

This is our reason, Mr. President, for writing a letter to you, that we may make ourselves heard on certain beliefs.

We believe that man was created by God and for God and we feel that because of the worth of all mankind that no man has the right to disrupt the lives of others by his protesting and rioting. We feel that our nation was established as a God fearing nation and the situation today would seem that our legislators are too easily influenced by man, when they should look to God for guidance.

It is our belief that civil disobedience should be prevented by law. There should be legislation to stop riots or any other form of civil disobedience and penalties should be established. Protestors and demonstrators have had their way too long. They are a disgrace to our country's image the world over. We are tired of draft card burning and sit-in demonstrating at our induction centers when so many of the fine youth of our country are dying for it every day. The government seems to go too far in trying to appease these types of people who are running our country down without actually doing anything to make this a better world.

Also, we do not believe that poverty is an excuse for laziness or justification for looting and rioting and that action should be taken against such un-American behaviour.

We do believe in the strength of prayer and we want you to know that our prayers are with you and our national leaders.

Respectfully,

PHYLLIS WILLIAMS.  
DEBBIE JOHNSON.  
SHELLA BROWN.  
DEBBIE BARNES.  
BRENDA BARKER.

**ABM**

#### THE ORBITAL BOMBING SYSTEM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Secretary McNamara's announcement of the possible Soviet development of an orbital bombing system should be viewed as an additional argument to redirect his Chinese-oriented ABM defense toward the Soviet Union. In focusing on the fractional orbiting bombardment system—FOBS—he highlighted just one of many possible nuclear weapon delivery systems that have bothered students of the strategic balance for some time.

Furthermore, Secretary McNamara did not disclose anything particularly new. The Soviets announced publicly, 2 years ago that they had a "monstrous new terrible weapon" which Tass described as "an orbital missile whose warheads can deliver their surprise blow on the first or any other orbit around the earth."

The whole spectrum of Soviet strategic weapons, which can attack the United States from outer space, from rocket launching sites, from submarines or from bombers, and which can arrive over the North or South Pole, or from the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean, has been documented publicly. The best documentation entitled, "The Changing Strategic Military Balance," was prepared at the request of the House Armed Services Committee, and published in June 1967. It can be purchased from the American Security Council, Washington, D.C., for \$1.50.

On the first page of this report is the clear warning that the Soviet Union is developing a strategy to win a nuclear war rather than to simply deter one, which is Secretary McNamara's policy

today. The report also contains a quote from Gen. Earle Wheeler's statement made before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during hearings on the Outer Space Treaty last March. With regard to orbiting weapons, the Chairman of the JCS had this to say:

This threat can be answered only through intensified U.S. efforts to develop capabilities to detect and verify the orbiting of nuclear weapons or those threatening mass destruction. We must develop the capability of dealing with that threat should it materialize, with or without a treaty.

Implicit in dealing with this threat, as General Wheeler described it, is the ability to defend against it. It makes little sense to speak in terms of a single-direction ABM defense against a Chinese threat, which Secretary McNamara now advocates. We need an ABM defense capable of 360 degree coverage, and large enough to cope with the Soviet threat, which is many times as large, more sophisticated, and further developed than the Chinese threat.

There has been a constant accumulation of factors that justifies an early decision to shift into full production of the heavy ABM defense advocated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The principal reasons given by the Defense Department for not proceeding with the full ABM are, first, nothing that the Soviets have on the drawing board will nullify our assured destruction capability of their homeland, and, second, that space offensive nuclear delivery forces are less efficient, less accurate, and less credible, than ICBM's.

While these reasons appear logical on the surface, we should remember that warfare is not a logical science. Further, we should not rely too much on our own estimates of the capabilities of the Soviet systems. It is far more important to consider what the Soviets think. If they conclude that their weapons are better than they are, they might be tempted to use them.

The Soviets are already known for miscalculation and overrating their capabilities, and they are willing to gamble on the basis of their estimates. They gambled in Cuba and in the Arab-Israel war. The fact that they are willing to take such chances should persuade us to be doubly careful in our preparations for defense against nuclear attack.

