

among the responsible Federal agencies. The committee remains seriously concerned, moreover, that the Federal radiation council still has not adopted a recommended exposure standard for uranium miners. Our committee expects to schedule additional hearings to inquire into this matter. We intend to maintain surveillance over the executive agencies to assure ourselves that appropriate measures are taken, and that the division of responsibilities within the Federal Government does not serve as an excuse for inaction.

Unfortunately, a considerable amount of misinformation has been publicized concerning the past, present, and future hazards facing the uranium miners. Some of this has been the result of erroneous statements made by Federal officials, as well as sensational news coverage. There are the usual individuals who seek to derive personal profit by playing upon the fear of the unknown, and the legitimate concern we all share for the welfare of our fellow citizens.

It is to be expected in a field as complex as this that public confusion will result, and we consider it one of our committee's primary responsibilities to help clarify these matters to the maximum possible degree. The record of our recent hearings, though not yet published, is available for anyone to read, and we believe that the printed transcript will make a significant contribution to understanding of this subject.

In summary, I believe H.R. 10918 provides for essential AEC activities relating to the uranium industry, and I urge enactment of this legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI).

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. MORRIS).

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, included in H.R. 10918 is an authorization for funds to build a meson physics facility at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in the State of New Mexico.

I would like to remind my colleagues of the importance of this project, not only to research in basic science at the Los Alamos Laboratory, but the importance of this facility to research and education in the Rocky Mountain States.

This facility, which consists primarily of a proton linear accelerator, when completed in 1971 will be the highest intensity—although not the largest energy—proton accelerator in existence. Thus it will be a unique research tool, the only one of its kind in the world, and it will be located in the Rocky Mountain States.

The Los Alamos Laboratory is already a center of excellence in nuclear science as you all know. The atomic bomb was developed at the Los Alamos Laboratory and for the most part this laboratory has devoted itself to the weapons aspects of our national security. However, approximately one-half of the Los Alamos effort today is in nonweapons research

and development, such as the Rover nuclear propulsion for space program and the controlled fusion program which some of my colleagues may have alluded to. I wish to point out today that the scientists at the Los Alamos Laboratory are also engaged in unclassified basic research of great significance. The meson physics facility will indeed provide another way to further that fundamental research.

The primary reason for this facility is to study the forces within the nucleus of the atom, to try to understand why and how protons can stick to each other or stick to neutrons in the core of the atom. My colleagues are aware of the fact that we have been able to achieve the release of nuclear energy from the nucleus of the atom. We can utilize such energy to produce electricity. We can also utilize such energy to deter other nations from nuclear war, but scientists still do not know the nature of the forces involved in the large amounts of energy that are available in the nucleus of the atom. The highest intensity proton accelerator—this meson physics facility—is being built with the purpose of studying these nuclear forces. The reason it is called a meson physics facility is that it will produce a secondary beam of medium mass particles known as mesons. It is these medium mass particles, specifically of the pion type, which it is hypothesized is the means by which the forces between protons and neutrons in the nucleus are exchanged. Scientists have great hopes that when this facility is operating in 1971 we will begin to see evidence of the mechanism by which these forces are maintained.

Another group of scientists, the biologists and the medical scientists, have another use for pions. They would like to use negative pions for the purpose of treating deep-seated cancers in human beings. The linear accelerator at Los Alamos will provide beams of pions which can be utilized for medical research purposes in conjunction with the University of New Mexico Medical School. Such experiments will be carried on there and hopefully before the end of the 1970's, if better methods are not found for coping with deep-seated cancers, these strange particles may be used to alleviate the problems of deep-seated cancers.

As I stated before, this meson facility will be a great research facility unique in this world and located in a place convenient to all the scientists of this country, but most particularly, convenient to the researchers in the Rocky Mountain States. There are many good universities in the Rocky Mountain States and we need such research facilities to assure us that the people we train in the sciences will be able to work at home and receive further graduate training within their own region. Furthermore, it will give other Americans not blessed with the opportunity to live in the Rocky Mountain region, an opportunity to do their graduate study and perhaps make their careers in science and live in the Rocky Mountain region.

I would therefore urge my colleagues to follow the recommendations of the

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and support H.R. 10918, the bill authorizing funds for the Atomic Energy Commission's fiscal year 1968 program, a program which is forward looking with regard to science and technology. Not only ourselves but our children and our grandchildren will in the years to come profit from the research and development that will be carried out with the funds being recommended for authorization today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Atomic Energy Commission received from Mr. Clarence Mitchell, the director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a letter which does put in question the racial atmosphere and the lack of an open housing policy in and around the village of Weston, Ill. Mr. Mitchell's letter reads:

JUNE 21, 1966.

Dr. GLENN T. SEABORG,  
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: It is my understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission is carefully evaluating sites for the location of the Atomic Energy Commission's new housing facility. It is gratifying to note that among other things the Commission is considering whether adequate housing facilities will be available for persons connected with the project. During a recent visit to Colorado it was heartening to hear that the officials of that state were determined to see that there would not be any discrimination on the basis of race in the field of housing. As I am sure you know, the state of Colorado has passed and now enforces a fair housing law.

We are advised that the state of Illinois is also under consideration as a possible site. That state has a long history of extensive housing discrimination on the basis of race. In addition, its legislature has refused to pass a fair housing law. President Lyndon Johnson has called upon the Congress to enact a national fair housing statute but the junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. Everett Dirksen, has announced his opposition to this proposal. With the state legislature opposed to fair housing and an influential United States Senator also against fair housing policies, it would seem that Illinois should be disqualified as a possible location for the project.

Accordingly, it is urged that the Commission make a careful inquiry on the housing picture in Illinois. Without a clear legislative safeguard from the state and/or the Federal Government, it would seem that Illinois cannot possibly give assurances that there would be adequate safeguards against persons being deprived of housing solely because of race. A reply to this letter will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE MITCHELL,  
Director, Washington Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission responded as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1966.

Mr. CLARENCE MITCHELL,  
Director, Washington Bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: Thank you for your letter of June 21 concerning the problem of housing discrimination and its relationship

to the Commission's choice of a site for the proposed 200 Bev accelerator. You may be assured that the Commission deems this matter to be an important aspect in its search for the best site for the machine.

Under the circumstances, I have taken the liberty of making key portions of your letter available to the Director, State of Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development, so that he might respond on this matter, which is of concern to us all. I am enclosing a copy of my letter.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,  
Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question Mr. Mitchell raised a year ago is exactly what is in contention today. Each of the other five final site choices were in communities which had better support for open occupancy and which had better conditions with reference to this factor.

Mr. Chairman, for anyone to suggest to the Congress or to anyone else that that question was not involved or is not involved, I think they should be referred not only to the Chairman's letter, but to the assurances that were sought by the Atomic Energy Commission regarding the availability of housing to all on an equal basis. They went to some length to emphasize that they were going to inquire into the racial atmosphere existing in the community in which they were going to locate an ultimately one-half billion dollar project.

A press release of the AEC, issued on January 20, 1967, reflects the fact that it did, indeed, seek assurance of a harmonious racial atmosphere, and that there was some uncertainty concerning housing conditions in the area around the Weston site. The release stated in reference to "other considerations" in determining the site for the project:

With regard to using the Accelerator Laboratory to help establish new centers of excellence, the Commission concluded that the national nature of the project is of such importance as to mitigate against too closely associating the project with any one institution or group of regional institutions. The outstanding accessibility of the Weston site should enable the Accelerator Laboratory to have a large and beneficial impact on more than merely the universities and colleges closest at hand.

In its investigations and evaluations the Atomic Energy Commission included consideration of the climate of equal opportunity and non-discrimination that existed in the communities containing and surrounding the six prospective sites, as well as the applicable state laws, executive orders and local ordinances.

The AEC sought and obtained assurances of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity from local government entities, labor unions, business and industry, lending institutions, professional groups, as well as assurances that there would be individual and common efforts to prevent or offset discrimination and to deal with it promptly should it occur.

Information received pertaining to the Western area reflected a progressive attitude toward equal employment opportunity, efforts to provide equality in suburban public school systems, and a number of community human relations councils devoted to eliminating discrimination.

The Atomic Energy Commission noted differing views with respect to existence of nondiscrimination in housing, and in certain areas more distant from the site, with respect to integration in public schools, but

will expect that with the leadership of the state and local governments and with the cooperation and support of citizens and community organizations in the Chicago area, a broad satisfactory record of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity will be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this should be a matter of special concern to the House since last year we went on record that the national public policy should be to eliminate segregated housing anywhere in America.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall offer an amendment to delete from this bill all funds for the preliminary design of the Weston project.

Since this question may be raised later in the debate, I want to particularly discuss the position of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I want to read to the House a telegram sent by the executive director of the NAACP, Mr. Roy Wilkins, to Chairman Seaborg, on the day after the Illinois State Senate defeated the open housing law.

JUNE 16, 1967.

DR. GLENN T. SEABORG,  
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,  
Washington, D.C.:

Since Illinois senate today voted to kill fair housing bill National Association for Advancement of Colored People calls upon Atomic Energy Commission to revoke award of atomic installation to Weston, Illinois, on ground the State has no guarantee in law against racial discrimination in the sale or rental of homes. This refusal of Illinois Legislature means that an intolerable situation in which hundreds of millions of dollars made available by taxes upon all the citizens of the Nation, will be used to provide jobs only for white workers since only they will have unrestricted access to housing near their employment. We do not intend that this shall happen. The contract for this installation should go immediately to a community and a State which already has a fair housing statute. Illinois has had its chance and has chosen its course. We ask the Atomic Energy Commission to invoke the national non-discrimination policy and laws of the United States.

ROY WILKINS,  
Executive Director.

To further amplify my initial presentation on this matter, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a letter from the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing which I think summarizes the case against the Weston site cogently, concisely, and persuasively. I want to point out the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing is made up of all the many national organizations which are concerned that no American should be denied a place to live because of the color of his skin. The organizations in the national committee include church, labor, civil rights, fraternal and various other civic groups:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST  
DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING,  
New York, N.Y., January 27, 1967.  
DR. GLENN T. SEABORG,  
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: We are deeply disturbed by your Commission's decision to build its new \$375 million proton accelerator in Weston, Illinois, in the most segregated large metropolitan area in the United States. Despite Weston's proximity to Chicago's heavily

impacted racial ghettos there are no Negroes living in Weston or in the surrounding communities.

The National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing (NCDH) has long maintained that Federal Government installations of every magnitude and importance should be located only in communities which are committed to a policy of and are taking affirmative action toward achieving integration in the housing market and in every aspect of community life.

This position of NCDH has been upheld by President Johnson on numerous occasions, most recently in his address to the employees of the Social Security Administration in Baltimore, Maryland. Executive Order 11063 and Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act require that Federal agencies plan and execute all programs in a manner offering maximum opportunity to all citizens. As the President repeatedly has noted, the relationship of housing to job opportunities is clear, direct and crucial.

Unlike the other areas which participated in the competition for the AEC facility, metropolitan Chicago alone has taken no positive steps to confront its racial problems. When one considers that applications from areas other than Chicago were reinforced by state fair housing laws and other state and locally developed programs to break down segregation in employment, education, housing and related facilities, the determination of the Atomic Energy Commission to base its selection of Chicago on mere assurances of nondiscrimination must raise serious questions concerning the AEC's good intentions. This decision not only flies in the face of established Federal policy, but represents a major retreat from the position publicly enunciated by the AEC itself. NCDH recognizes that numerous factors went into the site selection process, and that race was but one of these factors. However, the pronouncements of your agency led the nation to believe that the open housing condition would not be waived under any circumstances.

As the AEC well knows, Negroes are denied the right to purchase and rent homes in suburban Chicago, which alone would make real their access to suburban employment opportunities. The Legislature of the State of Illinois, for example, has refused consistently to enact fair housing legislation covering the private market. Only last week the majority leader of the Illinois State Senate indicated that further "study" is required before Illinois is ready for fair housing legislation. In addition, the City of Chicago, with more than one million Negroes rigidly confined to segregated areas, has refused to extend its limited and weakly enforced fair housing law to the total housing supply. Even now, Chicago officials are planning to develop six thousand units of public housing in an area already heavily Negro to assure that racial segregation in that area is continued for generations to come.

