft carriers: The estimated expenditure for the basic construction for fiscal 1972 is \$265 million. We have nothing in the appropriation bill to continue that program, and yet this amendment would affect that.

As to the Navy's general purpose assault ships—LHA—the estimated expenditure is \$172.7 million. New appropriations requested for fiscal year 1972, none. Yet, under this amendment, part of that would likely be cut off. These are contracts that have been solemnly entered into by our Government and privately owned concerns. I do not want to contemplate the effect this will have, because the cutback on that means that probably we will have to enter into new contracts. There is no telling what it will cost the Government.

For the Navy's A-4 attack aircraft, estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1972, \$42 million. No new appropriation is being asked for in the appropriation bill we are now considering and that, hopefully, will be reported to the Senate next month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 2 additional minutes. For the Army's CH-47 Chinook transport helicopter, estimated expenditures, \$26.2 million. Appropriations requested for fiscal 1972 are none. That would be affected.

For the Army's UH-1H tactical helicopters, estimated expenditures, \$38 million. New appropriations, none. Yet, it would be affected by this amendment.

For the Army's AH-1 Cobra armed helicopters, estimated expenditures, \$31.9 million. New appropriations requested for fiscal year 1972, none. Yet, it would be affected.

For the Army's Shillelagh antitank missile, estimated expenditures, \$27.4 million. No new appropriations are requested.

For the Air Force's UH-1H Iroquois tactical helicopters, estimated expenditures, \$46 million. No new appropriations are requested.

For the Air Force's A-37B attack air-

craft, estimated expenditures, \$20 million. New appropriations, none.

All these contracts are in effect or in force, and the moneys for them have been appropriated in the past. Yet, under this amendment, those contracts may be affected.

I hope the Senate rejects this amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute, and then I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

I should like to modify my amendment so that it will read as follows:

Except that the amounts available for expenditure for military functions administered by the Department of Defense shall not exceed a rate equal to \$68,000,000,000 a year.

The reason for that correction is that I think the Senator from Louisiana raises a proper criticism of the ambiguity of the amendment. It could apply to appropriations or expenditures. This clarifies it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator has clarified that, because I interpreted the first amendment as affecting appropriations. So that it will be expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the modification to the desk?

The amendment, as modified, reads as follows:

On page 4, line 2, before the semicolon at the end thereof insert a comma and the following: "except that the amounts available for expenditure for military functions administered by the Department of Defense shall not exceed a rate equal to \$68,000,000,000 a year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I might also point out that the Senator from Louisiana, of course, is right, that it is painful and difficult for the Defense Department to adjust to a reduction of 7 percent in spending. That is what this will amount to. There are all kinds of ways in which this can be done. The fact is that we put ceilings on the civilian agencies—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield myself 1 additional minute. I think we can get some time from the manager of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. PROXMIRE. An additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield myself 1 minute now.

I might point out that this ceiling is an old business. Congress has done this several times in the past, and most Members of the Senate have voted for those ceilings. Those ceilings are difficult and painful. We all know the complaints we heard from the civilian agencies. But we know that none of those agencies came to a halt. People were not deprived of their pay. Contracts were not canceled. There are ways this can be done with stretchouts. Choices have to be made. I think it is about time those tough choices were made by the Defense Department,

and that is why we are offering this amendment today.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I fully support the Proxmire-Mathias amendment to limit Pentagon spending to \$68 billion for fiscal year 1972. I urge the Senate to accept the amendment today, as part of the pending "committee resolution," so that the ceiling may take effect for the entire new fiscal year that begins on Thursday.

Today, the Senate has the opportunity to translate our action on the SST earlier this spring into an across-the-board vote on the principle of reordering our national priorities. Like a colossus of the ancient world, the Pentagon budget stands astride all our hopes for real action on the countless domestic issue we face—issues like inflation and unemployment, law enforcement and crime control, race and poverty, health and education, pollution and transportation, and the crisis in our cities.

The President boasts about winding down the war, about hundreds of thousands of troop reductions in Vietnam, about a generation of peace, but the Pentagon budget goes on, virtually unchanged—as though, somehow, it has a life of its own, free of real control by Congress or even by the President.

To be sure, there have been modest reductions in military spending in the past two fiscal years, but hardly of a magnitude that gives us any confidence that we actually have the problem under control.

Time and again, the pattern is the same. Faithfully each spring, as the military budget juggernaut begins to roll in Congress, we get the reports of "terrifying" new weapons breakthroughs by the Soviet Union, followed hard by calls for renewed American commitments—and spending—to meet the challenge.

But, as we have heard so often in recent days, the crisis lies as much in credibility as it lies in substance. After each new wave of spring defense alarm subsidies, and the budget is enacted, calm returns, and once again, we see the inevitable result of the annual process—defense spending programs emerge virtually unscathed, while urgently needed domestic programs have had to run the gauntlet of drastic budget cuts.

We know the dismal figures, but they bear constant repetition. In 1969, for example, for every man, woman, and child in the United States, we spent the following sums: \$410 on national defense; \$125 on the war in Vietnam; \$19 on the space program; \$19 on foreign aid; and only 80 cents on cancer research.

Today, however, we can see that things are changing. Priorities have become a major national issue in their own right. Gone are the days of weak and ineffective scrutiny of the annual requests for military spending. Gone is the blank check policy that Congress has given the Pentagon for so long.

That is why I favor a ceiling on Pentagon spending for the next fiscal year. It is the most effective single step we can take at this time if we are to buy the

time we need to begin to meet the challenge of the seventies.

In the course of the coming debate on the various individual military appropriations bills, we will have the opportunity to examine spending for specific defense programs. Today, however, we have the opportunity to take the important overall step of setting an outer limit for overall military spending, and thereby to establish the basic framework within which all the later programs will be examined.

The \$68 billion figure for the ceiling is essentially the amount appropriated by Congress for the current fiscal year. In light of the substantial force reductions we have already made in Vietnam during the current year, the ceiling is a realistic figure within which the Pentagon can reasonably be expected to operate. If the ceiling must be raised, it is entirely appropriate for the administration to come back to Congress later, when the need arises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Two minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Unless we take the steps we must to limit the soaring costs of military spending, and to reflect the real force reductions we made so far, all our dreams for progress on our domestic problems will be postponed, and the problems will grow worse. The time has come for Congress to make a comprehensive commitment in favor of new priorities, and to make clear to the people of the Nation that we can practice what we preach. We can begin by setting a realistic limit on defense spending.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me, and I yield back the remainder of the time of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, of the 5 minutes the Senator from Louisiana yielded to me, do I have time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Maryland, first, that I am delighted that he stressed, as he did—the fact that we face a deficit of \$23 billion this year and probably more than \$23 billion for next year.

We all recognize that we must provide more money for our cities, for combatting pollution, for health, and for many other programs. Where is the money coming from? It is true that we may be able to pass some kind of tax increase, but that is doubtful. If we are going to meet these problems to any extent at all, we have to hold down military spending. There is no other answer, as I see it.

Charles Schultz, former Director of the Budget testified that for the next 3 years there will be no fiscal dividend that even if we reduced unemployment to 4 percent and we had a booming economy, we still would not get the Federal revenues. To do more than the limited domestic programs we now have on the books.

Mr. MATHIAS. The Senator is exactly right. We face a serious problem, as I

pointed out, of chalking up a \$23.3 billion deficit at the end of the current fiscal year. We look forward, at least conservatively, to the same deficit next year, so that it would be over \$46 billion. We are probably talking in the ball park range of \$50 billion.

As the Senator from Wisconsin asks, where is the money coming from? It has got to come from the people of the United States either in the form of new taxes or in the more insidious, unfair and inequitable form of robbing them through inflation. That is where it will come from. That is really the decision being made here today.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) says—and I am very much interested in his statement, he has a lot of sound wisdom in it—that we are asking the Department of Defense to undertake a 10 percent cut in a 30-day period and that no \$500 million or \$1 billion corporation in the country could do that.

Well, let me say, those companies are responsive to the disciplines of the markets in which they operate. They react quickly. They see the handwriting on the wall. What I am suggesting to the Senate to vote on here today is that companies like that, which see the handwriting on the wall, corporate boards, and corporate executives, observe these things and they will say either, "Keep going full blast, the signals are up," or "adjust to market conditions." Which button will we push because we have got a customer here that will react to those signals.

Mr. YOUNG. I would be very much interested in knowing where the Senator would suggest the cuts be made. Would he make them in personnel? Would he close some bases? Would he close out military contracts in Maryland or North Dakota? Just where would the Senator suggest the cuts be applied?

When we on the Defense appropriations make cuts, we usually state where they should be made.

Mr. MATHIAS. As the Senator from Wisconsin explained, we have felt that this should be a function of the Defense Department. We are willing to give the Defense Department the widest latitude. This is not an unusual device. It is a device the Senate has adopted before and Congress has adopted before; namely, an overall spending limitation. It has worked in the past successfully. It has worked in terms of the total budget as well as a department budget. I think we can apply this kind of limitation successfully and that we should do it because if we do not, we will face more red ink.

I might inquire of the Senator from North Dakota, as the Senator from Wisconsin inquired of me, where will the money come from?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAMBRELL). The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield more time to the Senator from Maryland if he wants it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that in the past 2 years we have had five bills proposed to Congress setting ceilings on the amount to be spent by executive agencies. I have here a list of the membership of the Senate, and virtually every Senator has voted for at least one of the ceilings. A number of Senators, including those Senators most vehement in opposing the pending amendment, have voted for all the ceilings—at least four out of five of them.

Further, I point out that this is nothing new. It has been done before. The only way we can get at something that is as complex and as technical and that requires such a high degree of knowledge as the defense budget does is to make the general reduction and leave the specific ones to the agency experts. Time and time again, as the Senator recalls, how we debated the aircraft carrier or the B-1 bomber or some of the technical fighter planes, that time and again we would be told that we did not understand the tremendous complexity of our modern defense establishment, on how important a particular weapons system was, that if we spent a week in study we still would not know as much as the men who have devoted their whole lives to the subject.

We should ask the Secretary of Defense, who is a competent man—I have great faith in his judgment and his ability—as he has back of him the most competent people, people who have devoted their lives to this subject. The Secretary is in the best position to make a careful, thoughtful, priority judgment on where to make the cuts with the least possible damage. It would be better to do that than to wipe out wholesale two or three weapons systems on which we have, unfortunately, in the Senate little knowledge, or even to wipe out some bases on which we can make a foreign policy judgment, or a defense judgment; but I doubt that would be wise, certainly in the limited period we have, that that kind of judgment could be made by the Executive.

Mr. MATHIAS. Let me point out, in response to the Senator from North Dakota, that there has been a lot of alarming talk about what would result from adoption of the pending amendment. The Defense Department indicated that if the amendment is agreed to, they would have to cut personnel 50 percent and procurement 40 percent. Of course, that is ridiculous.

The Secretary of Defense himself has estimated that each U.S. soldier costs the Government \$10,000 annually, so that if we took the entire \$7 billion cut out of military personnel alone, we would still end up with 1,805,000 plus troops, and that would accomplish the whole thing. Of course, I am not suggesting that we do that, but it is just a measure of what is taking place in responding to the very modest and limited suggestion that is incorporated in the pending amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota, if I have the right to do so.