We should remember that the Soviet Union is dedicated to offensive world objectives. In this endeavor, they would find the special effect of space military forces very useful. If their space satellites, or fractional orbiting systems become operational, the Soviets would enjoy the following advantages: prestige; terror; persuasion; coercion; pressure; and demoralization. They could threaten to use these space systems in conjunction with other strategic weapons, and perhaps, achieve their goal of victory by nuclear blackmail.

Our own response to these possibilities could be much more firm if we had the reassurance inherent in a full ABM defense such as that urged by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In this regard, Senator HENRY JACKSON is conducting an investigation this week that may shed more light on the Defense Department's plans

and programs for the ABM. It is hoped that the testimony before his subcommittee will provide sufficient evidence to move the American public to demand a full and adequate ABM defense for the United States.

#### SENATE RATIFICATION OF POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN IMPERATIVE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the struggle for human rights—throughout recorded history—has been a continuing battle against the lethal enemy of reason and decency: discrimination. No nationality, no religious sect, no race, no people in history has been subjected to the oppressive and dehumanizing discrimination that has been visited upon women.

In every epoch—no matter how glorious or how gross—the blight of inequality of women has persisted. At the time of the signing of the United Nations Charter, women were granted political rights in only half of the sovereign countries of the world.

The United States—where the political equality of women is constitutionally established—has failed to ratify the United Nations Convention on the political rights of women. Over 4 long years ago President Kennedy sent this treaty to the Senate, asking ratification, but for 4 years this Senate has failed to act. We, a Nation which has disclaimed and disdained almost the last vestige of discrimination from our statutes, have again remained internationally mute on one of the vital issues of our time.

Here in America—where women have made momentous contributions to our national life as Senators, jurists, cabinet officers, scientists, university presidents, and ambassadors—we have proved not only the wisdom but also the inherent value of full equality of women. I doubt that any one of my male colleagues, be he bachelor or benedict, does not bear daily witness to this fact of American life.

The time has arrived for the United States to join China, Japan, India, Nigeria, Lebanon, Turkey, Thailand, Pakistan, and the 46 other members of the United Nations in ratifying the convention of the political rights of women.

Again, let the record of the United States in human rights serve as a beacon for the old nations as well as the new—demonstrating for all mankind that the elimination of all forms of discrimination is more than worth the labor and the pains. I once again ask my colleagues to join me in seeking immediate ratifica-

#### COMMUNITY-FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, late last month, on October 23 and 24, I sponsored a conference in Washington for mayors, selectmen, county commissioners, and other community leaders in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Community-Federal tion of the Human Rights Conventions on Political Rights of Women, on Forced Labor, on Genocide, and Freedom of Association.

partnership for national development was the theme of the conference. The sessions were devoted to discussions on national issues and Federal legislation of special interest to local communities in my State.

I feel the conference was extremely helpful in broadening the lines of communication between the community leaders and the Federal bureaucracy, especially at this time when expanding activities of the Federal Government need local understanding and initiative to achieve their objectives and goals. There is little doubt that the community leaders, the Federal officials who participated in the discussions, as well as myself, learned a great deal and benefited much from the exchange of views.

Federal officials who spoke to the conference and responded to questions included, in order of appearance:

Hon. R. Sargent Shriver, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Hon. Robert Wood, Under Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Hon. Ralph Nicholson, Assistant Postmaster General.

Hon. James B. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Hon. Mike Mansfield, majority leader, U.S. Senate.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States.

Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, Treasury Department.

Hon. Ramsey Clark, Attorney General of the United States.

Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General of the United States.

Hon. John W. Gardner, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, special consultant to the President.

Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

Hon. J. Oliva Huot, Chief, Local Government Liaison, Department of Transportation.

Hon. Paul C. Warnke, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense.

Staff members of these agencies were also on hand to confer with the delegates.

I believe the proceedings of the conference will be of interest to Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts be printed in the Record.