So hostile is the Chicago metropolitan area to the idea of open housing for Negroes that the organized real estate industry of DuPage County, where the AEC facility is to be located, initiated the successful effort to enjoin the enforcement of Governor Kerner's executive order on housing.

The AEC's decision was announced more than a month ago; yet, there has been no significant change in the attitudes and practices of public officials or the real estate industry in and around Chicago toward open housing. Community doors have been locked to Negroes for generations, and they continue to be locked to Negroes today. Moreover, the virtual absence of Negroes from communities in and around the Weston site and the complete lack of Negro membership in the suburban craft unions of metropolitan Chicago calls into question the basis on which even the limited assurances of nondiscrimination were given. If Negroes cannot live or

work near the site area, their legal right to AEC employment is essentially meaningless and without foundation.

We submit that if the public funds and monies of the Government of the United States are to be used to develop the Weston-DuPage area along existing lines of racial and economic exclusion, this nation will have forfeited in advance the opportunity to utilize the last remaining land resource in the Chicago metropolitan area to facilitate the outward movement and suburbanization of thousands of Negro families now trapped in the slum ghettos of Chicago.

For the foregoing reasons, NCDH calls upon the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to withhold final approval of the Chicago area site, pending specific positive demonstrations that Illinois and Chicago will in fact plan, enact and carry through an across-the-board program to open wide the doors of equal opportunity for minority families.

The AEC and the Joint Committee should insist first, that the Legislature of the State of Illinois, now sitting in executive session, enact comprehensive fair housing legislation, covering the total housing supply. This legislation should apply to owners, builders, brokers, mortgage lenders and advertisers. Provision for vigorous and affirmative enforcement should be included and specific penalties prescribed.

Secondly, the terms of the agreement between the Chicago Freedom Movement and the political and economic forces which govern Chicago should be positively and unequivocally implemented, with the specific aim of breaking down existing patterns of residential segregation which have created the ghetto way of life.

Thirdly, the suburban Chicago community should initiate a revision of zoning laws, building codes and other legal and administrative devices which are used to bar entry to those communities of low- and moderate-income Negro families. Suburban jurisdictions should be required to enact local fair housing ordinances which establish as a matter of public policy the desire of these communities to welcome persons of all races and income groups.

Finally, the business community of metropolitan Chicago, including major employers and the real estate, mortgage lending, and home building industries, should declare publicly their determination to promote residential integration through such specific action as the affirmative marketing of existing housing to minority families and the development of an ample supply of low- and moderate-cost units widely dispersed throughout suburban Chicago.

We expect the Atomic Energy Commission to hold the state and metropolitan area firmly to their commitments, and to fulfill its responsibility and obligation to insure that the new town resulting from this installation will be a truly integrated community which opens the entire surrounding area. The steps outlined above are essential. If they are taken, they will result in substantial desegregation from one of the nation's most impacted racial ghettos. If they are not, the Weston site must be abandoned.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD RUTLEDGE,  
Executive Director.  
JACK E. WOOD, Jr.,  
Associate Executive Director.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that this bill (H.R. 10918) authorizes funds for engineering plans and designs to locate the proposed 200-Bev accelerator at Weston, Ill.

The gentleman from California [Mr.

HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] have discussed the criteria and detailed consideration which entered into the final selection of Weston for this great scientific project.

I am confident that the scientific and academic talent and personnel available from Illinois Institute of Technology, Northwestern University, the University of Illinois, University of Chicago, and other colleges, universities and scientific and academic agencies in this area of the Nation contribute to make the selection of this site highly commendable.

I am confident that the cooperation of the State of Illinois and the surrounding and neighboring communities to Weston will be immediate and complete. Their hospitality will be warm and genuine. I predict that the experience of those who serve with the 200-Bev accelerator at Weston, Ill., will be harmonious and rewarding to the entire Nation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee in urging the House to enact H.R. 10918, the Atomic Energy Commission's fiscal year 1968 authorization bill.

The Commission's request for authorization of appropriations has again this year been subjected to the closest Joint Committee examination. In addition to the 34 hours of hearings before the full committee which Mr. HOLIFIELD referred to, related hearings totaling 9½ hours were held in executive session before the Subcommittee on Military Applications concerning nuclear weapons policy and special, nuclear materials requirements. Also, the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation devoted 6 hours of open hearings to reviewing several issues directly pertinent to the Commission's authorization request.

Mr. HOLIFIELD has already summarized this bill and I believe there is no need for me to repeat what he has said. However, there are one or two points about the bill that I might call to your particular attention. In what I consider to be a very prudent step the committee has recommended an increase of \$15,000,000 over the \$700.5 million in operating funds requested by the Commission for its important nuclear weapons program. The committee became convinced during its executive session hearings on this program that added moneys would be needed if the Commission was to carry out both its high priority weapons development and production program and its testing program without sacrificing one to supplement the other. While some committee members might have thought it advisable to add more than \$15 million to the weapons budget, and others less, there was no question among the members that an increase in the neighborhood of the amount finally agreed to was necessary and desirable. I would like to comment further later on concerning the weapons program.

On the civilian side of the AEC budget I was particularly gratified to see the committee recommend an increase of \$1.5 million in operating funds for the Stanford linear accelerator—SLAC.

After spending \$114 million to construct this machine the Commission was planning to operate it at only one-half capacity during the coming fiscal year, primarily for budgetary reasons. The \$1.5 million increase recommended by the committee, together with another \$1.5 million which the committee has recommended should be provided by the Commission from within the physical research program, will permit a more efficient 15-shift-per-week operation of this machine.

Despite these and one or two other recommended increases in particular AEC programs, the overall amount requested by the AEC would not be increased by this bill, and in fact would be reduced by more than \$4,000,000.

As noted by our distinguished vice chairman, H.R. 10918 has been reported by the Joint Committee without any dissent among the House Members of the committee. I am confident that the bill which the Joint Committee has recommended to Congress is a sound one and believe that it warrants passage without change.

Mr. Chairman, it is very important to note at times not only those items that are authorized, but also those significant items that because it is a tight budget year failed to receive the committee's recommendation.

In this connection I wish to bring to the attention of this House the importance of a modest sized accelerator, the omnitron, that the Joint Committee deferred recommending for funding.

The proposed omnitron is a facility capable of accelerating all kinds—hence the name omni—of ions from the single charged proton, the nucleus of ordinary hydrogen to the 92 proton charges in the nucleus of uranium.

The research to be accomplished with the omnitron accelerator, which is proposed to be built at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, Calif., can make significant contributions to many fields of science. In particular it has been pointed out to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that this accelerator will permit experiments critical to nuclear chemistry, nuclear physics, and biology and medicine. The omnitron accelerator is probably the most versatile accelerator ever proposed.

Studies on the design of this accelerator commenced in 1964 and the laboratory designers, under the able leadership of Prof. Albert Ghiorso, are now ready to begin the detailed architectural engineering of this device.

One area of especially significant research is in the field of creating and then identifying new elements. These new elements have nuclei heavier and of greater charge than uranium. Heavy elements with atomic numbers between 114 and 124 may even be relatively stable like plutonium, for example, and thus permit new nuclear fuels or possibly the most dense types of materials to be produced.

Another important area of research is biomedicine. Heavy ion beams can produce more precise and localized effects in living tissue than can X-rays or gamma rays. These beams may be used

as a surgical knife in areas which would otherwise be inaccessible.

This facility is estimated to cost \$25,000,000. Its importance to science and eventually to mankind will be great.

I urge my colleagues in the House and on the Joint Committee to remember next year that this project was only deferred. It was deferred without prejudice and its approval next year should be assured. Its importance is too great to do otherwise.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a letter from the distinguished director, Dr. Ed McMillan, of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, Calif., where this accelerator would be built. He clearly states how important this research tool is:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
Berkeley, Calif., June 23, 1967.

HON. CRAIG HOSMER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CRAIG: Following up on our telephone conversation of last Friday, I would like to make a strong statement in support of the Omnitron project, and to do all that I can to ensure that the recently announced deferment does not end up in cancellation. I do not believe that this is the intent of the Joint Committee, and my statement carries no implication of such belief, but I wanted to express again to you my opinion that the loss of the Omnitron would be a disaster to the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and to American science.

The Omnitron will be a most important research instrument for the Nuclear Chemistry and the Biology and Medicine programs conducted by LRL. It is expected that the Omnitron will also be widely utilized by many other scientists from institutions throughout the country.

It will make possible research investigations in areas which heretofore were not accessible. New, rich regions of research will be developed and exploited, adding greatly to the understanding of the basic laws of science and leading to important strides in biology and medicine (for instance, medical therapy).

A great amount of dedicated effort has gone into the conception and design of the accelerator and a highly competent staff has been built up. These people are naturally very disappointed by the deferment, and will have to make some readjustments in scale of effort, but with adequate support and assurance of continuation they will make profitable use of the coming year to improve the design and sharpen the cost estimates of the project. We are expecting \$600,000 in R. and D. Funds, and we are requesting the AEC to make available \$400,000 in CP and D Funds. If this is forthcoming we shall be able to maintain the strength and momentum of the group.

Thank you for your continued interest in our well-being; it is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

EDWIN M. McMILLAN.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union of this House of Representatives has seen a rather remarkable thing today, it does almost each year when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy presents this annual AEC authorization legislation. It has seen almost total unanimity on the part of the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Committee has seen this because these members, realizing the

difficulty of the subject with which they deal, and realizing that there are matters of biological and physical science, and all the other related scientific disciplines involved in these responsibilities, make every effort to examine these subjects carefully and to examine them as thoroughly as possible during the open and closed sessions of the committee as well as during its deliberations on the actual language of the bill and the report thereon which accompanies this bill.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy come to an agreement and a consensus as to what is good for the United States in relation to its atomic energy and related activities.

We do not always agree down to the last dollar. I believe possibly we should spend more on Plowshare, and that possibly we should spend more than is in this bill on some of the nuclear weapons activities. Nevertheless, the other members of the committee and I always did agree on the sums that are in there, because as a consensus we felt they were adequate for the purposes and were not excessive in relation to the financial condition of the country in light of the war our country is now fighting.

I realize such respected gentlemen as the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL, may feel that we should have made some kind of an effort to shrink this authorization by 10 or 15 percent in light of these extraneous conditions, and perhaps he is very right, but we did not happen to see it that way. We have done the best job we could.

It is a pleasure to work with the gentlemen who are on this committee, and it is a very nice privilege to have the support of the fine staff the joint committee has. I believe we have come out with a bill that can be acceptable to all, or at least the majority of the Members. I realize we have this problem relative to the site in Weston, Ill., which will be considered in further detail during the reading of the bill, but I do hope the majority of the Members will support the committee at this end of the long trail that it has gone down since early January of this year to bring out a good, well-rounded program in the atomic energy field for the United States of America.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to again say a few words about an important part of this bill and explain further a significant action taken by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the nuclear weapons program.

Mr. Chairman, one of the paramount objectives common to both the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and its successor, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, is that of assuring the common defense and security of the Nation.

How well that objective has been carried out is easily measured by the achievements of the AEC's weapons and naval propulsion programs.

While the achievements have been manifold, the Nation's defenses will not remain strong if we rely solely on past accomplishments. Our potential enemies have not stood still technologically.

The strongest of our adversaries has moved into areas of sophisticated defensive and offensive nuclear missiles.

At the same time, the largest of our adversaries has in a very short period of years shown that he is capable of starving his people but achieving great technological success in large nuclear weapons. Needless to say, I am talking here about the Chinese Communist regime which only last week punctuated the crisis of the world with a hydrogen bomb explosion.