Mr. YOUNG. A cut like this has not been leveled at the Department of Defense in 20 years, so far as I know. There has been overall cuts in Government spending, but defense cuts have never been singled out before, and for very good reasons. Many people still consider the national security as having the highest priority. To me, without adequate national security, all other priorities become meaningless.

Mr. MATHIAS. I would respond to the Senator from North Dakota by saying that I think national security does have the highest priority. But I think we are finding that our national security priority is being betrayed by fiscal policies that are unwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time does the distinguished Senator from Connecticut desire?

Mr. WEICKER. About 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WEICKER. I regret to find myself in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Wisconsin, and for the very reason enunciated by the Senator from Maryland, who said that this amendment gives the widest latitude to the Department of Defense to make cuts. That is the whole problem.

Some of us feel that the widest latitude is given to the Department of Defense to go ahead and raise its budget. Clearly, in my mind, that is a job that belongs to Congress, both as to the cutting of any moneys, and in the way of raising the budget for the Department of Defense. Our job is to consider the specific weapons for a system and to see if, in fact, they enhance the security of the United States.

The defense budget should be examined both in this body and in the House of Representatives. I am not willing in any manner, shape, or form, to give the wide latitude to the Defense Department.

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

Mr. WEICKER. I yield.

Mr. MATHIAS. We are not proposing this amendment without precedent and experience. The distinguished former Senator from Delaware, Mr. Williams, proposed a ceiling on procurement that operated in simple fashion with respect to imposing limitations. Certainly there was no more knowledgeable, more thorough, or more conscientious Member of the Senate than he with regard to fiscal policy. He felt it to be a desirable and responsible way to proceed, and the Senate concurred with him.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I repeat to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the job of examining the budget and making cuts is not the job of the Defense Department. It is the job of the Senate. We have ourselves in the bind we are in today because we gave to the Defense Department the job of getting whatever they asked for without coming to Congress. If it applies for one situation, it applies for the other.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what the Senator said has a lot of appeal. I wish we could proceed in that way. However, we tried for years. I do not know of one single weapons system that the Congress ever eliminated. In that connection, the Defense Department stopped the B-70 and temporarily stopped the Cheyenne and several other programs. But not Congress. Congress does not do this for many reasons. One reason is that any big project has involved in it considerable employment in a number of States. Senators feel that they have to fight against that kind of a cutback and for specific jobs back home.

I think that theoretically the Senator from Connecticut makes a very good point and a very logical point. It would be a good thing if we could sit down and convince our colleagues that a weapons system should be cut back. We have tried to do so, but unfortunately we could not.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, of all Senators in the Chamber, the Senator from Wisconsin should realize that a change has taken place and that whereas in the past the Senate did not exercise its right on specific items in the President's budget, we have now seen a turn of events.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows this very well, having focused the attention of the country and the Senate on a matter and succeeded in defeating a project. In times past we handed the authority to the Defense Department and did not contest any single item. It was only with an item such as the ABM system that Congress did start to apply itself and occupy itself with the matter and did not allow the Defense Department to beef up the budget in an instance where more money did not necessarily mean better defense.

I think the time has come when we should scrutinize the budget line by line. I am not willing to let them decide where the cuts should be made.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 742 provides continuing authority to the Department of Defense to pay for the support of its operation after June 30, 1971, which marks the end of the current fiscal year. My distinguished colleagues from Wisconsin and Maryland have introduced an amendment which would limit expenditures by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1972 to \$68 billion. This amendment would have the effect of reducing defense spending during that year by some \$7 billion.

There are a great number of arguments which can be made against this proposed \$7 billion reduction in spending, which in its very concept must be considered as bordering on the irresponsible, illogical and self-defeating. Not only would it jeopardize an adequate level of defense, it would retreat from congressional responsibility in such matters by leaving it up to the Pentagon to decide where the spending cuts are to be made. In effect, it defeats its own purpose. Instead of reasserting civilian control, it abandoned it.

I am concerned about the total operation of the Department of Defense, but I am even more concerned about the re-

search and development portion of the total defense program since I have a direct responsibility for that program as chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee for Research and Development of the Armed Services Committee. The proposed amendment would be totally disruptive of the Department of Defense program for fiscal year and would be chaotic in its effect on the research and development program which provides in large measure for the orderly and time-phased development of major weapons systems that spans a period of years.

The proposed amendment would undermine all of the long and tedious efforts of the Armed Services Committee, which has been engaged in an item-by-item review of all of the appropriations comprising the military procurement authorization bill. The entire staff and membership of this committee has devoted literally hundreds of hours in exhaustive briefings and hearings involving each of the Department of Defense programs for which authorization is requested for fiscal 1972. This is the sensible and responsible way to effect savings without jeopardizing national security. I might recite my own experience several years ago when because of the overriding pressures of a lack of time, a lack of experience, and a lack of sufficient numbers of people to conduct a proper review, a somewhat arbitrary percentage reduction was adopted as the basis for cutting the authorization request for research and development. In good conscience and in retrospect, this approach at best was arbitrary and could not withstand the test of logic. When I consider what effect the proposed amendment would have, I am overcome by the same emotional uncertainties and discomfort which I felt when I recommended a percentage reduction several years ago.

The lesson which I have learned and which I would share with my colleagues is the lesson which I have applied last year and again this year in discharging my responsibilities for review of the research and development program. The total defense program, which has been described by the Secretary of Defense as "rock bottom," has been referred to the various committees under established procedure for their review and consideration. The committees do not take their responsibilities lightly. They have been given a task and they are pursuing it with their utmost capability and with keen sensitivity to the serious economic situation which confronts this country.

The reordering of national priorities can be meaningful only if we maintain an adequate level of defense. In my judgment, an adequate level of defense would not be possible if we were to limit spending in such an arbitrary manner.

Moreover, a spending cut of such magnitude is certain to have some adverse effect on the national economy priority.

The economy is in trouble. We all know that. And while I do not believe prosperity must depend on military spending, there is little doubt that a wholesale reduction in military and civilian manpower, the closing of bases, the deactivation of our operating forces, the widespread termination of essential contracts, and the chain reaction throughout industry which would occur if this

June 29, 1971

amendment should pass would deal our reeling economy still another blow.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment and permit the Senate to consider the recommendations of the responsible committees and to make its decision on the merits of the evidence in each case.

Mr. HART, Mr. President, it is estimated that Michigan will receive only enough Federal money in the next fiscal year to fund 25 percent of applications already on hand for public and senior citizen housing projects.

Budget restraints may limit Detroit's summer feeding program to 20,000 poor children rather than the 40,000-child program the city was encouraged to develop.

Senate-House conferees have completed work on the education appropriation bill, and, at least in part, because of budgetary problems, have agreed to eliminate impact aid for communities affected by Federal housing projects and to cutback the Senate-approved increase for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The budget contains no funds to develop many national parks and national forest recreation areas despite the Federal Government's pledge to local communities that early development would help offset loss of tax revenues.

The past weekend we applauded the opening of youth conservation camps, ignoring the fact that we spend billions to operate camps to train people to kill, but only \$1 million to train youths for the battle to save our environment.

Detroit has been waiting since 1963 for construction of the Pat McNamara Federal Office Building, a project delayed because of budgetary restraints. In a city with a high unemployment rate, in a city struggling to revitalize itself, the empty, unused lot purchased as the site for this building is both a constant reminder of a commitment not kept and a deterrent to private investment in the future of the city.

A Michigan mother recently wrote about the lack of facilities for her mentally sick son, who, because he is now over 21, is sent to prison rather than to a treatment center. She wrote not to ask for help for her son, but for the mentally ill of the future.

She asked, "Doesn't anyone care?"

The same question is asked by residents of Sault Ste. Marie, where Indian and white alike live in houses without water and sewer service.

"Doesn't anyone care?"

That question is asked not in Michigan alone, but in every State and community in our country.

That is the question which spells out in human terms the sterile rhetoric which calls for a change in national spending priorities.

Today, we can give some meaning to that rhetoric by voting to set a spending limit of \$68 billion for military functions.

If we are to hold down Pentagon spending, it is important that we establish an expenditure rather than an appropriations limit.

In each of the past 3 years, the Pentagon, making use of carryover funds, has spent more than Congress appropriated.

For example, Congress last year appropriated \$68.7 billion for military functions. It is now estimated Pentagon expenditures for that year will run about \$73.4 billion.

The spending limit proposed in this amendment would limit the Pentagon to outlays totaling about what Congress appropriated for the Pentagon last year.

An expenditure limit of \$68 billion would be about a 9 percent reduction from the \$75 billion the Pentagon anticipates spending this year.

It has been argued that such a limit will force base closings and add to the unemployment rate.

National defense figures and Pentagon budget requests do not support that position.

Spending on the Vietnam war is down from a high of \$24 billion a year to an estimated \$8 billion for the next fiscal year. That reduction of \$16 billion, along with a cutback of 1 million men in uniform by the end of the year, means the Pentagon should be able to absorb a \$7 billion decrease without endangering the national security.

Also, the overkill capacity of our nuclear deterrent and the history of arms limitation negotiations indicate that we can safely and should delay expenditures on deploying the Safeguard ABM and MIRV's.

For example, only 400 of 4,200 nuclear warheads are needed to destroy 30 percent of the Soviet Union's population and 70 percent of its industry. Yet we plan to double the number of warheads by putting multiple warheads on our Minuteman and Polaris missiles.

And not only should we delay deployment of Safeguard because of its extremely doubtful effectiveness as a defensive weapon, but history indicates chances for a meaningful SALT agreement would be improved by such a delay.

When President Eisenhower sought a treaty to maintain the Antarctic a nuclear-free zone, he did not embark on a program to deploy nuclear weapons in the Antarctic.

And today we have an agreement not to place nuclear weapons in the Antarctic.

When President Kennedy sought a treaty banning atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, this Nation did not embark on an accelerated program of atmospheric testing. To the contrary, the President announced that not only would the United States suspend all such testing so long as other nations did not test, but he promised that this Nation would not be the first to resume testing.

And today we have an agreement controlling atmospheric testing of nuclear devices.

When President Johnson sought a treaty to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons, this Nation did not launch a program to give nuclear arms to other countries.

To the contrary, under the leadership of Senator PASTORE, the Senate helped create the atmosphere which resulted in the signing of a nonproliferation agreement.

During the negotiations, Moscow expressed concern that under one guise or another, the United States might seek to

transfer nuclear weapons to West Germany.

The Pastore resolution commended the President's efforts to negotiate a non-proliferation treaty. The wording of that resolution, combined with its legislative history, and the expressions of the Senator from Rhode Island in the course of the hearings, helped convince Moscow that we had no intention of transferring nuclear arms to West Germany.

Under the reasoning that we should continue to deploy Safeguard, that resolution should not have been passed; the proper course would have been to amend the Atomic Energy Act to permit the transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries. But today, because of our restraint at the time, we have a nonproliferation treaty.

In brief, there is ample opportunity to cut Pentagon spending without endangering the national security and without widespread closing of military bases necessary for the national defense.

Let us take this opportunity to back up rhetoric about changing national spending priorities by setting a limit of \$68 billion on Pentagon spending.

If we do not take this step now at the beginning of the fiscal year, it will be more difficult to establish such a limit later in the fiscal year.

A switch of \$7 billion from the Pentagon to domestic programs would not solve all or even many of our problems at home, but it will help.