We in this country subject the military's recommendations for weapons systems to public debate. That is as it should be in a democracy. In particular, I have in mind here the deployment of an antiballistic missile system and the expenditure of funds for new and expensive offensive weapons system. I personally feel that the United States needs both, and that efforts should continue in both these directions to assure optimum progress not only in research and development but in deployment as well.

In an effort to save money in a year in which large sums are being expended for the war in Vietnam, the AEC's proposed weapons program budget for fiscal year 1968 came to us with a somewhat lean and emaciated appearance.

According to figures supplied by the committee at our request, the Division of Military Applications requested more than \$874 million to carry out its responsibilities for the research, development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons in fiscal 1968. By the time this budget was submitted to the Congress of the United States, approximately \$175 million was pared from the proposed weapons budget. Approximately \$110 million of this sum represents a change in the Division's estimate of what would be required for a supplemental test site program. Nevertheless, the executive hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy revealed that the proposed weapons budget was inadequate to assure both the development of new weapons and the maintenance of research necessary to this Nation's continued qualitative superiority in nuclear weapons for the coming years.

The Joint Committee has therefore added \$15 million to the Commission's request for funds for the coming fiscal year. Of this additional sum, it is recommended that \$10 million be used for underground weapons testing and the remaining \$5 million be utilized in related research and development at each of the Commission's three weapons laboratories. Possibly even this increased sum will not be equal to the tasks that lie ahead. These include the development of new offensive weapons systems, such as the Poseidon, and defensive systems, such as Spartan and Sprint, in addition to the production surveillance and research and development programs.

I do not believe that this is the time to discuss the important question of the deployment of an antiballistic missile system. I do note, however, that only last Sunday we heard the Soviet Union's answer to the President's attempts to get the Soviets to cease and desist in the further deployment of their ABM system.

They do not appear to be interested. I will not attempt to debate that question now. However, I wish to impress upon my colleagues that unless funds are made available for necessary research and development and testing, there will be nothing to debate about. Testing and development take time. We must provide the necessary funds for this development now if we are to be in a position to deploy such systems and arm them at a later date.

I again urge you to support H.R. 10518. As proposed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it makes a good start for the necessary research and development required in the Atomic Energy Commission's weapons program for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this time to point out to the House what seems to me is somewhat of an inconsistency between the action we took yesterday on the NASA authorization bill, and the action we are going to take today in the Atomic Energy Commission authorization. And that is this: that on the Nerva development program we are talking here about the supplemental request of the President, the request he made in February of this year for the development of the Nerva rocket in which he asks for an additional \$27.5 million from NASA. Under the action the House took yesterday, we have really reduced that by \$24 million, so there is only \$3.5 million of that left in the authorization bill.

And what is programmed is complementary funds, funds that cannot really be spent in one place without being spent in another. As part of the same program we had a \$30 million request, and we are going to pass the \$30 million authorization.

I have spoken to the minority leader about this matter, and I believe the advice he gave to me regarding this is wise. He said that we do not know at the present time what action, if any, may be taken in conference on this matter, but on the assumption that the position of the House is upheld in conference, there would be adequate time for this to be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, and such adjustments as are necessary could be made at that time. So I am going to take the minority leader's advice and opinion in this matter, and not offer any amendment in this committee to change it and make it consistent with the action taken by the House on the NASA bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement. Obviously we cannot legislate on a specific field between this House and the other body and the conferences that lie between it. In any event, I wish to assure the gentleman that the money for Project Rover that is funded in this authorization is to establish a technological base for the development of the space nuclear rocket as such. Now we know

there was a constriction of funds yesterday that may or may not be of a temporary nature insofar as hardware is concerned, but it was not eliminated; the project for a nuclear rocket in space is still on. Therefore the technological base is still insured by what is provided in the Project Rover funds in this bill.

In any event, such small adjustment as may be needed, as has been pointed out, can be made or appropriated when it acts or the authority granted by this bill.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman, the ranking minority member of this committee, that has brought this matter before the House today for its consideration in the Committee of the Whole House, would again explain for the benefit of Members the reductions and the percentage of reductions brought about by the committee over the funds asked or over the budget?

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman has asked me for a very difficult answer.

Mr. HALL. I may say to the gentleman, I am asking this question for a very specific reason. It is very difficult to discern from the report, and if the gentleman will refer to page 1 through page 4, particularly including the tables therein, I have difficulty in discerning whether or not there has been a reduction of \$4,381,000 with the different changes that have been brought in by the Commission; or whether it is a different figure. I would appreciate the House being enlightened on this.

Mr. HOSMER. Let me say this. The gentleman from Missouri has touched upon a sore point. We have one figure in the authorizations requested. Then we got six or seven changes down the line since that time.

We got a change that involved almost \$100 million for the weapons program.

Then we got some changes downward. Then the nuclear rocket thing was turned on again.

It is a long accounting job and I just cannot do it for the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Could the gentleman just summarize, and say whether there is an overage or an underage; or whether it was provided for in the budget?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I can give the gentleman the figures?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. HOLIFIELD. The additions and the deductions are on pages 3 and 4 of the committee's report and the final figures also are to be seen there.

There has been a total deduction of \$4,381,000 from the AEC request.

Mr. HALL. That is over the AEC request?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, \$4,381,000 less than the AEC request.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman compare that with last year's authorization, or the budget?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The total authorization, may I say, is more than that for 1967—that is true. We raised it. The

reason for that is that close to \$200 million of the increase is attributable to new weapon construction.

The reactor development program is increased by this bill.

Then the fast flux test facility, \$80,000,000, and the meson physics facilities, \$50,800,000, increased the authorization.

So there is in the total amount about \$374 million more than last year. But it is \$4 million less than the AEC request for 1968.

Mr. HALL. This sheds the first light of day on a rather confused issue on the floor.

As one of the physicians in the House of Representatives, I am not anxious to touch a sore point except when I think the taxpayers and the country have a right to know exactly in time of war where their moneys are going and how their moneys are being spent.

I find no fault with the Joint Committee bringing this to the floor today and I certainly have difficulty in finding any trouble in their rocket propulsion experiments or that associated with armed services hardware inasmuch as I serve on that committee—or even yesterday's NASA Nerva project wherein this commission participates.

But it is unusual not to have reduced beyond last year's request, in this time of a planned \$29 billion or so deficit.

I am sorry about the sore points that were touched on and I do appreciate the gentleman's references thereto. As I understand it, it is more than last year because of these various contingencies, but it is less than the AEC request by a few million dollars.

Mr. HOSMER. I understand the gentleman's reluctance to touch on sore points and I also appreciate that he does so when he feels that they should be touched upon.

I also appreciate the fact that some of the activities that we evaluated and concluded were valuable to be carried on, despite the fact that we are in this wartime situation, are not such activities as those that the gentleman himself would carry on under these circumstances.

It is a matter of difficult time judgment, and I certainly respect the judgment of the gentleman from Missouri and the reasons for it, despite the fact that it differs from my own in this particular instance.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to say in defense of the committee's presentation that in my own remarks I did give these figures. In analyzing the whole bill I did give, in the wall of the House, the figures which I have now given you, mentioning the fact that it was more than last year, and I gave the exact amount. I pointed out also that it was less than the AEC request. So the committee was not lax in presenting these pertinent facts.

Mr. HALL. Now, if the gentleman will yield further, I heard every word that the distinguished chairman said. As he knows, I am always in attendance here. The only question is not that they were

not properly portrayed. The question is they were not properly subtracted from. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10918, which has been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am for the entire atomic energy program and appropriation authorization. I would, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, call my distinguished colleague's attention to the Atomic Energy Commission's facilities in Oak Ridge, Tenn. From within this great industrial complex the nuclear age was conceived—nurtured by scientific ingenuity until today it stands second to none in nuclear research and technology.

Today, the importance of this diversified center is as great, if not greater, than it was in 1942.

Since the war, the efforts of Oak Ridge have turned to peaceful uses of atomic energy, in particular to those problems of society which have the solution and origin in science and technology.

Demands for future scientific accomplishments necessitate a greater utilization of facilities and scientific knowledge accumulated at the development.

Employees at Oak Ridge are among our most dedicated Americans, citizens who eagerly seek the opportunity to continue making dynamic contributions to the Nation's progress. The accumulation of know-how, capability, and excellence perhaps can never again be duplicated in the world in which we live and participate.

We have the finest laboratories in the world, and there is no material that cannot be analyzed.

It is my opinion that some of the great problems now facing mankind can and will be solved at Oak Ridge and at other AEC installations. For example, much effort is being put into research in water and air pollution and civil defense. Even the baffling and complex mysteries of cancerous diseases, by a cooperative program with the National Cancer Institute, are currently being tackled at Oak Ridge. This program is studying the action of viruses, chemicals, and other causes of cancer.

During the 11 months ending in November 1966, a total of 2,516,978 curies of processed radioisotopes were distributed by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Of this amount over 2 million curies of cobalt were sold, mainly for the treatment of disease.

AEC does not compete with private industry. As soon as a product is developed sufficiently, that is to the point that it can be turned over to private industry, the AEC immediately withdraws from that field. During the past year the AEC has withdrawn from the sale of 19 more radioisotopes, making a total of 36 radioisotopes from which the AEC has withdrawn since 1965.

There are other aspects of the AEC which I could go into, however, these

have amply been covered by my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the excellent report submitted in support of this authorization bill.

I am particularly glad to see that provision is made for continuing work in connection with the merchant ship reactors program.

The \$100,000 authorized in this bill is small—but it will, at least, allow study work to be continued while efforts are made to move forward with a program for nuclear merchant vessel construction.

I recall the Joint Committee's report of 2 years ago when it recommended an increase of over \$1 million in the authorization for operating funds for the merchant ship reactor program—because of its belief that—

Application of nuclear energy has the potential of contributing significantly both to our national security and to the commercial posture of the United States.

The Joint Committee has consistently shown its interest in the possibility of nuclear merchant ships.

At that time—it expressed its dissatisfaction with the direction which had been provided in the past within the administration for this country's merchant ship reactor program.

They noted that the program has suffered from the lack of clear-cut objectives.

During this past month—the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held comprehensive hearings on the subject of the proposed layup of the *NS Savannah*—the world's first nuclear merchant ship.

Happily—that ill-advised and short-sighted move was stopped through the action of the Appropriations Committee.

Our hearings revealed that the nuclear merchant ship program continues to suffer from the lack of clear-cut objectives.

They also revealed that the reasons for this lie within the administration—where there has been a failure to assert and exercise leadership in the development of an effective overall merchant marine program.

Hopefully—with the continued operation of the *Savannah* in carrying out the many chores she has yet to do to meet her original objectives—together with continued study with the funds authorized by this bill—we can continue to maintain our lead in this vital field—until the confusion in the administration nuclear—as well as overall—merchant marine program can be settled.

I commend the Joint Committee for its observations and recommendations.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I am voting today for H.R. 10918, the Atomic Energy Commission authorization which contains an authorization for a 300 Bev. accelerator laboratory to be constructed at Weston, Ill. I do so fully recognizing and disappointed that this site was chosen over an excellent one in my own congressional district.

In my reasoning on this action, I have, first of all, noted that Weston had been selected and approved after considerable

investigation by selection groups, the Atomic Energy Commission, and committees of Congress. Once the selection was made known, I conducted my own inquiry into the matter and raised two important questions contained in the following letter of April 27, 1967, which I now read:

APRIL 27, 1967.

Dr. GLENN T. SEABORG,  
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: Recent questions surrounding the selection of Weston, Illinois as the nuclear accelerator site prompt me to request official clarification from your Commission. These questions, both public and private, have naturally raised anxiety and anticipation on the part of Ann Arbor and Michigan which worked so hard to secure the final selection.

While we were disappointed that Ann Arbor was not chosen, we were thankful that a midwest location was recommended. My questions to you are in no way directed toward placing the Weston site in jeopardy. At the same time, however, since doubts do exist, the people of Ann Arbor and all of Michigan deserve clarification.

First, serious doubts have been raised about race relations in the Weston community. What are the findings of the Commission in this area and what, if any, action is planned?

Second, indirectly, questions on the adequacy of Weston's water resources also have been raised. Is there any validity to these doubts and what steps are currently being taken to resolve the problem?

And, finally, foremost in the minds of Michigan interests is whether these questions are of a serious enough nature so as to reopen the selection process. Certainly, if such is the case, our community stands ready to resubmit our qualifications which we feel fully meet the standards of the Commission.

The efforts of our people on behalf of Ann Arbor have involved the total community both public and private. This unequalled unanimity of purpose, completely bipartisan in nature, reflects the high degree of cooperation still available to the Commission.

Michigan and Ann Arbor stand in the forefront of the nation in the development of forward looking civil rights programs. The Michigan Civil Rights Commission, established in the 1963 state constitution, and the City of Ann Arbor have made great strides in attempting to guarantee equal opportunity for all citizens. Ann Arbor has passed an open housing ordinance and has established a strong Human Relations Council. This is not to say that we have solved all racial problems, but it does emphasize that we have the necessary structure and attitude working toward that end.

Furthermore, Southeastern Michigan is blessed with an abundance of water and power resources. There is no question that these resources could easily accommodate an accelerator without jeopardizing the needs of surrounding areas.

I am sure this inquiry will be received in the tone in which it is intended; not as an attempt to criticize your original decision but rather 1) to inquire as to the possibility of a review of that decision and 2) to reaffirm the desirability of a location in the midwest in general and Ann Arbor in particular should the matter be reopened.

Respectfully,

MARVIN L. ESCH,  
Member of Congress.

On May 11, 1967, I received the following reply, which I now read:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1967.

DEAR MR. ESCH: Thank you for your letter of April 26, conveying several questions regarding the selection of the Weston site near

Chicago for location of the proposed 220 BeV Accelerator Laboratory.

Your first question concerns race relations in the Weston area. During the long and extensive site selection process the Commission sought and received assurances of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity, as well as information on racial climates, from the six finalist sites that were then being considered. After reviewing the assurances and information, it was concluded that there were strong and weak points associated with each of the sites, and that each presented a changing picture. The conclusion that the Weston site is the most suitable location for the facility is, of course, based on a balancing of all the many factors involved, including those pertaining to equal opportunity and nondiscrimination. The Commission did not find that the open housing situation in the Weston area was satisfactory nor has it concluded that nothing can be done about it. We believe that a positive action program, concerning the availability of open housing and other equal opportunities, can have a very significant effect in this area. The Commission intends to have such a program throughout the life of the facility.

The second matter involves the adequacy of water resources at the site. The AEC expects, on the basis of information provided primarily by the State of Illinois, that ample water is available from aquifers underlying the site and from the Fox River. The water resources are, therefore, considered adequate.

You have asked, thirdly, whether these matters are of sufficient concern to reopen the selection process. In this respect, we do not foresee the probability that the Commission will reconsider other areas as possible locations for the facility. As a result of our detailed reviews, we are aware of the attributes of each of the six finalist sites, and extremely appreciative of the cooperation given by all the people who were interested in proposing them.

It is hoped that this information will be helpful to you, and if I can be of further assistance please let me know.

Cordially,

JAMES J. RAMEY,  
Acting Chairman.

Of course, I was disappointed in this reply. Yet, although some questions still remain in my mind, I believe at this time that it is in the best interest of the scientific and research community and of the whole nation that the facility be placed in the Midwest where it can draw upon the unique research complexes and expertise available there and still be accessible to the entire country.

And certainly when we are at this crucial crossroad, where the question could well be Weston or no facility, rather than Weston or Ann Arbor, we ought to proceed with Weston.

There continue to be questions raised concerning the racial climate of the Illinois site. While this deeply concerns me, I believe that the legitimacy of these claims should, properly and under existing law, be determined by the Justice Department. We have in title VI of the Civil Rights Act the power and necessary machinery to halt Federal projects where discrimination is being practiced. In addition, I draw your attention to Mr. Ramey's statement that the Commission plans an action program to attack discrimination in Weston.

Perhaps what we need is a thorough review of all Federal programs throughout the country so that Congress can determine exactly all the places we are spending money where discrimination

exists and what action may be taken to end such practices. I, for one, stand ready to face that issue. Yet this bill alone is not the proper vehicle for such a review.

Moreover, it would seem ironic that the U.S. Congress, which was unable to pass its own open housing law last year—a measure which I would have supported—would today take action aimed at coercing a State legislature to pass such a statute.

I feel confident that any racial problems in Weston can be corrected. The overriding factor at this point is the need to proceed with the development of this project so that the Nation can benefit from its scientific objectives.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) which would have killed the authorization of a \$7,333,000 appropriation to start work on the vital proton accelerator laboratory at Weston, Ill.

Had the amendment proposed substitution of Arapahoe County, Colo., as the site for this facility in place of Du Page and Kane Counties, Ill., I would have joined Mr. CONYERS in his motion.

To change the site of this facility is one thing. To simply obstruct the addition of this much-needed laboratory to the Nation's resources for nuclear research is another.

I was unhappy with the choice of Weston, because the State of Colorado, under the leadership of Gov. John A. Love and the Colorado Scientific Development Commission headed by Dr. Edward U. Condon, presented the AEC with a superb proposal for location of this laboratory on State and Federal land southeast of Aurora, Colo.

In the opinion of many, Colorado's proposal offered the AEC and the institutions which would operate the facility all of the physical support needed, plus unusual cultural and human resources and a tradition of gracious living for all citizens unmatched in the Nation.

It was and is my position that the AEC did not give sufficient weight to two aspects of Colorado's credentials. For one thing, I believe the AEC underestimated the standing of the University of Colorado in the scientific community of the Nation. The fact that this campus is surrounded by such outstanding scientific organizations as the National Bureau of Standards Laboratory, the National Center for Atmospheric Research, the Point Institute for Laboratory Astrophysics, the Environmental Science Services Administration Center and many other research-oriented laboratories is indicative of the university's attractiveness.

The other major point of contention was the fact that Weston does not have sufficient room to allow the facility to "grow" to accommodate an even larger proton laboratory which many in the scientific community believe the Nation will need within the coming decade.

Despite these points, Mr. Chairman, it is my judgment that few, if any, of the Colorado officials and citizens who were close to the site selection negotiations feel that our State failed to have its day in court. They take the position not

that Weston is a poor choice—only that Arapahoe County, Colorado, may be a better one.

There is no doubt in my mind that this facility is vital to the Nation, and that any action on the part of the Congress to delay or kill the project is unwise. I would rather get on with the project and then have us consider means to overcome whatever shortcomings Weston might have.

I would hope that the Nation's interests similarly will come first several years hence when—I hope—we stand at this same point with regard to authorization of appropriations for a 1,000 BeV proton accelerator to be located in Arapahoe County, Colo.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the House reduced the recommended NASA authorization for NASA's nuclear rocket program by \$20 million. This followed a lengthy debate on the wisdom of initiating a new stage of the program—conversion from technology studies to the development of flight hardware—specifically of a flight-configured Nerva nuclear rocket engine, for which there is at present no mission requirement. The House felt this costly hardware development had not been justified.

The same question is before us today in the proposed authorization for the Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC original budget request for Project Rover—which is the AEC program designation for the Nerva development—totalled \$60.4 million. Costs of \$2 million in capital equipment and \$1 million for construction of facilities also were associated with the nuclear rocket program for a total of \$63.4 million. On February 28 of this year the AEC budget request was amended to include an additional \$41 million. This relates to the flight hardware development portion of this program—the Nerva nuclear rocket engine—which is jointly carried out by AEC and NASA under the Space Nuclear Propulsion Office.

The extra \$41 million includes an additional \$30 million for Project Rover—new total \$90.4 million—and additional \$1 million for construction of facilities—new total \$2 million—and an additional \$10 million for changes in selected resources for goods and services on order associated with the nuclear rockets program.

As I stated yesterday, the only known requirement to date for this costly development—flight hardware by 1975 for an investment cost of \$2 billion—is a possible deep space mission such as a manned Mars landing. This would be a mission costing upward of \$200 billion. This is a mission that has neither been officially admitted to, nor discussed and approved as a national goal by the Congress. In addition, there has been no adequate comparison yet of the proposed nuclear propulsion system to be used in the third stage with alternative methods based on hardware already in hand. In other words, should the manned Mars mission ever be accepted as a national goal, the Nerva nuclear rocket engine would still have to be justified for use by cost and benefit.

The House expressed its doubts yester-

day and denied NASA's full request. Committee reductions and yesterday's floor action totaled a \$20 million reduction in funds for this program. I believe we should express the same wisdom here today on another portion of the same program.

I recommend that we defer funding of the \$41 million earmarked for a new development for which there is no mission requirement and allow technology studies to continue unimpeded as intended in AEC's original budget submission for fiscal year 1968. I propose that we leave \$80.4 million earmarked for Project Rover, \$2 million for capital equipment associated with the nuclear rockets program and \$1 million for construction of facilities associated with the nuclear rockets program. This sizable amount should be sufficient—as AEC's original intentions suggested—to continue advanced research pending any possible decision by the Congress that the development of flight hardware for the Nerva nuclear engine is desirable and necessary to carry out our goals in space.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10918

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

Sec. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of \$2,503,076,000, as follows:

(a) For "Operating expenses", \$2,164,843,000.

(b) For "Plant and capital equipment", including construction, acquisition, or modification of facilities, including land acquisition; and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, \$338,233,000 as follows:

(1) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 68-1-a, hot laboratory, New Brunswick, New Jersey, \$1,000,000.

Project 68-1-b, replacement waste storage tanks, Richland, Washington, \$2,500,000.

(2) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 68-2-a, new weapons production capabilities, various locations, \$100,500,000.

Project 68-2-b, weapons production, development, and test installations, \$10,000,000.

(3) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 68-3-a, research and development test plants, Project Rover, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, and Nevada Test Site, Nevada, \$2,000,000.

Project 68-3-b, isotopic space systems facility, Sandia Base, New Mexico, \$2,250,000.

Project 68-3-c, modifications to reactors, \$1,000,000.

(4) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 68-4-a, accelerator and reactor additions and modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, \$1,095,000.

Project 68-4-b, accelerator improvements, zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, \$1,900,000.

Project 68-4-c, accelerator improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, California, \$1,740,000.

Project 68-4-d, accelerator improvements, Cambridge and Princeton accelerators, \$400,000.

Project 68-4-e, accelerator improvements, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, California, \$865,000.

Project 68-4-f, 200 Bev accelerator, Du Page and Kane Counties near Chicago, Illinois, \$7,383,000.

Project 68-4-g, laboratory and energy storage facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, \$8,500,000.

(5) TRAINING, EDUCATION AND INFORMATION.—

Project 68-5-a, addition to biomedical building, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico, \$1,400,000.

(6) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—\$39,175,000.

(7) CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.—Acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction, \$156,575,000.

Sec. 102. LIMITATIONS.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101(b) (1), (2), (3), and (4) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start the project set forth in subsection 101(b) (5) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101(b) (6) only if it is in accordance with the following:

(1) The maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be \$500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be \$100,000, provided that the building cost limitation may be exceeded if the Commission determines that it is necessary in the interest of efficiency and economy.

(2) The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101(b) (6) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

Sec. 103. The Commission is authorized to perform construction design services for any Commission construction project whenever (1) such construction project has been included in a proposed authorization bill transmitted to the Congress by the Commission and (2) the Commission determines that the project is of such urgency that construction of the project should be initiated promptly upon enactment of legislation appropriating funds for its construction.

Sec. 104. When so specified in an appropriation Act, transfers of amounts between "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be made as provided in such appropriation Act.

SEC. 105. COOPERATIVE POWER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 111 of Public Law 85-162, as amended, is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1967" in clause (3) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1968".