And let us not forget that in choosing between Federal spending on education, health, and housing programs and on Pentagon projects, the latter type of expenditure is the more inflationary.

Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. President, everyone who has served in the Armed Forces in recent years is aware of military waste and extravagance. Eleven million-dollar aircraft are used to destroy \$3,000 trucks in South Vietnam. Expensive equipment is sometimes too sophisticated to be used effectively or even maintained in the field. Legions of uniformed chauffeurs, bartenders, and gardeners are maintained at taxpayers' expense. At one Army facility I visited recently I could detect no activity, except on a well manicured 18-hole golf course. But what concerns me most is that the Armed Forces are the prisoners of old and wasteful habits and obsolete ideas.

The Navy has in recent years built many ships. It wants to build more. But a warship is a platform for weapons—and it has not built the weapons. We now find ourselves with a fleet outfitted with not one surface-to-surface missile. The Soviet Union does not spend money on aircraft carriers. It puts its resources into relatively inexpensive platforms for advanced weaponry, including nuclear submarines with cruise missiles. Not for lack of money, but because of the Navy's misplaced priorities, our fleet and our merchant marine are vulnerable to attack from the sea. The Army still seems to place its confidence in large land armies of conscripts. And yet Vietnam demonstrates, painfully, that wars of insurgency are not won by large conventional land armies any more than by B-52s or helicopter gunships. If wars must be fought again they will be won by



June 29, 1971

S 10154

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, despite these reductions in our general purpose force structure, military personnel—although it has fallen by a total of 180,000 men between 1964-72—has not been reduced correspondingly. In its study of the fiscal year 1972 budget, the Brookings Institution calculates that total Army manpower per active division has increased by 19 percent, total Navy manpower per ship has increased by 28 percent, and total Air Force manpower per aircraft has risen by 16 percent.

If the same ratios of total military manpower per division, ship, and airplane existed today as existed at the end

of fiscal year 1964, military manpower needs for fiscal year 1972 would be 408,000 less than the Defense Department has requested. Required military outlays for personnel alone would be \$3.7 billion less. Those reductions in personnel would be followed by a reduced cost of training and military facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table listing 1972 manpower needs based on the 1964 ratios of men per force unit be inserted in the Record at this point:

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Total men per division, ship, aircraft		Actual 1972 manpower	1972 manpower based on 1964 rates of men per division, ship, aircraft	Difference
	1964	1972			
Army.....	59,632	70,829	942,000	763,000	178,980
Navy.....	716	918	604,000	495,280	108,720
Air Force.....	67	78	753,900	632,520	120,480
Total.....			2,505,000	2,086,820	408,180

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, these figures make it apparent that there has been a proliferation of support forces since 1964. But where has this proliferation occurred?

The concept of military support is a confusing one. The Department of Defense divides its military personnel into four classifications: strategic forces personnel, general purpose forces personnel, other mission forces personnel, and general support personnel. Total military personnel has decreased by 182,000 since 1964—7 percent.

Strategic forces personnel man our nuclear deterrence systems. Since 1964, strategic forces personnel has fallen from 221,000 to 139,000—a decrease of 82,000—37 percent.

General purpose forces are prepared to engage in combat or provide direct support or services—such as communication, logistics, transportation, construction, and maintenance—to those in combat. The nonnuclear force structure outlined in table I is manned by general purpose forces. Army general purpose forces are structured into divisions of approximately 16,000 men each. Each division is backed up by an initial support movement capable of providing support for the first 60 days of combat and by a sustaining support increment required for any combat after 60 days. These increments are equal in size to the division itself. A division slice—the division itself, plus its initial and sustaining support increments—consists of about 48,000 men. Since 1964, general purpose forces personnel has decreased from 1,068,000 to 1,032,000—a total reduction of 36,000—3 percent.

In the same period, Army general purpose force personnel has decreased by only 28,000, even though the number of divisions has fallen by three. A decline of three divisions ought to result in a reduction of 144,000 positions and nearly 130,000 men since each division of 16,000 is backed by two support increments of similar size, manned to an average of 90 percent capacity.

Other mission forces personnel engaged in functions such as intelligence and security, research and development, and support to other nations. Personnel for this function has remained relatively stable, increasing by only 9,000—5 percent.

Finally, general support manpower is involved in training, logistics, command, and base support including upkeep, police, construction, and provision of medical services. Army general support manpower is formally outside the division structure and should not be confused with division combat service support increments. Total general support manpower has decreased by 73,000—6 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put in the Record at this point a table comparing our 1964 and 1972 military manpower profile.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1972	Percent change 1964-72
Strategic.....	221	139	-37
General purpose.....	1,068	1,032	-3
Other mission.....	190	199	+5
General support.....	1,208	1,135	-6
Total.....	2,687	2,505	-7

Mr. STEVENSON. Although the four categories are conceptually distinct, there is actually some spillover and overlap among them. General support forces in some cases act as combat support and combat service support personnel for general purpose forces, particularly for those general purpose forces based in the United States. Similarly, according to the Defense Department, general purpose personnel sometimes perform general support duties, particularly for overseas Army bases—NATO—and on ships at sea. For example, the 2½ division sustaining support increments now deployed in Europe are required to perform peacetime functions such as repair, maintenance

and operation of commissaries and other services provided for the dependent population, rather than support for the combat divisions.

The Defense Department has focused on the category called "general support forces" in its efforts to prove that the military has not become overburdened with support. Its claim that only 40 percent of total military manpower is in support obviously refers solely to the category of general support. It should be clear that the other 60 percent are not all combat troops—they are strategic personnel, general purpose, and other mission forces, a very small portion of which are actually combat personnel.

I particularly question the increase of manpower within the general purpose forces. Despite the significant cuts in force structure, the number of men in the general purpose force has decreased by only 67,000 since 1964. Although total military manpower at the end of fiscal year 1972 will be 7 percent less than 8 years ago, general purpose forces will have been reduced by only 3 percent—less than one-half the rate. The unexplained slower reduction in general purpose manpower is reflected in the price we pay for it. It actually costs more—even after adjustments for inflation—to pay for our general purpose forces now than it did for the larger force we had in 1964. Using constant 1972 dollars, the Brookings Institution has calculated the cost at \$50.5 billion in 1972 compared to \$49.5 billion in 1964.

Why has the number of personnel increased in the general purpose forces? We have spent billions of dollars to develop and equip our general purpose forces with more sophisticated weaponry designed to increase the productivity of each person involved in combat. As the productivity of each man increases, fewer men should be needed to accomplish a specific combat mission. Having paid extra costs for machines, we have a right to expect reduced costs in manpower. Yet general purpose manpower per force unit has increased since 1964. The number of command, combat support, and combat service support personnel have burgeoned.

I am well aware of the fact that more sophisticated weapons require increased maintenance. And some of the increased manpower undoubtedly can be attributed to increased maintenance needs. But I seriously question whether all or even a significant portion of it can. Since 1964, an army combat division, for example, has increased in size by about 1,500 men, but, according to Col. Edward King, a former Regular Army officer who served with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the number of men in a division who are prepared to directly engage in combat has actually decreased from around 9,000 to about 7,500. Combat support and combat service support troops per division have increased by 3,000. I find it difficult to believe that most of this increase is necessary to fill reasonable maintenance needs.

The category of general support—as distinct from combat support and combat service support of general purpose forces—has decreased by 6 percent since 1964, nearly the same rate as total mili-

tary manpower. General support forces increased rapidly with the Vietnam buildup and then dropped precipitously as Vietnam withdrawals accelerated. Between fiscal year 1970 and projections for fiscal year 1972, general support personnel was reduced by 323,000—22 percent. However, all of the reduction has occurred in three services; since 1970, Air Force general support personnel has increased by 6,000 while Army general support has fallen by 226,000, Navy by 54,000, and Marine Corps by 41,000.

GENERAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL

	1970	1972	Percent change 1970-72
Army.....	590	364	-40.0
Navy.....	329	275	-16.4
Marine.....	129	88	-31.8
Air Force.....	407	409	+ .5

I would also call the attention of my colleagues to the military grade distribution as well as to the excessive number of support personnel. During the Vietnam war, the military has become topheavy with officers and higher ranking enlisted men. At the end of fiscal year 1972, there will be 5,000 more officers holding the equivalent rank of lieutenant colonel or above than there were in 1964. Yet there will be 187,000 fewer enlisted men to command. An example is in the grade of colonel/captain. On June 30, 1969, when the active Armed Forces numbered around 3.5 million men, there were 18,277 colonels/captains on duty, compared to a June 30, 1945 total of 14,898 when there were around 12 million men in the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this time a table comparing military grade distribution in fiscal year 1972 compared to fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Percentage of total end strength	
	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1972
Officers.....	12.6	13.8
Senior enlisted (E-6 to E-9).....	14.5	18.3
Middle enlisted (E-4 to E-5).....	31.6	38.0
Low enlisted.....	40.8	29.6
Officer candidates.....	.4	.5

Mr. STEVENSON. The causes of this inflation of the military grade distribution are no mystery. During all wars, more men get promoted than would normally be expected, and there are shorter waiting periods between promotions. Given an incentive, the Defense Department might take action to bring the grade distribution back into balance. Robert S. Benson, former special assistant to the Comptroller of the Defense Department, has estimated that this top heavy grade distribution will result in \$1.3 billion extra in budgetary outlays than if we had the same grade distribution applied to the 1972 manpower levels requested by the Defense Department that we had in 1964.

Management inefficiencies also contribute significantly to excessive manpower levels. Many of these were detailed last year in the Defense Department's own blue ribbon defense panel management study, known popularly as the Fitzhugh Commission report.

First is the question of rotation policy. The short tours of duty for service in Vietnam temporarily increased the frequency and number of permanent change in station moves throughout the military. In fiscal year 1969, at the height of our involvement in Vietnam, 5.1 percent of military manpower slots were set aside to offset productive time lost by personnel in transit. As we have withdrawn troops from Vietnam, the number of slots set aside for rotation because of service in Vietnam has fallen. It is estimated that in 1972, only 175,000 moves will be Vietnam related. Yet the Defense Department is nonetheless setting aside 3.8 percent of its total manpower slots—96,000 men—for this purpose in 1972.

Although it is obviously desirable to rotate personnel frequently when they are stationed in combat areas or hardship areas—and this requires more frequent rotation throughout the force during a wartime situation—I am convinced we routinely rotate military personnel much too frequently during normal times. As my colleague, Senator Percy, pointed out last year in his effort to reduce appropriations for permanent change of station moves by 25 percent, no business would think of moving personnel around the way the Defense Department does.

The Fitzhugh Commission made two recommendations on rotation policy that have yet to be implemented.

The duration of assignments should be increased, and should be as responsive to the requirements of the job as to the career plan of the officer.

In technical assignments, the officer's replacement should be assigned to the job sufficiently in advance of his predecessor's departure to be ready to take over without loss of momentum when he leaves.

Poor utilization of military manpower is another example of inefficiency. Many tasks now performed by military personnel could be performed more effectively and with lower long-term costs by civilian personnel—as experts inside and outside of the Defense Department have been saying for some time. The Department of Defense itself has long supported civilianization of military personnel slots where appropriate—particularly in the general support category—and has undertaken programs to accomplish this goal.