SEC. 106. AMENDMENT OF PRIOR YEAR ACTS.—

(a) Section 101 of Public Law 89-32, as amended, is further amended by (1) striking therefrom the figure "\$2,604,821,000", and substituting therefor the figure "\$2,655,621,000"; (2) striking from subsection (b) thereof the figure "\$344,045,000", and substituting therefor the figure "\$394,845,000"; and (3) striking from subsection (b) (5) thereof "Project 66-5-h, meson physics facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico (AE only), \$4,200,000", and substituting therefor "Project 66-5-h, meson physics facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, \$55,000,000".

(b) Section 101 of Public Law 89-428, as amended, is further amended by (1) striking therefrom the figure "\$2,210,658,000", and substituting therefor the figure "\$2,290,658,000"; (2) striking from subsection (b) thereof the figure "\$246,530,000", and substituting therefor the figure "\$236,530,000"; (3) striking from subsection (b) (3) thereof

"Project 67-3-a, fast flux test facility (AE only), \$7,500,000", and substituting therefor "Project 67-3-a, fast flux test facility, \$87,500,000"; and (4) striking from subsection (b) (3) thereof "Project 67-3-b, modifications and addition to SIW reactor facility, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$10,000,000", and substituting therefor "Project 67-3-b, modifications and addition to reactor facilities, West Milton, New York, \$10,000,000".

SEC. 107. RESCISSIONS.—(a) Public Law 88-72, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 64-e-3, SNAP development and test facilities, Santa Susana, California, \$500,000.

(b) Public Law 89-428, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project as follows:

Project 67-3-e, heavy water organic cooled reactor (AE only), \$2,000,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. HOLIFIELD

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk. They are technical amendments which we are offering to comply with the request of the minority leader yesterday in order that the bill be technically perfect and not subject to conflict between the total amount outlined in the bill and the line item amounts that might be changed during the consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I offer the two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 1, line 6, strike out "amended, the sum of \$2,503,076,000, as follows:" and insert in lieu thereof: "amended:".

On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "construction, \$338,233,000 as follows:" and insert in lieu thereof "construction, a sum of dollars equal to the total of the following:".

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the minority agrees with the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONYERS: Amend section 101 to change "\$338,233,000" on line 1 of page 2 to "\$330,900,000" and strike lines 9 and 10 on page 3.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The point of order is that the first part of the amendment refers to an amount that has already been stricken from the bill on page 2.



The CHAIRMAN. Page 2, lines 1 and 2. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment and resubmit it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman in the well [Mr. CONYERS] has offered an amendment which would reduce the amount that appears in lines 9 and 10 by \$300,000. The point of order is that if the reduction in the aggregate amount has not been reduced to \$7,333,000, is not his amendment proper, and failure to consider it would result in—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman who has offered the amendment advises the Chair he will reoffer it, and that as it will be reoffered it will be in order.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a revised amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONYERS: On page 3, delete lines 9 and 10.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. I want to express my gratitude to the chairman for permitting this revision of the amendment which, very simply stated, would remove from this bill all funds for the Weston project.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion as to whether or not the factor of a good racial atmosphere and a fair housing policy and practice is relevant at all to the consideration of what will ultimately turn into a half billion dollar project.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is important for this Government to foster basic research in these very important areas, but I believe it is equally important—if not more so—to begin to foster the notion that the freedom to live where one chooses is as important as the scientific technology that we are concerned with in this bill, and that the American way is to make sure these experimental centers are being located where all of the potential employees, Negro and white, will be able to participate in this very large project.

It is going to take between 6 and 8 years before this project is completed. The Commission has sought in a good many instances to attempt to make certain that the local status of civil rights was one that was acceptable to the Commission.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that of all the five finalist sites that were under consideration, this was the only site located in a State that does not at least have a fair housing law. I would like to make it clearly understood to my colleagues that I do not consider a fair housing law to be the end-all or the be-all in perfecting human relations in a community. But of all the sites, the one least likely to afford adequate housing to any potential employees was the site located at Weston.

This was a factor considered by the Atomic Energy Commission. I urge that

the Members join with me in assuring that this consideration is very carefully examined, not only by the Commission, but also by the final reviewing body in this country, the Congress itself.

I have had much documented evidence and met with people whose personal experience shows that equal housing opportunity regrettably does not exist in the area surrounding Weston.

I am not in this well to blackmail Illinois into enforcing a fair housing law nor to punish the citizens of Weston—and I called and talked to the mayor of Weston only a few minutes ago, and I can assure you that he is a very fine gentleman and he is very concerned, as are a number of citizens in and around the Chicago area, about this problem—but we have seen that the assurances have not been adequate. A fair housing bill was passed by the Illinois House of Representatives, but then it was defeated in the Illinois Senate.

We had testimony from the Atomic Energy officials themselves, who admitted that guaranteed assurances relevant to equal opportunity in housing in this area do not exist. Below is Chairman Seaborg's statement on April 12, 1967, regarding the need for open housing legislation:

#### STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN SEABORG, APRIL 12, 1967

My colleagues, Commissioner Ramey, Commissioner Tape, Commissioner Nabrit, and I have come here today at the invitation of Governor Kerner to discuss with you what we believe to be a common interest and a common problem. The common interest to which I refer is, of course, obtaining from the Congress authorization and funds for the design and construction of the 200 BEV Accelerator Laboratory at the Weston, Illinois site. Although we have taken some substantial steps toward this objective, I must emphasize that we are a long way from its attainment.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has concluded its Authorization Hearings for this year but has not yet reported out with regard to the 200 BEV Accelerator Project. AEC is about to start similar hearings before the House Appropriations Committee and then, of course, debate will follow on the floors of both Houses of the Congress when the Authorization and Appropriations Bills are considered. Under consideration will be a request for authorization of some \$10 million for design work on the project. Although approval of these funds would permit proceeding with design, it would not constitute final authorization of the project. Such final authorization will be sought next Spring from the Congress assuming that design work proceeds according to schedule. At that time we can expect that the project will be again reviewed by the Congress in all its aspects.

I feel sure that all of us here are anxious that the design and construction of the 200 BEV Accelerator proceed just as fast as possible. It is a formidable task even without continuing uncertainties regarding the location of the project. This leads me to our common problem—discrimination in housing.

We have come here today because we believe that authorization and appropriation of the design monies for the 200 BEV project by the Congress this year and the construction authorization and appropriation of money for the project next Spring are endangered by the allegations of the existence of discrimination in housing in the site area and by the absence of legal means at either

the State or local level to deal with the situation effectively. If this issue could be eliminated we believe that the chances of obtaining the authorization and attendant confirmation of Weston as the site for the project would be greatly enhanced.

There is no question in our minds but that the issue of housing discrimination will be debated when the AEC Authorization bill goes to the floor of Congress within the next few weeks. Those offering and defending authorization of the project will need all of the evidence of positive action to eliminate discrimination in housing they can obtain. Frankly, at the moment, the AEC has little to offer. The commitments sought from communities in the Weston area have failed to materialize. On the other hand the concern in Congress resulting from protests of civil rights organizations against location of the accelerator at Weston has not subsided. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the AEC recently have received new demands that an alternate site be named if Illinois does not enact an effective open occupancy law or the communities pass effective ordinances.

Even members of the Illinois Legislature have recently protested to the President against location of the Accelerator Project at Weston because Illinois has no effective open housing law.

With the exception of the Village of Weston, no community in the site area has enacted an effective open housing ordinance. None has even provided the AEC with commitment letters on nondiscrimination in housing. The record here will not be impressive to the Congress. There is still time for effective action at the State level and the local level and that is why we have come to brief you on how the situation looks.

In our judgment, enactment of an effective open housing law by the Legislature of Illinois would go a long way toward ending any question of change of location of the accelerator site. We are not in position to say what the Congress will do with regard to the 200 BEV Accelerator Project if such a law is not enacted.

The schedule for Congressional action being what it is you might ask if enactment of a State statute could come in time to affect the outcome of authorization for the project. As I have already indicated, we anticipate that Congress will consider this matter both this year and next. We hope that if there is reason to believe that the Illinois Legislature will enact an open housing statute at the current session, Congress may be willing to authorize the funds for continued design knowing that next Spring it will have the opportunity to study the matter again before authorizing construction. If the State of Illinois does not act this session, it probably will not have another opportunity before Congress considers the matter again.

You may also ask if it is actually feasible to move the site from the State of Illinois. Political issues aside, it certainly is feasible to move the site. Work is just getting underway on adapting the accelerator design to the Weston site. As you know, the Commission found that any of the final six sites under consideration was suitable for the project. The Commission certainly does not favor relocation of the site but if authorization cannot be obtained for constructing this important scientific project in Illinois, the matter of location may have to be reexamined.

Let us consider for a moment other problems that may be raised by the not unlikely situation of the Congress authorizing and appropriating design money this year on the basis that such action will provide an additional year to observe what the State of Illinois and the local communities do about open occupancy legislation. If the Legislature does not now enact an open housing statute and if the State proceeds with ac-

quisition of the land for the project site it is going to face a real dilemma because of uncertainty as to whether Weston will in fact be the project site will continue until Congress acts again next year. Will the State actually acquire the land for the project site when doubts continue as to whether Illinois really has the project? If it does not acquire the land by next Spring what will be the Congressional reaction then when it considers final authorization of the project? How long can the AEC proceed with design of the Accelerator for the Weston site with there being uncertainties as to project location? These are hard but very real problems which could be all but put to rest if the discrimination in housing problem could be eliminated this Spring by enacting an effective State statute or local ordinances or preferably both.

That concludes my initial remarks. My colleagues and I would be happy to attempt to answer any questions which you may wish to pose.

What I ask, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, is merely to delete this section and thus make a declaration that the Congress firmly backs the Atomic Energy Commission's policy. I want to emphasize that my aim is not to have this project awarded to New York, Colorado, California, Wisconsin, or even Michigan, but merely to eliminate the project from the bill now before us.

Hopefully the Illinois Legislature could rectify the situation by the time this bill is considered by the Senate and the funds could be restored at that time. If the matter cannot be solved that quickly the funds could easily be authorized in a later bill.

In any case we have plenty of time to wait a number of months or even a year to gain the necessary assurances. This is particularly important because the Atomic Energy Commission has had repeated trouble on the score of housing wherever sites have been built. I refer to Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Pasco, Wash., and a number of other places. I talked only this morning with Clarence Mitchell, Jr., director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP regarding housing discrimination around atomic project sites. He was kind enough to give me the following statement to share with you:

STATEMENT FROM CLARENCE MITCHELL, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE—JUNE 29, 1967

The beginning of the housing discrimination in connection with Atomic Energy Matters Centers on World War II. At that time the Atomic Energy Operations were under the direction of Major General Leslie Graves. Three important locations gave extensive trouble. One was the Argonne Laboratories in Chicago. Another was an installation at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and the third was in operation at Pasco, Washington.

Since the areas used at Pasco and Oak Ridge were under-developed so far as housing was concerned, dwellings were constructed which were almost exclusively for the use of personnel connected with the Atomic Energy Commission operations. From the very beginning, and over a five year period, complaints involving colored persons who were denied housing were a constant source of friction. Some of the persons denied housing were in the scientific classification.

Although Argonne is in the Chicago metropolitan area, we are advised by our Chicago NAACP branch that most of the colored personnel cannot find housing in the immediate vicinity of the project. The largest percentage of the colored personnel must commute.

The construction of AEC projects under the direct supervision of the Atomic Energy Commission, after the Army had relinquished control, began in the 1940's in the area between Aiken, South Carolina, and Augusta, Georgia. A similar project was started in Paducah, Kentucky.

Both of these areas were also largely rural, as in the other cases. Here too, many new dwellings were constructed for the purpose of making them available to AEC employees and to employees of the private constructions handling the operations.

The similarity between each of these cases and the present Weston problem is apparent. At this period in the country's history, when we are acutely aware of our responsibility to be fair to all our citizens, we have an opportunity to avoid the mistakes of the past. This is why the requirement of firm assurances that there will be machinery to prevent discrimination in housing at the site chosen for the development of the Bevatron is essential.