Civilianization would result in a more efficient performance of tasks because of the lower turnover of personnel and consequently, the reduced need for retraining inexperienced recruits. In addition, primarily as a result of lower turnover, the number of civilians needed to perform civilianized tasks would be less than the number of military personnel now performing them. The Defense Department estimated in 1965 that 10 civilian employees could replace 12 military employees—a ratio of 1:1.2; the Gates Com-

mission last year posited a ratio of 1:1.1. Although total budgetary costs might increase in the short run in order to meet civilian wage scales, there would be substantially lower long term cost due to the lower turnover and the aggregate reduction in required personnel.

In 1965 the Department of Defense identified 373,000 "relatively substitutable" positions and undertook an immediate program to convert 74,300 of them. In 1966 it began the second phase of the program designed to civilianize an additional 40,000 positions. By June 1968, 114,000 military positions had been eliminated and 95,000 additional civilians had been hired. However a GAO study of the civilianization program disclosed that 30 percent of the military positions converted had been vacant before conversion. For this reason, only 70 percent of the positions civilianized actually resulted in the release of military personnel for military duties and an ultimate reduction in military personnel and cost.

In addition, for reasons largely beyond the Pentagon's control, many of the positions civilianized later reverted to military positions. The Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 put severe constraints on civil service personnel available to all Government agencies. Section 201 of that act prohibited any civilian hiring when the total number of employees in the executive branch exceeded the number employed on June 30, 1966. The same section also permitted a Department to fill only 75 percent of the civilian positions vacated through resignation, retirement, removal, or death. Nearly 30,000 civilian positions were lost during fiscal year 1968.

Although the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 was repealed in July 1969, the Budget Bureau nonetheless continued to prescribe manpower ceilings.

However the Office of Management and Budget has recently announced that it will lift manpower ceilings for an experimental 1-year period in fiscal year 1972. This would appear to present an excellent opportunity to recoup past losses in the civilianization program and to move vigorously ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point, a table comparing civilian personnel strength between 1964-72.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[In thousands]

Fiscal year—	Civilian personnel strength	Civilian additions due to civilianized program
1964.....	1,035	.....
1966.....	1,126	60
1967.....	1,278	35
1968.....	1,287	.....
1970.....	1,161	.....
1971.....	1,104	.....
1972.....	1,082	.....

Mr. STEVENSON. A recent GAO study of four installations found that 10 percent of their personnel were assigned to duties—military occupational specialists—MOS—for which they had not been

trained. A similar study conducted in 1964 disclosed only 4 percent of military personnel misassigned. Use of personnel in assignments for which they are not trained results in reduced morale and effectiveness as well as lower productivity per man and requires more men to accomplish the same duties than would be necessary if the men were qualified.

These misuses of manpower resources I have cited indicate we do not require the high number of military personnel requested by the Defense Department. My vote for the Hatfield amendment to end the draft reflected my belief that our real manpower needs could be met entirely through volunteer enlistment. The Senate's acceptance of the Mansfield amendment to the selective service extension legislation was a principal reason for not opposing final passage of a bill containing a 2-year extension of the draft.

In the long run, the level of our military manpower will depend upon the level and distribution of force structures necessary to satisfy our national security needs. And there is reason to question whether our general purpose force levels and allocation are consistent with our stated national security goals.

In his testimony on the proposed fiscal year 1972 defense budget, Secretary Laird reiterates the Defense Department's switch from planning for a 2½ war contingency to a 1½ war contingency.

How does this stated policy translate into force allocations? At the end of the fiscal year 1971 we had 13½ Army divisions and three Marine divisions.

According to Secretary Laird, the Defense Department is planning 13½ active Army divisions and three active Marine divisions for the end of fiscal year 1972—a reduction of only one-third of an army division. How will these forces be allocated?

Will forces returning from Vietnam be assigned to European contingencies? If so, what changes in the European theatre would justify these additional force allotments? Will the returning forces be assigned to Asian contingencies? How would such a decision square with the Nixon doctrine which posits an Asian policy of providing material and logistic support, but not combat manpower to our Asian allies?

I also have questions concerning the size of U.S.-based forces assigned to a European contingency. If all the divisions are necessary, must they immediately be accompanied by their full ISI and SSI components? According to the Defense Department's statement on military manpower defense requirements, the SSI consists of "personnel assigned to nondivisional units required to support a combat division and its ISI after 60 days of combat." Why do we not eliminate the three SSI components associated with U.S. based divisions earmarked for Europe and transfer the support functions of these increments to Army reserve units. The SSI units perform predominantly combat service support duties which are quite closely related to civilian skills held by many reservists, so they would require very little additional

training after they were called up. Certainly it should be possible to call up reserve units and transport them to Europe within 60 days of the initiation of combat. Eliminating three SSI units would reduce military manpower by nearly 60,000. An additional 60,000 reserves would be needed, but the cost per man of maintaining reserves is much less than for maintaining active personnel and many existing reserve units could be readily converted to these civilian type duties.

The above option would allow us to retain all active combat divisions assigned to Europe plus the full support—ISI and SSI—components of Europe based divisions. The Europe allocated force structure would include:

Division	ISI	SSI
In Europe.....	4½	2½
Dual-based.....	¾	¾
In United States allocated to Europe.....	3	12

1 At present, 5 SSI units are in the United States, but allocated to Europe.

Perhaps a similar argument could be applied to our remaining division in Korea, should it prove necessary to maintain a division there. Certainly the argument could apply in Vietnam where most of the original eight ISI and SSI units remain despite the fact that all but two of the combat divisions have been withdrawn.

In summary, the evidence suggests that military manpower levels can be reduced significantly—and consequently so can military expenditures. The burden of proof for justifying the seemingly excessive manpower request lies with the Defense Department. So far a convincing justification has not been made.

Enactment of the Proxmire-Mathias amendment would provide the Defense Department with a powerful new incentive to make the long overdue personnel changes I have outlined above.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have become increasingly concerned with the attitude that is developing here in the Senate regarding our Nation's defense. The feeling generated here is one of complacency and growing lack of interest in the state of America's security. I recognize, as we all do, that America faces urgent domestic problems, but I do not believe that the answer to these problems is to be found in hasty precipitous moves, to cut, across the board, large amounts from our defense budget. The long-term effects of such a cutback should be carefully analyzed, not only in terms of what we stand to lose in a security sense, but in a domestic sense as well. I believe that the Proxmire amendment falls short in its consideration of both of these vital aspects.

We have become aware of a gradually and consistently increasing Soviet destructive capability. We cannot afford to remain complacent or uncaring while the Soviets and the Chinese continue to make strides and investments in weapons technology. I am aware of the importance of the SALT talks and of what we hope to achieve there, however, I do not be-

lieve at this point we are in a position where we can afford to make across the board nondiscriminatory defense cutbacks.

On April 22, of this year, Dr. John Foster, Jr., testified before the House Armed Services Committee regarding the Safeguard system. Dr. Foster pointed out that the number of Soviet ICBM launchers had risen to 1,440 and was expected to rise to 1,500 by mid-1971. This, compared with the 1,054 operational facilities in the United States at the time. He went on to explain that recent intelligence shows that the Soviets have started a new ICBM silo construction program and that the silos under construction are unlike any previously constructed. We do not know what they are for or how many there will be. In addition, Dr. Foster cited increased missile production and stepped up production of "Y" class submarines.

I cite Dr. Foster to indicate that large-scale indiscriminate cutbacks at this time are foolish to say the least. I would like to look at the proposed amendment in two brief aspects:

First, The concern over DOD expenditures which generated this amendment does not appear to be justified by the actual figures involved;

Second, the disruption to our economy and to the employment situation is certainly not justifiable.

It is claimed that the Defense Department has spent some 4.7 billion in excess of its appropriations for fiscal last year. Defense Department figures indicate that spending was \$1.9 billion in excess of the original estimate for last year. That spending was authorized by Congress. The Defense Department was given direct authorization to use its prior balance to meet its needs. In addition, the Department received two supplemental appropriations, the last one in May of this year. The Department has not had a free hand in spending the taxpayers money.

It is true that overall defense needs were lower last year than in previous years—1968-69, and that projections for the coming fiscal year are lower than that; however costs have increased. Manpower needs are down 28 percent, but payroll costs are up. From fiscal year 1969 to fiscal year 1972:

First, military basic pay rates increased by 36.2 percent;

Second, civilian salary rates increased by 29.8 percent;

Third, military retired pay increased by \$1.3 billion or 55 percent;

Fourth, the volunteer force, a new item in fiscal year 1972 was included in the budget at \$1.4 billion.

Nonpayroll costs found increases through inflation, which was estimated at 12.3 percent from fiscal year 1969 to fiscal year 1972.

If concern over "unauthorized" DOD expenditures was the motivating force behind this amendment, I doubt that it was really warranted. The program pact of a \$7 billion cut would be catastrophic for our defense programs, let alone the economic and unemployment impact of such a cutback. A \$7 billion cut would involve:

First, a cut of about 1.7 million in military and civilian manpower from the



June 29, 1971

level budgeted for June 1972—nearly one-half—this assumes that \$3.5 billion of the cut is applied in the pay area.

Second, terminations affecting about 40 percent of all outstanding contracts for major weapons systems.

Third, cuts of about 30 percent in operating and training rates—ships, aircraft, and land forces.

These reductions would be the minimum required to save \$7 billion outright for fiscal year 1972.

I contend that enactment of the amendment would cause serious economic dislocation, increased unemployment, and serious damage to our Nation's defenses.

Senator PROXMIRE and others have observed that we must reorder our priorities. I submit that today we are changing our priorities. Nondefense spending has increased on the average of \$14 billion per year for the last 4 years. We cannot expect to change the face and the attitudes of America overnight, but we can expect progress, and we see progress. I fail to see where a nonselective across-the-board cutback in our defense expenditures could do more than is being done. Indeed, it could succeed in undoing much which has been accomplished and in endangering our security.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I will vote for the amendment introduced by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) and the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) to put a ceiling of \$68 billion on defense spending for fiscal year 1972.

Such a ceiling would save \$8 billion in defense spending. I would like to see these resources applied to the pressing human and social needs of our time, to meet the crisis within that is as deadly to our society as any enemy without.

With \$8 billion we could—build 2,000 hospitals of 125 beds each, or—construct 500,000 decent low-cost housing units, or—send 800,000 deserving students through 4 years of public college or university with full tuition, room and board, or—build 120,000 new elementary or high school classrooms, or—eradicate hunger in the United States and create 300,000 public service jobs to find useful work for those who have lost their jobs in the current recession.

Not only could that \$8 billion be effectively applied to begin to solve some of the domestic problems which now confront us, but a reduction in defense expenditures in that amount need not mean weaker, less effective U.S. armed services.

I believe the Proxmire-Mathias amendment, by establishing a reduced ceiling on defense spending, is an important and essential first step. It is imperative that we halt and reverse the trend toward an ever-more ponderous and expensive military establishment which seems increasingly inefficient, self-serving, and redundant. This amendment would do so.

Mr. President, I regard the \$68 billion figure suggested by this amendment to be a reasonable one. But I believe that the Congress fulfills only a portion of its responsibility by writing into law this or other legislation that cuts Defense spending on a percentage basis or which selects a particular figure as a spending ceiling.

I believe it is our responsibility to examine on a rational and analytic basis each of the components which are part of the Defense budget. We must be sure that we are buying the kind of defense that we really need; that our defense posture conforms in a realistic way to our vital responsibilities and the potential threats we might face; and that we are not spending our national resources on weapons which are unnecessarily redundant or which are requested because they conform to some obsolescent tradition rather than to current needs.

Mr. President last week the Senate passed by a voice vote an amendment which I and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) introduced. Among other things it called on the Defense Department to project how it might make a further 10-percent cut in our military manpower levels below fiscal year 1972 levels. I believe that study could show both to the Pentagon and to the Congress new ways in which a more efficient and austere use and deployment of military personnel could result in considerable savings in military spending—without damaging our capacity to protect our truly vital interests.

Should Congress authorize a 10-percent reduction in military manpower—we could save \$5.4 billion in the coming year alone.

Beyond possible manpower savings, I believe there are a number of ways in which we can save on military procurement and operations. In coming days I will be speaking on this question in greater detail. But for now let me suggest at least several widely publicized weapon systems on which we could save substantial amounts without damaging our capacity to defend ourselves and meet our vital commitments.

We could save \$1.2 billion next fiscal year by postponing further ABM deployment. Not only is the Safeguard system itself highly questionable, but the administration has indicated it believes an ABM limitation agreement at the SALT talks is close. It would be unwise and potentially wasteful to appropriate funds for continued construction of an ABM system which such an agreement might make unnecessary—or even cause to be dismantled.

We could save \$1.64 billion by postponing further deployment of MIRV warheads—both for Poseidon submarines and Minuteman III land-based ICBM's. MIRV was justified as necessary to penetrate a Soviet ABM system. The ICBM's we now have are more than sufficient to penetrate the small Moscow ABM system that now exists. If an agreement is reached at SALT freezing the Soviet ABM capability at about the current level, we clearly need no more MIRV's. Even if the SALT talks failed, we could buy and deploy MIRV's next year—still far ahead of the capacity of any Soviet ABM expansion to deal with them.

We could save over half a billion dollars by deferring procurement of the F-14 Navy fighter plane and related weapon systems. The House has already acted to delete funds for F-14, due to serious

cost overruns and the questions of some experts about the usefulness and desirability of this aircraft. We need not now make a final decision on this weapon system, but we certainly should defer procurement until cost problems are clarified and until more advanced models are available for "fly-offs."

We could save \$370 million by postponing appropriations for the B-1 bomber. The question of whether a "triad" deterrent is essential is currently under serious consideration in the Foreign Relations Committee. But even if some kind of a manned bomber is desirable, it is doubtful that B-1 is the manned bomber we need. B-1, in fact, could be one example of a weapon system derived more from past tradition than from current needs.

This is only a partial list of military items which, if examined carefully enough, could result in savings of at least \$8 billion, if not more.

In a different context, 10 days ago Judge Gurfein of New York declared—

The security of the Nation is not at the ramparts alone. Security also lies in the value of our free institutions.

What concerns me is that, if we perpetuate the past distortion of priorities, we will allow those institutions and the society from which they have sprung to wither from inattention and inadequate resources. If we do, all the guns and missiles we have will not save America.

## EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution now before the Senate, House Joint Resolution 742, is to extend, at current levels, funding of ongoing programs for which the Congress will not have completed appropriations by the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

I am most disturbed to find that, at the request of the administration, the resolution as passed by the House contains an extension of the \$75 million "Emergency School Assistance Program."

This program, funded under the Economic Opportunity Act and other existing authorities, was established in the Office of Education appropriation last year. Its purpose was to assist school districts desegregating under the decision of the Supreme Court in Alexander against Holmes County Board of Education, and it was to be replaced by a comprehensive \$1.5 billion program to encourage and assist school integration throughout the Nation.

I and many of my colleagues had serious misgivings at the birth of the program. We doubted that the Office of Education had engaged in sufficient planning and preparation, and we knew that Congress had not been given an opportunity to closely examine the proposed program.

I have no wish to belabor the point. It is clear, however, that our worst fears were borne out. Reports by civil rights groups and the General Accounting Office revealed widespread mismanagement. Major violations of civil rights and program requirements were frequent.

Last April the Senate passed a comprehensive school desegregation assistance measure, as the President had re-

June 29, 1971

quested. That carefully designed, nationwide proposal is currently awaiting action in the House of Representatives.

I fear that any substantial extension of the ESAP program will jeopardize enactment of that vital legislation.

Secretary Richardson states that additional funds to meet the immediate crisis needs of school districts desegregating under the recent rule of the Supreme Court in *Swann* against Charlotte-Mecklenburg. I am sympathetic with the Secretary's argument, but I believe that the \$8½ million authorized by the continuing resolution presently before this body should be more than enough to accomplish his purpose.

I wish to make clear my very profound hope that the limited extension of the ESAP program here authorized will not be subject to the abuses documented last fall. And I would warn the administration not to take the Senate's action as endorsement of extension of the ESAP program beyond August 6.

I ask unanimous consent that letters to me from Clarence Mitchell, legislative chairman of the leadership conference on civil rights and Secretary Richardson be printed in the Record.

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

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE  
ON CIVIL RIGHTS,  
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1971.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your inquiry, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which supported the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education Act passed recently by the Senate, recognizes that the continuing resolution approved by the House last week contains funds to continue temporarily the so-called Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). As you know, it was ESAP for which Congress last year appropriated \$75 million and in which several civil rights groups and the General Accounting Office have found serious abuses and misuse of the appropriated funds.

The Leadership Conference had been hopeful that the Senate-passed school aid authorization measure or a similar bill would have been enacted by now so that funds could be appropriated under that new authority. In the absence of enactment of such a bill, we have no objection to continuing the funding of ESAP on a temporary basis so that funds might be made available to desegregating school systems to meet emergency additional expenses this fall—to assist in the purchase of buses, for example, in districts which must undertake substantially more transportation of students in order to comply with the standards of integration set forth in the Supreme Court's recent *Swann* decision.

We wish to make it absolutely clear, however, that while we do not oppose the continuing resolution temporarily refunding ESAP until August 6, we would not support any move to secure Congressional approval of a special appropriation along the lines of the \$75 million item of last year. We believe the Congress should instead be focusing its attention upon the school aid legislation authorizing \$1.5 billion in assistance to school systems which are desegregating and/or reducing racial isolation.

Respectfully,

CLARENCE MITCHELL,  
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Chairman, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I thought it would be helpful to provide you with some background on the Department's request to continue the emergency school assistance program.

As you know, early in this session of Congress, the President submitted the proposed Emergency School Aid Act designed to help school districts carry out successful desegregation programs. The Administration feels that legislation of this nature is of the greatest importance, and we hope that a bill acceptable to both Houses of Congress will be approved in the very near future.

Essentially, our current dilemma is that with the opening of the 1971-72 school year, a number of school districts are faced with additional desegregation requirements, and there is very little likelihood that the Emergency School Aid Act or similar legislation will be enacted in time to meet their immediate and critical needs.

The continuing resolution (H.J. Resolution 742) now before the Senate would continue emergency school assistance funding provided in the fiscal year 1971 Office of Education Appropriations Act.

The authority proposed in the continuing resolution becomes very important given the Supreme Court's decision in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* and in companion cases handed down on April 20, 1971. The effect of the *Swann* ruling is to impose additional desegregation requirements on those school systems which do not now meet the Constitutional standards set forth in that decision. At the moment and until the Emergency School Aid Act or its equivalent becomes law, the only authority to provide emergency assistance to school districts is that which is embodied in the continuing resolution as proposed by the Senate Committee.

We should point out that, under the Continuing Resolution, we would be providing such emergency assistance only to school districts which must make significant adjustments this fall in response to the Supreme Court's *Swann* decision. Revised program regulations to this effect will be issued shortly in the event the Congress approves the continuing resolution. The statutory provisions applicable to the present program will, of course, remain in force. Our purpose under the resolution is to assist comprehensive desegregation programs, including activities such as teacher training, curriculum revision, and support services.

As I have indicated, we anticipate that a considerably smaller number of districts will be eligible to participate in the program during the period of the continuing resolution. This will facilitate a more thorough review of each application in light of the lessons we have learned in administering the funds during the course of the 1970-71 academic year.

This interim action under the continuing resolution would, of course, continue only for such time as the continuing resolution remains in effect or until such time as the Emergency School Aid Act or its equivalent becomes law.

Again, let me emphasize that a continuation of this limited emergency measure in no way preempts the larger scope and purpose of the school aid legislation now being considered by the House.

The President's objective is to encourage all school districts to deal affirmatively with the problems of minority group isolation in the schools and the funds provided by the continuing resolution will not meet this vital

objective. I urge the Congress to act on this crucial legislation.

With kindest regards,  
Sincerely,

ELLIOT RICHARDSON,  
Secretary.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967: to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HEBERT, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. FISHER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. O'KONSKI, and Mr. BRAY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED MEASURES SIGNED

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

H.R. 5257. An act to extend the school breakfast and special food programs; and House Joint Resolution 744. A joint resolution making an appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 742) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year of 1972, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

MR. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had in mind addressing myself to a different part of this measure which is a continuing resolution on many matters, but which specifically deals with the emergency school assistance program which is also contained in the continuing resolution.

That involves assistance in the desegregation of the public schools of the country. It will be remembered that we provided \$75 million for that purpose, anticipating the emergency school aid program which would amount to \$1.5 billion for 2 years as proposed by the President and contained in the budget.

The Senate passed such a bill which I think is a very admirable bill. The House has not yet acted. May I say first that I am deeply regretful that the House has not acted. Members of the Senate have been in consultation with Members of the House in the hope of laying the groundwork for action: I urge the Mem-

bers of the House of Representatives to act expeditiously upon this very urgently needed legislation. We will perhaps have a conference on the bill. However, we should face up to the responsibility of having the availability of \$1.5 billion for such urgently needed purposes in the country which is contained in the President's budget and is unused, although the need is towering and great.

That is my first point, as to the continuation of this operation which would mean, until August 6, a continuance of the right to spend at the prevailing rates in the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, after much thought I have decided to be in favor of the proposal notwithstanding the fact that there are obvious difficulties which I will specify. First, of course, and foremost is the failure existing in the other body to act on the full \$1.5 billion to promote equal opportunity. The bill passed the Senate on April 28.

Second, there has been a deep feeling that there is much abuse in the utilization of the \$75 million which we appropriated last year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent in respect of the specificity of that which relates to the spending activities unrelated to the desegregation process, and discriminatory activities in funded districts, for example, the in-school segregation among children of a different color as well as wholesale firings and demotions of black principals and black teachers, that excerpts from a report of General Accounting Office to the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of which I am a member, be printed in the RECORD, as well as excerpts from comments on this program and its operation by a group of voluntary organizations, including the American Friends Service Committee, the NAACP legal defense fund, and the Washington research project.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

At the request of the Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the policies and procedures of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) for approving grants of Federal funds to school districts to defray the costs of meeting special problems arising from school desegregation.

To meet the emergency needs of school districts that were desegregating, the President, on May 25, 1970, requested that the Congress appropriate, under six existing legislative authorities, \$150 million to be made available immediately to these school districts. On August 18, 1970, the Congress appropriated one-half of this amount and thereby established the Emergency School Assistance Program.

In accordance with the Committee's request, GAO selected grants made to 50 school districts for its review of approval procedures. The 50 grants, which were made by five of the HEW regional offices, totaled about \$14 million, or about 25 percent of the approximately \$55 million in grants made to 793 school districts as of November 13, 1970.