I do not want to go back to all those sites and take away their grants, but I believe the House should become increasingly careful, since we should recognize, as the AEC has, that the availability of housing for all Federal employees is a very important factor in choosing a site for such a large project.

Regrettably, the Weston area falls in this respect.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to oppose my friend. I know his sincerity, and I know the principles he has and what he seeks to obtain. I feel he is perfectly in order in offering this kind of amendment. I know he is dedicated to the principle of civil rights for all people.

I honestly feel that I am dedicated to that same principle.

The problem of civil rights has been an onerous one in this country. We have been moving toward obtaining equal opportunity for people of all races, creeds and colors, and we are going to continue.

The very fact that this problem has been considered in the State of Illinois has brought new attention to it. An open housing law was passed in the State assembly, and it failed in the Senate. We have seen that happen on the local scene in many States, and have seen the situation remedied later.

We have seen similar things happen in this House.

The problem exists, I might say, in States which have open housing laws as well as in States which do not have them.

The passing of the open housing law in California did not in and of itself correct this problem in California. It was a move forward, and it has helped some, and it is going to help more.

So far as equal opportunity of employment is concerned, I say to the gentleman from Michigan and the other Members of the House that this committee is going to watch what happens out there. We have had assurances from several of the towns, from the chambers of commerce, from the real estate board and from others.

There have been open listings, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EARLENBORN] said. There are a large number of open listings right at this time.

There will not be a real housing problem there for 5 or 6 years. There will be

construction of this facility going on, if the money is appropriated, but most of the construction workers live in trailers. They come in their own trailers.

Considering that point and considering the time that is going to be involved, 5 or 6 years, for the construction of this facility, and the fact that we are going to keep our eye on it, and we are going to see that the maximum equal opportunity is given to the people out there to become employed on this facility according to their merits, and also that we are going to interest ourselves in housing in the surrounding communities, I believe this can be worked out.

Now, there are 6,800 acres that are going to be in this facility. I would say, if we find that there continues to be an insoluble problem in the community surrounding this facility, I would be in favor of and I would promise to hold hearings on the utilization of some of this 6,800 acres for a housing project which will be on a nondiscriminatory basis. I will hold hearings on that and bring a bill to the floor of this House, because we are going to do the fair and the honorable thing to see that equal housing opportunities are given to those people who want to work in this facility. I think this is right, this is honorable, and this is fair. I want to say that I will do everything in my power to bring this situation about if it is necessary. I do not believe it will be necessary. I believe that the people in these communities are moving and the letters and assurances indicate they are moving in the right direction.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I would like to say that I personally know of the chairman's activity in the area of civil rights. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has effectively fought for civil rights legislation for many years. I think his statements here will go a long way to help resolve the regrettable problem that has marred this matter and perhaps will smooth the passage of this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say that if we find an objectionable situation exists out there in regard to the employees of this facility when it is finished, then I will do everything in my power to see enough of the land of this great 6,800-acre tract is made available on some kind of cooperative basis so that houses can be built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOLIFIELD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If at that time the State has not acted and the county and the cities have not solved this problem.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes. I yield.

Mr. CONYERS. I reluctantly question the assurances that are going to be forthcoming. Let me tell you why. A fair housing bill passed the State house of representatives, and the State legislators from this area and both counties involved, I want to report, voted for the

bill. It was introduced by the member from the area in question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And the Governor of the State fought for it.

Mr. CONYERS. Yes. But the senate was unable to pass the bill. Mr. Chairman, I am questioning what kind of assurances we are going to have forthcoming when the Senate was unable to do what the House had so valiantly fought for. We know there is segregated housing that exists in the greater part of suburban Chicago.

As the situation stands now, a Negro American employed at the Weston project would only be assured redress for housing discrimination in the very few small villages which have enacted their own fair housing ordinances. Therefore, he may have to sift ordinances and verify assurances in order to find a home for his family which is reasonably close to his job.

I would like to call your attention to a condition which arose after the move of the 5th Army Headquarters from Chicago, Ill., to Fort Sheridan, near Waukegan, Ill. Our distinguished colleague, Mr. O'HARA, brought up this matter on May 1, 1967. At that time he cited the fact that "one-third of the civilian employees at the headquarters were forced to quit their jobs rather than move into a locality where homes ran between \$25,000 and \$45,000." Moreover, a real estate salesman told Charles Mount of the Chicago Tribune on April 30, 1967, that his firm, one of the largest in Waukegan, Ill., "could not handle any transactions in the move because of the no-discrimination stipulation by the Army."

Mr. Chairman, if such difficulty for 400 employees of an already existing installation has arisen because of a move into the Chicago suburbs, what might the thousands of new people who will be coming into the atomic project expect? The logic of putting this huge new project into an area which has proven its policy of housing discrimination simply eludes me.

To further amplify my remarks regarding the availability of open housing in the area around Weston, I would have Mr. Blount's article in the Chicago Tribune printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 30, 1967]  
THE 5TH ARMY GEARED FOR FORT SHERIDAN MOVE

(By Charles Mount)

The biggest military campaign in the Chicago area in recent years will begin May 9, most of it under cover of darkness.

After more than 2 years of planning, the nation's second largest army headquarters, 5th army, will move from 1660 E. Hyde Park Blvd. to Fort Sheridan, adjacent to Highland Park. The move, which military officials say will cost \$2.6 million, will mean relocating, over a 12-year period, the work of 945 military personnel, about 500 civilians, and 500 tons of equipment.

#### MOVE TO REDUCE COSTS

It also will mean that civilians will be working in a complete military setting for the first time. The headquarters, in a move to reduce defense department costs, will relocate from a former hotel and military hospital to an ex-cavalry post. Many civilians will be leaving a place they have worked for 20 years.

Relocating their homes will be 325 civil-

ians and 140 military families who have found or still are seeking off post housing on the north shore. Most of the personnel are moving from scattered locations on the south side.

Some 136 personnel, 126 of them civilians plan to commute to the fort on special military buses which will stop daily at the Hyde Park building and at Howard and Paulina streets. Another 80 personnel are seeking car pool partners.

#### RUN SPECIAL BUSES

The special buses will run for a three-month trial period to accommodate personnel who don't want to move while their children are in school and to encourage civilians who want to work at Fort Sheridan but don't want to move their homes. The army is trying to persuade private bus companies to take up the routes.

About one-third of the civilians are quitting their jobs rather than make the move, said Col. Paul A. Baldy, coordinator of the move as special assistant to the 5th-army chief of staff. Other military sources said as many as one-half of the civilians will not make the move. Most are going to other federal jobs.

In order to avoid massive traffic jams, five commercial moving companies will load furniture and other equipment onto about 27 vans after work hours. The vans, to conform with police requests, will leave one at a time at night for the fort, where they will be unloaded shortly after dawn.

#### DEVISE TRAFFIC PLAN

Military police, on orders of Col. Victor G. Conley, Fort Sheridan post commander, have devised traffic flow plans and special parking areas to avoid confusion.

Each of the 24 sections will move half of their operations at one time, thus leaving the other half to maintain emergency facilities.

Col. Baldy said some of the civilians quitting the headquarters are top-rated management and supervisory personnel. The others are spread thruout the other civil service levels. The army, in order to fill vacancies, has hired 283 people from the north shore in the last two months, he said.

#### MOST BUYING HOMES

The hiring of local people and the movement of 465 personnel into the area is expected to have a considerable effect on the north shore economy, particularly the housing market. Most of the personnel are buying homes in the \$25,000 to \$45,000 bracket in the Deerfield-Highland Park, Libertyville-Mundelein, and Palatine-Arlington Heights areas, Col. Baldy said.

The army has conducted housing tours and contacted real estate brokers to help personnel, but many of them still will end up paying from 25 to 100 per cent more in property taxes than on the south side, he said.

#### IMPROVE FORT SHERIDAN

In a move to help reduce possible discrimination against Negro personnel, the army has held consultations with Negroes stationed at Fort Sheridan, who live off post. Col. Baldy said no problems have been reported, but a salesman for one of the largest Waukegan realtors told The Tribune he could not handle any transactions in the move because of the no-discrimination stipulation by the army.

Col. Baldy said the present headquarters building will be turned over to the Federal General Services administration.

Improvements made at Fort Sheridan prior to the move include installation of underground communications cables; remodeling of eight buildings to house the headquarters; completion of 250 more living quarters; a new electrical wiring system, heating plant, medical and dental facility, and restaurant; and expansion of the library and enlisted

men's barracks. Expansion of the officer's club is under way. Improvements at the fort will total about 6.8 million dollars.

I do not think the proper way to grant these awards is to first emphatically state that the definite availability of housing on an equal basis is a precondition and then move back from that position and rely on mere assurances from an area that has a history of segregated housing. Mr. Chairman, I think we will be moving into the same kinds of problems that have been involved in Pasco, Wash.; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; and several others of the Atomic Energy sites.

There is no question that housing discrimination occurs in many of the areas surrounding major Government facilities. This is particularly true for Federal facilities located in the suburbs of our large cities.

Just last week, Secretary of Defense McNamara dealt with such a problem, in the area surrounding the Andrews Air Force Base which, as the House well knows, is Prince Georges County, Md., a suburb in the Washington metropolitan area. Secretary McNamara exercised his authority to prohibit the rental of housing to any servicemen in the area around Andrews by any landlord who was not willing to make his housing available to all American servicemen.

I am hopeful that in the near future similar orders will be issued to cover the areas around all military installations so that our Negro servicemen who are called upon, without any exclusion, to die for our country may live, and have their families live, in equal and integrated housing. I would also hope that every Federal agency would use its influence to see to it that Federal funds are not used to subsidize segregated housing.

[Memorandum from the Secretary of Defense]

#### UNSATISFACTORY HOUSING OF NEGRO MILITARY FAMILIES LIVING OFF-POST IN THE ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE AREA

On May 18, 1967, we received from the Governor of Maryland Joint Resolution 47 of the Maryland General Assembly which he had signed and which called on the Secretary of Defense to take immediate action to end housing discrimination against military personnel. On May 25, 1967, I responded to Governor Agnew, stating that the Department of Defense would move expeditiously to carry out the intent and spirit of this mandate in the State of Maryland, as we had started to do elsewhere in the country. I advised the Governor that we had already initiated studies of housing discrimination in the area surrounding Andrews Air Force Base. He was informed that we would proceed with similar studies at other Maryland installations during June.

Studies at Andrews Air Force Base have now been completed. The results have been reported by the Under Secretary of the Air Force to representatives of the real estate interests in the Andrews Air Force Base area at meetings held with such representatives on May 25 and June 12. At these meetings, voluntary compliance was sought with DOD Directive 5120.36, which states the basic policy of equal opportunity for members of the Armed Forces in off-base accommodations. Several of these representatives have worked diligently to obtain voluntary agreement by a majority of apartment owners concerned. I appreciate these efforts, but to date they have

not succeeded. We cannot delay further actions to attack this problem.

The severity of the problems affecting Negro military families assigned to the Andrews Air Force Base who must live in private housing facilities, is demonstrated by the experience of over 300 Negro enlisted families whom we have contacted. These families report the following:

70% are not satisfied with their housing.

59% reported that they had considerable difficulty in obtaining housing. Of this number:

60% stated the reason was due to racial discrimination.

74% were directly refused rental housing when vacancies were available.

37% were quoted higher prices than those quoted to other applicants.

A primary reason for the dissatisfaction of these Negro families is the unsatisfactory location of their housing, resulting from racial discrimination. A canvass of 22,000 apartment units within a reasonable commuting distance of the Andrews AFB reveals that less than 3% of these units are now open to Negro families.

The above conditions demonstrate, beyond question, that housing discrimination is producing problems which are detrimental to the morale and welfare of the majority of our Negro military families in the Andrews AFB area, and thus to the operational effectiveness of the base.