This review was conducted at HEW headquarters, Washington, D.C., and at five HEW

regional offices. No work was done at the grantee school districts. Consequently, this report does not contain comments on the procedures and expenditures of the school districts relating to these grants. As a follow on to this review, GAO plans to make reviews at the school districts to examine into the expenditures of the grant funds.

The Office of Education and HEW have not been given an opportunity to formally examine and comment on this report, although most of the matters were discussed with agency officials.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Procedural weaknesses

GAO believes that, in many cases, school districts did not submit with their applications, nor did HEW regional offices obtain, sufficient information to enable a proper determination that the grants were made in accordance with program regulations or that the grants were in line with the purpose of the program.

Most of the applications did not contain comprehensive statements of the problems faced in achieving and maintaining desegregated school systems, nor did they contain adequate descriptions of the proposed activities designed to comprehensively and effectively meet such problems. Particularly, there was a lack of documentation in the regional files as to how the proposed activities would meet the special needs of the children incident to the elimination of racial segregation and discrimination in the schools. (See pp. 26, 45, and 55.)

Therefore GAO believes that the applications in many cases did not provide HEW with an adequate means for determining that project approvals were based upon consideration of such required factors as the applicants' needs for assistance, the relative potential of the projects, or the extent to which the projects dealt with the problems faced by the school districts in desegregating their schools.

The files supporting most of the grants reviewed did not evidence full compliance by the school districts with the regulations concerning the formation of biracial and student advisory committees. Also most of the applications did not contain, contrary to the regulations, adequate descriptions of the methods procedures, or objective criteria that could be used by an independent organization to evaluate the effectiveness of each project. (See pp. 38, 39, 47, 51, 58, 61, 67, and 69.)

Officials in HEW's Atlanta Regional Office which made 28 of the 50 grants reviewed, told GAO that they generally did not have detailed information beyond that in the project files concerning the program activities set forth in the applications. Some said that they did not have time, prior to grant approval, to seek additional information and had to rely on school district officials to identify the major problems which the districts faced in desegregating their schools and to propose programs to deal with those problems.

Officials in HEW's Dallas Regional Office, which made 12 of the grants agreed, in general, that many of the applications did not contain adequate statements of the problems or descriptions of the activities designed to meet these problems. Officials in both the Dallas and Philadelphia Regional Offices—the Philadelphia office made seven of the grants reviewed—told GAO that they had satisfied themselves with respect to the merits of the projects, prior to project approval, on the basis of their knowledge of the school districts' problems and of their contacts with school officials to obtain additional information as considered necessary. There was an almost complete lack of documentation in the files with respect to the additional information that was known to, or obtained by these regional officials on the basis of which they had determined that the projects merited approval.

In the Kansas City and San Francisco Regional Offices which approved a total of three applications, the applications seemed to have provided sufficient information to enable regional officials to determine that the proposed activities were in line with the purposes of the program.

Transfer of property in Louisiana

GAO noted that Louisiana law requires that school districts furnish school books and school supplies to students in private schools and provides that transportation may be furnished to students attending parochial schools. HEW regional officials contacted 14 Louisiana school districts prior to grant approval and determined that the majority had transferred property or had provided transportation to private schools under the State law. For the two Louisiana districts included in GAO's review, HEW determined that neither district had transferred property or had provided transportation to private schools. HEW decided to certify that the Louisiana school districts were eligible for program funding if it had no indications of civil rights violations other than the transfers allowed by Louisiana law.

Questionable Situations

GAO believes that HEW should have questioned, prior to grant approval, the following situations noted during GAO's review.

One school district appeared to have been ineligible to participate in the program, because it had entered the terminal phase of its desegregation plan prior to the time period specified in the regulations for eligibility. After GAO brought the situation to the attention of HEW officials, payments under the grant were suspended, pending a final determination of eligibility. (See p. 20.)

Information pertaining to another school district indicated that program funds may have been used, contrary to regulations, to supplant non-Federal funds available to the district prior to approval of its grant. (See p. 37.)

Information in the regional files at the time that one district's application was reviewed showed that the ratio of minority to nonminority faculty in each school within the district was not substantially the same as the ratio for the entire school system, contrary to the regulations. (See p. 59.)

GAO noted another case where information that had become available after the grant was made indicated that program funds may have been used to supplant non-Federal funds otherwise available to the school district. (See p. 37.)

Reasons for Weaknesses

GAO believes that the weaknesses in the HEW procedures and practices were due, to a large degree, to HEW's policy of emphasizing the emergency nature of the program and to its desire for expeditious funding, at the expense of a more thorough review and evaluation of school districts applications, particularly as to the adequacy of described program activities in satisfying program requirements.

GAO believes that, to overcome the weaknesses in the HEW grant approval procedures, HEW should undertake a strong monitoring program to help ensure that the grant funds already made available to the school districts are being used solely for program purposes and not for educational assistance in general. GAO recognizes that postgrant reviews at certain grantee school districts are currently being made by HEW regional officials.

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

GAO believes that, in the event additional Federal funding is authorized for similar assistance to school districts to defray the costs of meeting special problems arising from the desegregation of elementary and secondary schools, HEW should strengthen its procedures for approval of grants to school districts. Such action should:

Provide sufficient time for regional officials to make a thorough review and evaluation of each application received so that approval will be based on an understanding of the problems faced in achieving and maintaining a desegregated school system and on an adequate determination that the proposed activities are designed to meet such problems.

Require that all information relied upon in approving school district applications, whether obtained orally or in writing, be made a matter of record so that the basis upon which grant approvals are made will be readily available to HEW program managers or to others authorized to review the conduct of the program.

Provide for an effective monitoring system to help ensure that (1) grant funds made available to the school districts are being used for the purposes specified in their applications and (2) the school districts are complying with HEW regulations or nondiscrimination as well as with the other assurances given in their applications.

#### THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—AN EVALUATION

##### INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The promise of the Emergency School Assistance Program has been broken.

Funds that were appropriated by the Congress last August to help desegregated public schools have been used for general school aid purposes unrelated to desegregation. In many instances, funds have been granted to school districts that are continuing to discriminate against black children.

This report, prepared by a group of private organizations concerned with the problems of race, education and poverty, is an evaluation of the first months of the administration of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP).<sup>1</sup> The report is based upon personal visits to nearly 300 school districts receiving ESAP grants by attorneys and by other persons experienced in school desegregation problems, and upon a review of the grant proposals of over 350 successful applicant districts.

We found serious defects in the administration of the program.

1. Large numbers of grants have gone to districts engaging in serious and widespread racial discrimination. Of the 295 ESAP-assisted districts which we visited, 179 were engaged in practices that rendered them ineligible for grants under the statute and the Regulations. In 87 others, we found sufficient evidence to consider the districts' eligibility questionable. In only 29—less than 10 percent—did we find no evidence of illegal practices. Specifically, we found:

94 clear and 18 questionable cases of segregation of classrooms or facilities within schools;

47 clear and 10 questionable cases of segregation or discrimination in transportation;

62 clear and 4 questionable cases in which facilities and staff had not been desegregated in accordance with applicable requirements;

98 clear and 123 questionable cases of discrimination in dismissal or demotion of black teachers or principals;

12 clear and 4 questionable violations of student assignment plans approved by HEW or ordered by the courts;

13 clear and 39 questionable cases of assistance by the grantee school district to private segregated schools.

2. ESCP funds have been used to support projects which are racist in their conception,

<sup>1</sup> The organizations involved in the preparation of this report are: American Friends Service Committee, Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., and Washington Research Project.

and projects which will resegment black students within integrated schools.

3. A substantial portion of the "emergency" desegregation funds have not been used to deal with desegregation emergencies; they have been spent for purposes which can only be characterized as general aid to education. Many of the grants are going to meet ordinary costs of running any school system, such as hiring more teachers and teacher aides, buying new textbooks and equipment, and repairing buildings—needs that desegregating districts have in common with school systems throughout the United States.

4. Grants were made to school districts that are not operating under terminal desegregation plans and therefore do not meet the initial condition of eligibility for ESAP funds.

5. In the haste to get some money to as many southern school districts as possible, ESAP money has been dissipated in grants which in many cases are too small to deal comprehensively and effectively with the problems of desegregation.

6. In contrast to the hasty and haphazard way in which grants for school districts have been approved, the significant provision of the ESAP Regulations authorizing community groups to receive grants under the program to lend their assistance to the desegregation process has been virtually ignored—not a single grant has been made to a community group.

7. In many districts, biracial advisory committees have not been constituted in accordance with the requirements of the Regulations.

8. The funding priorities used by ESAP administrators have been distorted. Only a very small portion of ESAP funds have gone to projects that emphasize student and community programs designed to improve race relations in desegregating districts.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill passed by the Senate contains several safeguards against discrimination, as we found in the utilization of the \$75 million, safeguards principally contained in section 5(d)(1). I ask unanimous consent that material be printed in the RECORD as well as the findings relative to desegregation activities permissible—and which we think should be permissible—with the use of this money as contained in section 6 of the Senate-passed bill.

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

##### ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

Sec. 5(d)(1) No local educational agency shall be eligible for assistance under this Act if it has, after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) transferred (directly or indirectly by gift, lease, loan, sale, or other means) real or personal property to, or made any service available to, any nonpublic school or school system (or any organization controlling, or intending to establish, such a school or school system) without prior determination that such nonpublic school or school system (i) is not operated on a racially segregated basis as an alternative for children seeking to avoid attendance in desegregated public schools, and (ii) does not otherwise practice, or permit to be practiced, discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in the operation of any school activity;

(B) had in effect any practice, policy, or procedure which results: (or has resulted) in the disproportionate demotion or dismissal of instructional or other personnel from minority groups in conjunction with desegregation or the conduct of an activity described in section 5, or otherwise engaged in discrimination based upon race, color, or national origin in the hiring, promotion, or as-

signment of employees of the agency (or other personnel for whom the agency has any administrative responsibility);

(C) in conjunction with desegregation or the conduct of an activity described in section 5, had in effect any procedure for the assignment of children to or within classes which results in the separation of minority group from nonminority group children for a substantial portion of the school day: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing does not prohibit the use of bona fide ability grouping by a local education agency as a standard pedagogical practice; or

(D) had in effect any other practice, policy, or procedure, such as limiting curricular or extracurricular activities (or participation therein by children) in order to avoid the participation of minority group children in such activities, which discriminates among children on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

except that, in the case of any local educational agency which is ineligible for assistance by reason of clause (A), (B), (C), or (D), such agency may make application for a waiver of ineligibility, which application shall specify the reason for its ineligibility, contain such information and assurances as the Secretary shall require by regulation in order to insure that any practice, policy, or procedure, or other activity resulting in the ineligibility has ceased to exist or occur and include such provisions as are necessary to insure that such activities do not reoccur after the submission of the application.

##### AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

Sec. 6. (a) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 3(a) and apportioned to a State pursuant to section 4 (which have not been reserved under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 4(a)) shall be available for grants to, and contracts with, local educational agencies in that State which have been established as eligible under section 5(a), to assist such agencies in carrying out the following programs and projects under the comprehensive districtwide plan submitted pursuant to section 5(a) as necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act:

(1) The development and use of new curricula and instructional methods, practices, and techniques (and the acquisition of instructional materials relating thereto) to support a program of instruction for children from all racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds, including instruction in the language and cultural heritage of minority groups.

(2) Remedial services, beyond those provided under the regular school program conducted by the local educational agency, including student-to-student tutoring.

(3) Guidance and counseling services, beyond those provided under the regular school program conducted by the local educational agency, designed to promote mutual understanding among minority group and non-minority group parents, children, and teachers.

(4) Administrative and auxiliary services to facilitate the success of the project.

(5) Community activities, including public information efforts, in support of a plan, program, project, or other activities described in this section.

(6) Recruiting, hiring, and training of teacher aides: *Provided,* That in recruiting teacher aides, preference shall be given to parents of children attending schools assisted under section 5(a).

(7) Inservice teacher training designed to enhance the success of schools assisted under section 5(a) through contracts with institutions of higher education, or other institutions, agencies, and organizations individually determined by the Commissioner to have special competence for such purpose.

June 29, 1971

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10161

(8) Planning programs and projects under this section, the evaluation of such programs and projects, and dissemination of information with respect to such programs and projects.

(9) Repair or minor remodeling or alteration of existing school facilities (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of instructional equipment) and the lease or purchase of mobile classroom units or other mobile education facilities.

In the case of programs and projects involving activities described in paragraph (9), the inclusion of such activities must be found to be a necessary component of, or necessary to facilitate, a program or project involving other activities described in this section or subsection (b), and in no case involve an expenditure in excess of 10 per centum of the amount made available to the applicant to carry out the program or project. The Commissioner shall by regulation define the term "repair or minor remodeling or alteration".

(b) Sums reserved under section 4(a)(2) with respect to any State shall be available for grants to, and contracts with, local educational agencies in that State making application for assistance under section 5(b) to carry out innovative pilot programs and projects which are specifically designed to assist in overcoming the adverse effects of minority group isolation, by improving the educational achievement of children in minority group isolated schools, including only the activities described in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (a), as they may be used to accomplish such purpose.

(c) Sums appropriated as set forth in section 6 shall also be available for grants to, and contracts with, any local educational agencies in such State, to assist such agencies in carrying out programs as may be required or provided for in the court order applicable to such agency referred to in section 5(a)(1)(A)(i)(I).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I express the hope that the Department will issue guidelines under this continuing resolution that are compatible with the judgment of the Senate as contained in its bill.

Mr. President, in withholding opposition to the continuing resolution on this subject, for the reasons I have stated, I am deeply moved by a letter to me from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, received today. I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I thought it would be helpful to provide you with some background on the Department's request to continue the emergency school assistance program.

As you know, early in this session of Congress, the President submitted the proposed Emergency School Aid Act designed to help school districts carry out successful desegregation programs. The Administration feels that legislation of this nature is of the greatest importance, and we hope that a bill acceptable to both Houses of Congress will be approved in the very near future.

Essentially, our current dilemma is that with the opening of the 1971-72 school year, a number of school districts are faced with additional desegregation requirements, and there is very little likelihood that the Emer-

gency School Aid Act or similar legislation will be enacted in time to meet their immediate and critical needs.

The continuing resolution (H.J. Resolution 742) now before the Senate would continue emergency school assistance funding provided in the fiscal year 1971 Office of Education Appropriations Act.

The authority proposed in the continuing resolution becomes very important given the Supreme Court's decision in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* and in companion cases handed down on April 20, 1971. The effect of the *Swann* ruling is to impose additional desegregation requirements on those school systems which do not now meet the Constitutional standards set forth in that decision. At the moment and until the Emergency School Aid Act or its equivalent becomes law, the only authority to provide emergency assistance to school districts is that which is embodied in the continuing resolution as proposed by the Senate Committee.

We should point out that, under the Continuing Resolution, we would be providing such emergency assistance only to school districts which must make significant adjustments in response to the Supreme Court's *Swann* decision. Revised program regulations to this effect will be issued shortly in the event the Congress approves the continuing resolution. The statutory provisions applicable to the present program will, of course, remain in force. Our purpose under the resolution is to assist comprehensive desegregation programs, including activities such as teacher training, curriculum revision, and support services.

As I have indicated, we anticipate that a considerably smaller number of districts will be eligible to participate in the program during the period of the continuing resolution. This will facilitate a more thorough review of each application in light of the lessons we have learned in administering the funds during the course of the 1970-71 academic year.

This interim action under the continuing resolution would, of course, continue only for such time as the continuing resolution remains in effect or until such time as the Emergency School Aid Act or its equivalent becomes law.

Again, let me emphasize that a continuation of this limited emergency measure in no way preempts the larger scope and purpose of the school aid legislation now being considered by the House.

The President's objective is to encourage all school districts to deal affirmatively with the problems of minority group isolation in the schools and the funds provided by the continuing resolution will not meet this vital objective. I urge the Congress to act on this crucial legislation.

With kindest regards,  
Sincerely,

ELLIOTT L. RICHARDSON,  
Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Secretary points out the urgency of providing some additional and continuing funds for the districts in the country now facing the process of undertaking substantial new desegregation. It will be remembered that the decision in *Swann* against Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education required busing to achieve desegregation.

Mr. President, may I have an additional 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired. He has no time to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield time under the bill to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, could the Senator from North Dakota yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank both Senators.

Mr. President, this letter spells out the fact that these districts which are now under the mandate of busing require ongoing sums in order to do what the country and the Court expects them to do. So, in withholding any opposition to this continuing resolution, I am deeply motivated by the letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Leadership Conference of Civil Rights, under the signature of Clarence Mitchell, chairman of its legislative committee. The Leadership Conference is really a consortium of civil rights organizations in this field. They, too, for the reasons which I have stated, feel that we should not stand in the way of the enactment of this particular continuance.

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

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON  
CIVIL RIGHTS,  
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1971.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,  
Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: In response to your inquiry, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which supported the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education Act passed recently by the Senate, recognizes that the continuing resolution approved by the House last week contains funds to continue temporarily the so-called Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). As you know, it was ESAP for which Congress last year appropriated \$75 million and in which several civil rights groups and the General Accounting Office have found serious abuses and misuse of the appropriated funds.

The Leadership Conference had been hopeful that the Senate-passed school aid authorization measure or a similar bill would have been enacted by now so that funds could be appropriated under that new authority. In the absence of enactment of such a bill, we have no objection to continuing the funding of ESAP on a temporary basis so that funds might be made available to desegregating school systems to meet emergency additional expenses this fall—to assist in the purchase of buses, for example, in districts which must undertake substantially more transportation of students in order to comply with the standards of integration set forth in the Supreme Court's recent *Swann* decision.

We wish to make it absolutely clear, however, that while we do not oppose the continuing resolution temporarily refunding ESAP until August 6, we would not support any move to secure Congressional approval of a special appropriation along the lines of the \$75 million item of last year. We believe the Congress should instead be focusing its attention upon the school aid legislation authorizing \$1.5 billion in assistance to school systems which are desegregating and/or reducing racial isolation.

Respectfully,  
CLARENCE MITCHELL,  
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, to make it clear, we emphasize that we reserve the right of opposition to the continuing

resolution for this purpose after August 6 in the absence of the passage of a bill by the other body. We feel that to continue the emergency school assistance program by means of a continuing resolution thereafter would only be one way of blocking action on an essential piece of legislation with \$1.5 billion waiting to be used for these vital purposes nationwide.

We wish to serve unequivocal notice that we shall not be disposed favorably to a continuance beyond the August 6 date for the reasons stated and we go along with the continuance at this time precisely for the reasons I have set forth and which are set forth in the respective letters of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the chairman of the legislative committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me 1 minute so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me 1 minute so that I may ask a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator tell me precisely why he picked \$8 billion? How does that compare with the situation last year, when, I recall, the figure was considerably less?

As one who has to vote, I am worried about the arbitrariness of the cut rather than the desirability of a cut, with which I agree, I am concerned about its steepness and its arbitrary character.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The reason was that last year the Committee on Appropriations originally appropriated \$68.7 billion. After that there was a supplemental. The difference between the amount we are providing in this continuing resolution amendment is about \$5.2 billion. This would amount to about 7 percent in reductions below the expenditure of last year. That was about the same percentage. That compares with approximately what we tried to do last year. We made a similar resolution and the difficulty is that this year the administration asked for an increase.

In addition, there is one other complication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. The complication is that the Allott amendment was agreed to and a similar amendment was agreed to in the House, which increased pay by \$1.7 billion above the budget.

In addition, the President expects to spend more this year. Altogether, we would reduce the requested expenditure, including the pay increase, by about \$8.7 billion or about 11 percent. That is a reduction below what they project, but a much more modest reduction below what they are spending this year.

In view of the fact there is a cutback in Vietnam of about \$16 billion since the

peak, and a cutback in military personnel of about 1 million since the peak, if those savings are added up there is a \$26 billion reduction, we should have a peace dividend of some kind. Even with the overlap, there should be at least a \$20 billion reduction.

Allowing all that one wishes to for inflation, it would seem there would be \$8.5 or \$9 billion we could reduce, and permit the Department of Defense to operate as they did. I realize that is in dispute, but that is our hope.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes so that I may reply to the Senator from New York.

The unwise or unreasonable part of this amendment is that the House has not acted. They have acted on the authorization but not on the appropriation. The Senate did not act on the authorization. The Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations held hearings for 6 or 7 weeks day after day. We did not have a chance to take action and we cannot until the House takes action.

Why must the Senate take this precipitate action? This only applies for the next 5 weeks.

Where will the cut be made? It would take 1 month to make plans. Therefore, it is unreasonable. The unreasonable part is that the proponents will not give the Committee on Appropriations a chance to take action.

We cut appropriations for defense rather sharply last year. They were deeper this year than I wanted to go. But we should have a chance to act, to consider it, and to consider, particularly, where the cut should be made.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and I ask that the time be charged against me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistance legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON).

#### EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 31) to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAMBRELL). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in House proceedings of June 28, 1971, pp. H5958-H5961, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate-House Conference Report on S. 31, the Emergency Employment Act, has been filed with the Senate.

Senators will recall that this is the bill which passed the Senate on April 1 by a vote of 62 to 10. It is designed to put unemployed people to work during times of high unemployment by providing Federal financial assistance to State and local governments which will hire unemployed people for vital, necessary jobs which could not otherwise be financed because of State and local budget limitations.

The Senate and House conferees agreed essentially to accept the Senate bill, although a number of features from the House bill—originally H.R. 3613—were incorporated into the conference report at the request of House Members and the Labor Department.

Thus, the bill authorizes a 2-year program of transitional employment, as authorized by the Senate, to help the Nation move from a period of high unemployment to more normal unemployment levels. Funds authorized by the legislation are triggered when the national unemployment rate averages 4.5 percent or more for 3 consecutive months. If the national unemployment rate averages below 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months, no further funds may be obligated under this legislation, except that even after the national rate of unemployment recedes below 4.5 percent, areas of substantial unemployment—6 percent or more—will remain eligible under the Special Employment Assistance section of the bill.

The original Senate bill authorized up to \$750 million in fiscal 1972 and up to \$1 billion in fiscal 1973. The conference report authorizes these amounts, triggered by 4.5 percent unemployment, but also authorizes an additional special employment assistance program authorizing appropriations of \$250 million each year to be made available to units of general government which have within them areas of 6 percent unemployment or higher.

Other major differences between the original Senate bill S. 31 as it passed the Senate and the conference report are as follows:

The Senate bill included private non-profit agencies among eligible applicants for public service employment programs. The conference report eliminates such agencies.