In view of the hundreds of military families who will be moving into the Andrews area during the next few months, and in view of the absolute essentiality of high morale and operational efficiency, these conditions can no longer be tolerated. Therefore, the following actions will be taken:

(1) Effective July 1, 1967, military personnel moving into the area or changing their place of residence, will not be authorized to enter into new leases or rentals of apartment or trailer court facilities—within approximately 3½ miles of the center of the Andrews AFB—unless such facility is available to all military personnel on an equal basis. This is the area in which the military families assigned to the Andrews AFB are now concentrated, and the area which is most desirable to enhance the responsiveness of military personnel to the operational mission of the base.

(2) The Coordinator of Off-Base Housing Services in the Washington, D.C. area will advise immediately the owner of each rental facility within the area designated above that, as of July 1, 1967, military personnel will be authorized to rent units in the owner's facility only after he provides written assurance that his facility observes a policy of equal opportunity for all military personnel.

(3) The Coordinator of Off-Base Housing Services will immediately establish procedures, in cooperation with each of the Military Departments, to inform military families already residing in the Washington, D.C. area of the above policies. Further, all personnel receiving orders assigning them to installations in the Washington, D.C. area will, at the time they are first informed of their assignment, be advised that after July 1, 1967, they may not lease or rent housing in the designated area adjacent to Andrews AFB without first consulting the Housing Office of the installation to which they are to be assigned.

(4) The Coordinator of Off-Base Housing Services will keep the above policy under continuing review. If he finds that the designated area should be revised to include additional rental facilities in the Andrews area, he will recommend such revisions to me immediately.

As our studies at other Maryland installations are completed, I shall direct further actions, as required, to end housing discrimination. These actions must be prompt and effective.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has chosen the housing discrimination around the Weston, Ill., site for the atom smasher as the topic of his next syndicated column. He has been kind enough to permit me to use an advance copy of this column, which will appear in the Detroit News, July 1, 1967, during this debate.

Mr. Wilkins' column clearly expresses the frustration of many Negro Americans who are told that on the one hand the Federal Government believes in equal opportunity and that on the other hand a Federal agency has decided to locate a huge project in an area which is known to be discriminatory. Mr. Wilkins makes two very important points which I would like to emphasize. One, this project is being paid for by all the taxpayers and not all will benefit equally; and two, by placing this project in an area which already practices housing discrimination we are laying the groundwork for a pattern of prejudice for the 6 to 8 years needed to construct the atom smasher.

Many persons with whom I have spoken feel that this project should not be built on a site in a State which does not have a fair housing law. However, I do not contend that a State law is the only way to guarantee fair housing, nor does a fair housing law necessarily mean that discrimination will be abolished. This is certainly the case in many States which have State open housing laws. Local ordinances and real estate practices could provide the same degree of fair housing as a State law. My basic disagreement with the Weston site is that open housing is not available in this part of Illinois. Until open housing is a reality, whether achieved through a State fair housing law or local ordinances and assurances, the atomic project should not be built on this site or any other site where housing discrimination prevails.

I would like to insert Mr. Wilkins' column into the RECORD at this point:

#### ILLINOIS CRITICIZED AS ATOM PLANT SITE

(By Roy Wilkins)

Negro citizens who have managed to preserve a faith in the easing of racial difficulties through steady, orderly procedure got another kick in the teeth a few days ago.

The Illinois state senate has killed a fair housing bill. The arresting aspect of this act lies in the fact that housing for minorities was a factor in the selection of Weston, Ill., as the site for the \$375-million atom smasher by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Weston, a town of a few hundred residents, has no Negroes in or near the place. DuPage County, in which Weston is located, has a population of approximately 300,000, of which only 600 are Negroes. Since the county is very near Chicago and Weston is only 35 miles from the metropolis, it is easy to believe that DuPage County has had a policy of deliberately discouraging Negroes from settling there.

In fact, the record shows that DuPage County politicians and leaders have opposed adamantly the enactment of any fair housing legislation by the state legislature. They were unbending when the Weston plant was being discussed. They wanted no concessions on minority housing.

Five other states, California, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin and Colorado, had sites

competing with Illinois. All of Illinois' rivals had laws on housing and employment even though California was involved in litigation. Despite this, and despiteilly-white Weston and almostilly-white DuPage County, the Illinois town was the winner, principally upon the assurance from Illinoisans that a fair housing law would be enacted.

Now the Illinois legislature has reneged. The state has the \$375-million atom plant and the \$60-million a year in maintenance money. It has 2,000 technical employes and many workers in other categories, all making up a fat payroll for Illinois. For white Illinois, that is.

Just in case Negro citizens get any ideas, a spokesman for the suburb of Cicero has already laid down talk of "bloodshed." Weston has adopted a town fair housing ordinance but a town official said that it would not require anyone to sell or rent to "anyone he did not choose to deal with." Negroes are still out in the cold on housing.

Why is this important? Why the blood pressures? Well, the United States, where Negroes have lived for 348 years, where they pay taxes and where their men have fought and died in defense of their country in every war from 1776 to Vietnam, is going to use tax money to create an employment bonanza in the middle of an Illinois prairie and that bonanza will be for white, not black Americans.

This use of the money of all the people to build a facility where nonwhite workers will have to face insults and bricks and mobs in order to occupy a home is a monumental sin in the world of 1967. Since about eight years of construction are required, a procedure is being adopted that will give life to the Jim Crow policy of 1975!

In a letter to a New York newspaper a woman points out that one Negro is in the President's Cabinet and one has been nominated to the Supreme Court. She asks, plaintively, "What more do they want?"

Well, madam, they are grateful to the President for the Cabinet member and (if confirmed) for the Supreme Court associate justice. However, two men, estimable as they are, cannot substitute for opportunity and justice and dignity for the entire Negro population, or even for Negro Illinoisans.

The Atomic Energy Commission and its controlling Joint Congressional Committee should cancel out Weston, Ill., and build the plant elsewhere.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but let me say this: I am just as firm on this as I am in my belief that people should have equal opportunity and equal rights. There are 30 States in this Union that do not have open housing laws. Racial discrimination has not been removed from the 20 that do have open housing laws. So we are talking about a serious situation here. In those 30 States that do not have open housing laws millions, and hundreds of millions, and billions of dollars worth of Federal facilities have been constructed and are being constructed and will be constructed. I say that to discriminate against any one of those 30 States and to say that you cannot have Federal money spent in your State notwithstanding the fact that you contribute to the Federal Treasury is discrimination of a very, very serious form.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be a party to that type of discrimination. I will support any civil rights legislation that comes to this floor which I deem just. But I shall not be a party to black-jacking any State in this Union into accepting a principle which does not rest

upon Federal law and which does not apply to that State.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman who has just addressed the Committee, I respect the motives and the sincerity of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] in offering this particular amendment today. But I wonder why it is that we have selected this particular project to which to apply this alarming and astonishing doctrine to the effect that we should begin to tell a State what kind of general laws it should pass.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I will not yield to the gentleman from Colorado at this point until I have had an opportunity to express my argument and opinions in respect to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a project that is located in a relatively small portion of two out of the 102 counties in the State of Illinois. Yet we are being told that unless the legislature of the great State of Illinois passes a law that is applicable in every single county, in every one of these 102 counties, that this project should not be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here serving in this Congress for now going on more than 7 years. I have never heard a more dangerous and arbitrary doctrine expressed than this.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Members of this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that we ought to look at this project today in the light of a very broader perspective than simply the Weston project, because if we establish this particular precedent today, it is going to come back to haunt us on every single public works bill, on every single authorization for new construction and on every Federal agency project.

Mr. Chairman, all we have to do is to look at what happened just yesterday. Yesterday we had a bill pending before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union very similar to this bill, a bill which called for the authorization of almost twice the amount of money involved in this bill, almost \$5 billion, and if the members of the Committee will recall the discussion which was held on that bill, there was one item after one item contained in that bill dealing with millions of dollars worth of construction in States where there is not open occupancy legislation.

Mr. Chairman, if we refer to this bill—and I do not want to single out my friends in the State of New Mexico, but in that State we have an authorization of some \$50 million for the construction of a meson facility which is a medium-energy research facility located in that State wherein there is no open housing law.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we have not heard anything about deleting that particular authorization here today.

So, I would suggest we remember that we are talking about not just Weston, Ill.; we are talking about a rather broad

and important principle when it comes to the manner in which this House legislates.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my distinguished friend, the gentleman in the well, the reason that I offered the amendment is because citizens around this area who have been working in an effort to bring about better housing relations and, indeed, race relations, came to me themselves to raise objections to the Weston site. They live in the area and know the problems from experience. I would most certainly object to the placing of this project or any other project in any site where housing discrimination is such a problem that it would affect the hiring of personnel. The same group also brought the problem to the attention of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission who is also concerned. The Commission itself made this request a part of the evaluation that would go into the question of the selection of one of the alternate sites. In fact, Dr. Seaborg was so concerned about the racial atmosphere around the site that he pointed out that if necessary the project could even now be placed at one of the other sites. I quote:

As you know, the Commission found that any of the final six sites under consideration was suitable for the project.

So my effort here today is not just a grandstand measure. There is still time to iron out the problems. We can pass this amendment and let the Atomic Energy Commission either choose a new site or postpone any activities at this site until there is a suitable guarantee of open housing.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit me to reply, I am not going to go back and restate what has already been stated during the general debate to the effect that this was not part of the original criteria that were set up.

But let me say, to assume that the progress in eliminating discrimination is going to stop in the State of Illinois because the Illinois General Assembly during the past session did not pass an open occupancy law is to err. I simply do not concede this. If I had been the legislature I would have voted for such a law. I believe the gentleman knows where my sentiments were with respect to title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, but I believe this is an area in which States should legislate, and I hope they will; and I have every reason to believe that during the next 6 or 7 years, while the project at Weston is under construction, that we are going to make progress in eliminating discrimination in housing in Illinois.

As the vice chairman pointed out, in these 19 or 20 States where they already have these laws on the statute books to eliminate all vestiges of discrimination there is still much progress to be made.

So I say give the people of the State of Illinois a chance to prove their good faith.

The gentleman from the 14th District

of Illinois [Mr. EALENBORN] in whose district this project will be located, has already given us proof that in the towns of Weston and Glen Ellyn, which are in the immediate vicinity of this accelerator, 62 percent of the new listings are on a nondiscriminatory basis. I believe this is probably a far better record than you could point to in many areas of our country where they already have open occupancy laws on the statute books.

I repeat that it would be a very extremely dangerous precedent to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan. I am as much for the elimination of discrimination in housing as anyone else, but the method sought to be employed here—to compel a State legislature to act by a variation of the carrot-and-stick technique—is unwise. As I stated earlier, the principle is far broader than the gentleman from Michigan seems to realize. Suppose a Federal administrator in selecting a site for a new Federal installation decides a State does not offer a wide enough range of social services because of inadequate State revenues. Should he be in a position to compel the State in question to enact a progressive income tax to broaden its revenue base before securing the Federal project in question? Certainly not.

I repeat the broad implications of the gentleman from Michigan's amendment go far beyond the question of open housing. It would be disruptive of our whole pattern of Federal-State relationships. I urge members to consider these ramifications in casting their votes today.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I presume that each time an individual may ask questions concerning this project, particularly if his own territory was considered for the project, that he is accused of eating sour grapes. That is not the situation here. And I pointed out and placed into the Record yesterday the decision or the decree from the Supreme Court of the United States which, to my way of thinking, places the question of water for the facility in danger. All you have to do is to take the Record of yesterday and turn to page 17793, and read section 4 thereof, and you will find that if there is a shortage of water that they have to go to Lake Michigan to get it, and they must go to the Supreme Court to get an additional order. That is No. 1.

No. 2. A great deal is said about the savings of money in this endeavor. If you will take a look at the hearings, particularly on page 217, when you come to Chicago and compare that with Denver you will find that they selected the one whose rate of operation was higher.

A member of the Committee, said the State of Colorado did not meet the educational requirements.