The House bill provided preference for veterans who served in Korea or Indochina subsequent to August 4, 1964. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report requires that special consideration be given to such veterans in filling jobs under this bill.

The House bill provided that no more than one-third of people hired under the program would be professionals as de-

Work done in developing high performance in rocket engines has been adapted for use in reducing industrial pollution.

An entire industry has grown out of research and development in communications satellites. Progress in this field has reduced the cost of a single telephone channel across the ocean from \$16,000 to about \$600.

The computer industry, stimulated and accelerated by space research requirements, has grown to an \$8 billion a year industry employing 800,000 people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brock). The Senator from Minnesota has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, if the issue is cost, the space shuttle should be defeated unanimously today. The Academy of Sciences has stated:

It is clear that space science and applications by themselves are insufficient to justify the cost of developing the shuttle.

An Air Force funded study by the prestigious Rand Corp. concludes that the shuttle could not be justified on grounds of cost. The only argument used to justify the shuttle on the basis of cost is the so-called Mathematica study which assumes that although in their peak year of 1969, NASA launched only 11,400 pounds in science and applications payloads and 370,000 pounds for four Apollo flights, that there will be 2,600,000 pounds of payload launched by the shuttle each year; based on that absurd estimate, Mathematica concludes that a shuttle becomes cost effective.

There is absolutely no basis for any such extravagant expectation. It conjures up the view expressed this morning by Dr. O'Leary that—

One can imagine having a requirement of nearly empty shuttle flights—either that or having elephants as experimental animals in space, going back to the vacuum tube from the transistor, using lead for casings and last but not least having weekly manned extravaganzas with multiple linkups and global surveillances. Twenty tons per week is a lot of stuff.

The shuttle and statement will require an enormous, wasteful, and useless investment—the likes of which I have not seen in the nearly 7 years since I came to the Senate. It is this investment which will put the valid and necessary part of the space program in jeopardy.

When the American public realizes that we are trying to authorize a space shuttle and space station program that will cost \$20 to \$25 billion, they will begin to lose faith in the entire program—that part of the space program which is so vital and which we need in the United States.

I am pro-space, but I am not pro-space waste. This is a wasteful project that will cost us \$20 to \$25 billion at least, before we complete development of the shuttle and the space station.

I am very hopeful that the amendment will be agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

Brock). One minute remains to each side before the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) on House Joint Resolution 742.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 742) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year of 1972, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brock). Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on the Proxmire-Mathias amendment to House Joint Resolution 742.

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. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MERCALF), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) is paired with the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND).

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) and the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator of New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) has been previously announced.

The yeas and nays were announced—yeas 24, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Bayh	Hatfield	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hughes	Proxmire
Church	Javits	Randolph
Cranston	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Fulbright	Mathias	Roth
Gravel	Mondale	Stevenson
Hart	Moss	Tunney
Hartke	Muskie	Williams

NAYS—63

Aiken	Dominick	Miller
Allen	Ellender	Montoya
Allott	Ervin	Packwood
Anderson	Fannin	Pastore
Baker	Fong	Pearson
Beall	Gambrell	Pell
Bennett	Goldwater	Percy
Bentsen	Griffin	Schweiker
Bible	Gurney	Scott
Boggs	Hansen	Smith
Brock	Hollings	Sparkman
Burdick	Hruska	Spong
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Stennis
Cannon	Jackson	Stevens
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Symington
Chiles	Jordan, Idaho	Taft
Cook	Long	Talmadge
Cooper	Magnuson	Thurmond
Cotton	McClellan	Tower
Curtis	McGee	Weicker
Dole	McIntyre	Young

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED—1

Mansfield, for.

NOT VOTING—12

Bellmon	Eastland	Metcalf
Brooke	Harris	Mundt
Buckley	Humphrey	Prouty
Eagleton	McGovern	Saxbe

So Mr. PROXMIRE'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on House Joint Resolution 742.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

So the joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 742—was passed.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7109) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brock). Pursuant to the previous order the Senate will now proceed to vote on amendment No. 233 of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE).

wealth of tangible contributions of space technology.

A company which supplied packaged food for the Apollo flights has been engaged in aerospace nutrition research for both military and civilian projects. It now markets a, low-calorie, high protein product which is a direct offshoot of aerospace technology.

A division of United States Bedding Co. has adapted fiber glass tube cushion fillers used in the spacecraft to mattresses in hotels and hospitals, cushions in buses, and fillers for chairs. The new material is easier to clean than existing fillers and is more easily sterilized.

Dramatic advances have been made in safety related materials: Fluorel, a plastic with good fire retardant properties is now used in housing construction for insulation purposes, in shipping cartons, and for insulation in the air transportation industry. Luminous devices developed by 3M Co. to assist in safe docking of spacecraft on the "dark side" of the moon now are being sold to airlines for use on aircraft exit signs. Automobile manufacturers have recognized a possible use of the material around keyholes, so motorists would not have to fumble at night to open car doors.

Many consumer products such as bedspreads, draperies, curtains, tablecloths, and pillows now contain a fiber which was used for its fire protection qualities in outer layers of the astronauts' space suits.

Technology which developed to cope with extreme temperature variations in space has been applied to the fabrics industry. An extremely lightweight, compact blanket that fits into a shirt pocket was developed from an aluminum-coated plastic materials that was used to make echo balloon satellites. The blanket reflects a person's body heat back to him. One version weighs less than 2 ounces and sells for about \$3.

From this brief cataloging of specific transfers of space technology to the products and processes of daily life, it is evident that the successful exploration of space has reaped bonus benefits—ingenious applications in unexpected fields. I conclude that developing technology in a specific area has a mushrooming effect as it infuses itself directly and indirectly into the fabric of our civilization.

There is every reason to believe that the total impact of space exploration will provide benefits that exceed all expectation, as Americans continue to make use of what they already know. The multiple returns from the space investment are already astounding. Our continuing commitment to the space program insures substantial improvements in the future of the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a release of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### BENEFITS FROM SPACE

If all goes according to schedule, Apollo 15 will be launched to the Moon July 26. As in the past three successful lunar landing mis-

sions, this expedition is expected to yield valuable and unique scientific information—knowledge about our Moon, Sun, and Earth and how man functions in strange environments.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which manages these missions, has a broad responsibility, which includes developing the tools and techniques for expanding our knowledge of phenomena in the atmosphere and space.

NASA's research work in aeronautics and astronautics has revolutionized such fields as weather forecasting and communications and promises even more far-ranging development in monitoring the Earth's resources.

Other fields, medical technology in particular, have benefited from space-related investigations.

#### AERONAUTICS

A joint study by the Department of Transportation and NASA gives top priority to the need for reducing aircraft noise and airport area congestion. NASA is currently working on quieter jet engines. The DOT-NASA study asks a reduction of at least ten decibels each ten years until aircraft noise is suppressed into community background noise.

NASA hopes to find a way to provide an effective air transportation system for travelers in smaller cities and less densely populated areas. A concept called the "dial-a-plan" system makes use of computerized routing and could work somewhat as a cross between an air charter taxi operation and a scheduled air shuttle.

The supercritical wing is a new airfoil shape that would allow aircraft of the future to travel farther on less fuel. Shaped almost the opposite from conventional wings, the supercritical wing has a relatively flat top and a rounded bottom to delay the rise in aerodynamic drag until the aircraft is flying at a higher speed.

Borrowing from Apollo technology, NASA will soon begin flight research to demonstrate that aircraft of the future can be flown by an electronic control system like that used in spacecraft.

General aviation manufacturers are usually small compared to other aerospace manufacturers and lack of the large engineering staffs needed to adapt new technology rapidly to their needs. Realizing this problem, NASA contracted for approximately 10,000 aeronautical documents to be organized, catalogued, and evaluated. Material pertinent to the design of light aircraft is presented in the form of abstracts.

#### EARTH RESOURCES

NASA research continues to contribute to the increasingly important field of remote sensing of Earth resources. One of the objectives of a recently expanded Airborne Research Program is to simulate over four ecological test sites (one in Arizona, two in California, and the Chesapeake Bay area) as closely as possible the data output of the Earth Resources Technology Satellite (ERTS) scheduled for launch in 1972.

The program will provide government agencies and university scientists who will analyze data with experience in using aircraft-obtained data similar to that which will be obtained by ERTS.

A cooperative smog research program involving space scientists and California air pollution experts has begun. Flights will trace the photochemical production of pollution and their dispersion in the atmosphere. Participation by NASA in smog research is the result of specialized instrumentation and research techniques at the Ames Research Center, Mountain View, Calif., originally developed to explore the evolution of planetary atmospheres and for investigations into the origins of life.

With the Department of Agriculture, NASA is conducting a corn blight watch. Goals of the project are to monitor development and

spread of corn blight during the growing season across the corn belt region; evaluate remote sensing techniques in assessing levels of infection in the corn belt; evaluate remote sensing's capability to assess the status and probable impact on corn blight and other plant problems; and evaluate results for feasibility of application to similar situations occurring in the future.

In the Caribbean, the government of Jamaica has asked the U.S. to assist in surveying the island's natural resources. A specially instrumented aircraft will make flights over the island and its surrounding waters at various altitudes to gather the data.

In another international development, Canada and the U.S. have agreed to a joint program for the use of satellites and aircraft in surveys of the natural environment.

The program will investigate remote sensing to monitor air, water, land, forest, and crop conditions, and the mapping of ice movements and ocean currents in Canadian and American waters. Mapping of geologic, hydrologic, vegetation, and soil phenomena will also be carried out.

Means for detecting and determining the size of oil slicks with air-borne sensing devices, and later, it appears, by satellite, have been developed. The sensors can detect and distinguish between heavy and light crude oils and light diesel oil.

#### MEDICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Many dramatic developments in the medical field have had their origins in aerospace research.

A NASA scientist conducting basic research into the effects of space radiation on body cells has discovered intercellular linkages that may help in understanding the behavior of certain types of cancer. He was studying the effects of ionizing space radiations in interfering with normal cell division.

Doctors can watch a movie of the beating of a patient's diseased heart—identifying dead spots or scar tissue in the heart wall, aneurisms, and other malfunctions—with a computer method devised by a NASA-Stanford University team.

A small analog computer that can continuously monitor changes in a patient's blood pressure and cardiac output has been developed at NASA's Lewis Research Center, Cleveland.

Scientists from the Stanford University of Medicine and NASA have successfully used sonar to monitor a patient's heartbeat and blood circulation. The studies can be made by a trained person in the doctor's office or at bedside in a matter of minutes.

A brain sensor and radio transmitter system developed for space medical research with test pilots appears to allow major improvements in diagnosis and treatment of schizophrenic mental patients.

The computer used to enhance pictures radioed back from the Moon and Mars has been successfully used to analyze pictures of human chromosomes. Chromosomes in a human blood cell have been analyzed in three minutes, about one-tenth the time required previously.

A pressure suit made for test pilots saved the life of a young woman whose internal bleeding could not be stopped by established procedures.

#### OTHER FIELDS

Early warnings from satellites are credited with saving thousands of lives and crops. ESSA has estimated that 50,000 people would have perished when Hurricane Camille hit the Gulf Coast in August 1969, if they had not been evacuated.

Techniques developed in the space program to separate chemical fuels in NASA boosters are now being adapted to separate oil from our natural waters to reduce pollution.