I direct the attention of the committee to page 411 of the hearings in connection with this, wherein they state that the University of Colorado in Boulder, the University of Denver, and a branch of the University of Colorado in Denver, can provide opportunities for the continuing education of the younger members of the laboratory staff.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] asked why and how did the so-called open housing thing get into this controversy, and why is it not used some place else?

Well, I will tell you how it got into it. This committee went around, and the AEC itself, and interviewed the respective sites that had been selected, and they were six in number.

One of the questions that they asked and insisted upon was, Do you have an open housing law? Not only did they ask that question when they came to Denver, Colo., but they insisted that the Governor of the State supply them with a copy of the law. At the conference that was held, the Chairman of the Commission made it plain and clear that they did not intend to put it at any site other than a site where individuals would not be discriminated against in any particular.

That is how it got into this issue and that is what the Commissioners themselves asked the people of the respective States when they were trying to find out, how and what it would cost to operate.

Hence, I take the position that if you are to save money, do not select the highest cost site that you have, according to your own report. If it must be called "sour grapes" then let me read you one of the paragraphs wherein they say:

Denver is an attractive and growing city with a population of more than half a million. The communities east of Denver in the direction of the site are good residential communities. The area offers adequate cultural opportunities. Schools are good and the recreational facilities are excellent, industrial services in Denver are diversified enough to support the project.

Now you may accuse me as being guilty of sour grapes, but this is nothing other than a plain explanation of the situation—and may I say the highest cost one in the setup was selected.

Now there is another factor that has not been explored here.

It is true that the State of Illinois will supply the land. But who is promoting the housing around the installation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

The taxpayers' money should not be spent where it reinforces any pattern of discrimination. Persons on the Federal payroll must not be subjected to intolerable and inadequate housing on account of their race or color.

Just last week Secretary McNamara ordered housing surrounding Andrews Air Force Base, where there is discrimination, to be off limits to servicemen.

This order seeks to insure fair housing for those men in uniform who are based at Andrews.

It is expected that similar regulations will be put into effect in other areas where discrimination is practiced.

We certainly should do as much for civilian employees of the Atomic Energy Commission and large Federal installations.

I should like to call the attention of the Members to a part of the report and to the separate views of Senator PAS-RORE in which he says:

In considering the selection of a site for the facility, the Commission announced that the local status of civil rights and non-discrimination would be of primary concern in making its choice.

Notwithstanding its own criterion, specified by the Commission, what was the decision of the AEC?

From the six finalists among the considered sites, the AEC chose a location in the only State of the six which does not have open housing legislation.

Then he goes on to say:

I happen to believe that such standards of human dignity are a proper premise.

Mr. Chairman, I too believe that they are a proper premise and that through the power of the purse the Congress has the responsibility to enforce equal opportunity in housing, in education, in jobs and in every area where Federal funds are spent.

Any community which would deny equal rights to all Americans certainly has no right to have the taxpayers' dollars spent in that community in support of this facility or of any other facility. I believe that the Federal Government should use its power to insure that there is no discrimination wherever our Federal installation is located, and that includes the 30 States where there are no fair housing laws.

Last year this House passed a watered down fair housing measure which was not adopted by the other body. The Congress has defaulted upon a responsibility in this area. In the absence of such legislation, let us at least insure, as Secretary McNamara did last week, that employees of Federal installations are not discriminated against, that taxpayers' money does not go to support bigotry. Equal opportunity in employment is provided wherever Federal contracts are involved. Can we do less in housing?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Could the gentleman from New York reinforce and emphasize a point that I think is being lost sight of in this debate? I refer to the fact that this amendment does not seek to require that every State enact a fair housing law. There seems to be some thought along that line.

I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] when he says that fair housing laws frequently are not worth the paper they are written on. For example, there is a lot of discrimination in the State of Michigan and the State of Michigan does have a fair housing law. But when the commission was looking for sites, they were looking for some indicia of concern about this very human problem.

One of the indicia is whether or not a State has seen fit to take a position as a matter of public policy on America's most unsolved problem, and that is the question of fair housing in this country.

So we are not trying to require that every State pass such a law. We are look-

ing for whatever evidence might be available that such fair housing would in fact exist. It does not happen to exist in and around the suburbs of the city of Chicago.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, calling for the deletion of the authorization of a 200-Bev accelerator in Weston, Ill. I believe that this project should be deleted for a number of reasons.

On December 16, 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission announced its selection of the Weston site in Illinois from the final list of six sites recommended by the National Academy of Sciences. The six sites proposed were Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, Calif., and Weston, Ill.

#### THE OPEN HOUSING QUESTION

In connection with the announcement, the AEC issued a statement entitled "Summary Data on Selection of Chicago-Weston—Site for the 200-Bev Accelerator." Under that section of the statement entitled "Other considerations," the Commission states in part:

In its investigations and evaluations, the Atomic Energy Commission included consideration of the climate of equal opportunity and nondiscrimination that existed in the communities containing and surrounding the six prospective sites, as well as the applicable State laws, executive orders and local ordinances. . . .

A wide range of assurances and statements of support were received responsive to the AEC's request. As a whole, these indicated individual and community awareness of problems of racial discrimination and determination to continue and institute measures to cope with it. These and other information reflected a progressive attitude in the Weston site area toward equal employment opportunity efforts to provide equality in suburban public school systems, and a number of community human relations councils devoted to eliminating discrimination.

During the selection process, the AEC informed the Weston (and the other) site proposers of the thinking of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on civil rights criteria, and indicated that the AEC planned to seek from the selected site, appropriate commitments in areas of employment, housing, education and community facilities and services as were suggested by the Commission on Civil Rights.

The Atomic Energy Commission noted differing views with respect to non-discrimination in housing, and in certain areas more distant from the site with respect to integration in public schools, but will expect that with the leadership of the state and local governments and with the cooperation and support of citizens and community organizations in the Chicago area, a broad satisfactory record of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity will be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the civil rights criteria quoted above, the site selected remains the only one of those finally considered which is in a State which does not have an open housing law. It is primarily for this reason that I am urging that the authorization of funds for this project be stricken from the pending bill.

It is said that billions of dollars have been authorized for projects in the 30

States without open housing laws. That such practices have gone on in the past furnishes no justification for the authorization at issue here today. If we are willing to allow this authorization can we refuse any other which is directed toward an area which rejects this Congress' notion of equality for all men? Further, Mr. Chairman, we deal here not only with criteria resulting from a broad based policy of this and preceding Congresses, but also with criteria emanating from the supervising agency, the Atomic Energy Commission.

Let the record be clear and reflect the fact that I, together with my colleagues in the House from Long Island and from New York State put forth our best efforts in cooperation with the Long Island Association and the Long Island Federation of Labor on behalf of the proposed site at Brookhaven National Laboratory. This is not the reason for my statement in the House today. I ask not for reconsideration of the Brookhaven or any other site at this time. I do ask that this Congress express its unwillingness to authorize funds to an area which has actively rejected pleas for open housing legislation. Today, more than 50 percent of the population of the United States live in States with open housing statutes.

If one seeks the statutes upon which we are basing request for fair housing—let him look at the Constitution of the United States.

#### THE QUESTION OF PRIORITIES

Mr. Chairman, there are other reasons for deleting this project which are adequately stated in the separate views contained in House Report No. 369. Among other considerations are the need to establish priorities in a year when the costs of the Vietnam war are mounting daily and the projected budget deficit is increasing at an unknown rate.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no convincing evidence that the public interest will be jeopardized by deleting this project. In fact, it may be argued that the public interest will suffer if we continue to pour funds into programs like this without first dealing with the problem of human needs.

In remarks delivered during the debate over the authorization for NASA, I stressed the need to establish priorities in regard to domestic spending. While I agree that this country's progress in the field of atomic energy is both dramatic and important, I cannot understand how this Congress can fail to see that the problems of our citizens are being shoved into the background in the name of progress.

Mr. Chairman, it must never be forgotten that progress is the result of man's creativity and a strengthening of our efforts to improve the lives of our citizens will, in the long run, bring greater progress. We must always be farsighted but cannot equate foresight with science, per se. In the end, better lives will build better science and we must lay the foundation, now, for the better science of the future.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to establish a record of legislative history and intent in order to make it clear to

the executive branch that the AEC had an obligation to the Congress and to the people of the United States to require legislative action by the Illinois State Legislature as a condition precedent to the commencement of work on the 200-Bev accelerator at Weston, Ill. Illinois has had that chance and rejected it. In the face of such a decision, we cannot afford to compromise our position on human dignity. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the motion by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ERLÉN BORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think the gentleman from New York, who just spoke in support of the amendment, must not have been present during the general debate when it was very clearly established that there was no criteria for an open housing law in the offerings to the States making bids for this project. This has been very clearly established.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLÉN BORN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. The considerations to be used by the Commission in the "Summary Data on Selection of Chicago—Weston—Site for the 200 Billion Electron Volt Accelerator," shows that I have included in my statement the following:

During the selection process, the AEC informed the Weston (and the other) site proposers of the thinking of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on civil rights criteria, and indicated that the AEC planned to seek from the selected site, appropriate commitments in areas of employment, housing, education and community facilities and services as were suggested by the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. ERLÉN BORN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I have no quarrel with the gentleman. I merely stated that the Atomic Energy Commission did not establish as criteria that there be an open housing law in the State, and the gentleman was not correct in his earlier presentation when he said that the criteria were changed after the site was selected. There was no change in criteria.

I would like to address myself to the substance of the amendment. Either the amendment is a personal vendetta against the State of Illinois, or we are going to be establishing something here which will be a test for all appropriations to be made in the future by the Congress. I think it is clear that even the gentleman offering this amendment is apparently not making this a broad test to be applied, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson]. This very bill has another appropriation for the construction of a facility by the AEC in a State that does not have open housing nor does the gentleman tell me that they have assurances on the site that they have adequate housing facilities. The fact is that the Atomic Energy Commission did inquire into the area of whether there would be adequate housing on a nondiscriminatory basis. They did not set this false criterion of having a State statute. I know the gentleman from Michigan states that this is not his test either.

But others have been in this fight and have been using this as a test. During the course of the deliberations of the Atomic Energy Commission, I was interrogated as to whether we could not have a county open housing statute, or whether we could get a couple of ordinances passed by some of the local communities. It got down that far. It became apparent that all that was sought by those who were pushing this feature at that time was to get some statute or ordinance on the books.

Frankly, I do not think this is the way to promote the civil rights cause. I believe the fact that we have in the nearby communities on a voluntary basis over two-thirds of new listings of homes on an open basis, without discrimination, shows that the people themselves—the only ones who can fight discrimination—are learning and they are doing a good job in this area.

Why can credit not be given to those voluntary efforts that have been made? Why can credit not be given to the fact that this community is doing a good job? Why do we use this as a criterion, that we must have an ordinance or a statute?

At the same time the national board of the NAACP finds that discrimination exists in those States that already have open housing statutes.

I want to finish my presentation by saying, if this is a personal vendetta against the State of Illinois, obviously it must fail. We cannot operate on such narrow considerations in this Congress. If this is to be a general rule to be applied in the future, then when the public works bill comes out, let us apply that across the board. But if we are going to say in every instance that we must have a State open housing law, that means 30 States in this country will be prohibited from having appropriations for public works, for NASA, and for the military. I do not believe this sort of rule can be applied, either.

It is obvious to me that neither of these reasons can justify the amendment that has been offered here today.

As a matter of fact, I believe it is unfortunate that some who felt they could get an advantage with this fight have brought it this far along. I believe it would have been well if they had stopped the fight before reaching this point.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not going to take a long time.

Dr. Seaborg, who is the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, is an honorable man and he is a Nobel Prize winner. He came and told us that he took all six of these sites and looked at them from question of the climate of nondiscrimination, and of equal employment. He took these questions to these Government agencies, and this includes the Weston site: The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Community Relations Service, the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity and Housing, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Civil Service Commission, and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance of the Department of Labor. Not one of these six Government agencies on