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

[Excerpts from proceedings]

COMMUNITY-FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY'S MASSACHUSETTS-WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF COMMUNITY OFFICIALS  
(Monday, October 23, 1967)

Senator KENNEDY. I want to welcome all of you to this Massachusetts-Washington Conference of Community Officials. I am delighted with your response to the conference—and I appreciate very much your taking time out of your busy schedules to come to Washington for these two days.

Community-Federal Partnership for National Development is our theme. And I am

extremely hopeful that the discussions we have will enable the local communities and citizens of the Commonwealth to participate more fully in the spirited adventure of progress in our generation.

The profile of our State is not unlike that of our neighbors across the country. We, too, are faced with enormous problems—and the challenge of creative leadership in finding new avenues and techniques in meeting the needs of our State and its growing population. Solving our problems and meeting our needs is no longer a matter of choice—if, indeed, it ever was. Today, it is a matter of necessity.

When more than 12% of the families in our State have an annual income of under \$3,000—and in one county this is true of more than 23%—poverty is an issue to be dealt with, by broadening the avenues of opportunity to all, in education, in health, in housing and in employment.

When the cost of pollution in our air and water is far outstripping the cost of controlling it, and making our environment second-rate—innovation is needed to end this debilitating plague.

When the education of our children is hampered by outmoded concepts, a shortage of faculty and facilities, a limited course of study, and a small local tax base—cooperative efforts are needed at all levels of government to provide new direction and additional funds to keep our school systems in the mainstream of progress, so that the graduates can make a full contribution to the work and life of our economy and our society.

When our citizens fear to walk and ride the streets of our urban areas—when our local police can no longer handle the increasing complexity of crime problems—the time is overdue in finding new approaches to ensure safe streets and to control and prevent crime and violence.

When adequate transportation systems are denied our citizens by antiquated concepts, limited financial resources and misunderstandings at the various levels of government—new efforts to coordinate planning and development programs are essential.

Movement in solving our problems and in meeting the complex needs of a growing population requires the active participation of all levels of government—from Washington to the Town Hall. It requires the active interest and concern of citizens and organizations in the private sector as well.

In the implementation of Federal programs, local initiative is imperative if we are to win Federal support for a community project, and if we are to maximize the effectiveness of the collective response to a particular community problem or need.

The value of this conference is that it will help keep open and broaden the lines of communication between the local community in Massachusetts and the Federal government. And I hope the words and ideas expressed here will flow on a two-way street—that you who are showing an active interest and leadership in solving your community's problems will leave with a better understanding of the nature, objective and limitations of Federal programs—and that the Federal official participating in the conference will learn from your suggestions on how existing programs can be streamlined and adjusted to better meet community problems and needs and will listen to your suggestions for new Federal programs.

You will note from the conference schedule a list of speakers, all of whom have agreed to run the gauntlet of your questions.

Additionally, there will be workshop sessions in which you are free to move along the tables on the sides and in the back of the room, and to express your views and questions to the Federal officials involved in specific programs. The Federal departments represented are listed on the back of your program.

Again, may I welcome you to what I hope will be a most worthwhile conference.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to introduce the man who spells poverty with a capital "P"—Sargent Shriver.

STATEMENT OF SARGENT SHRIVER, DIRECTOR,  
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. SHRIVER. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, Senator Kennedy and members of the Senator's staff. Things are looking up down at OEO. The Senate voted 60 to 21 in favor of the OEO program. That was the best vote by far we ever have received in the United States Senate and probably the best vote by far we have ever received anywhere.

It was significant, however, to us, not just because of the numerical count involved, it was significant for other reasons.

First of all, the Senate investigated the OEO for about three months. Both Senators Kennedy were on the investigating committee. There were six or seven Republican Senators on it. They took about 40,000 pages of testimony. They heard from more than 400 witnesses. They got written statements from something like 350 national organizations. They held hearings not only here in Washington but around the country, in about ten or 12 locations, and at the end of the investigation an official report was submitted to the Senate. It was signed by both all the Republicans and the Democrats and this report said many things. But among the more significant things was the statement that these Senators all believed that every one of the programs which had been inaugurated should be continued or expanded. So that with all the mistakes we have made, I say that everybody, apparently, regardless of party, believed that the programs themselves, all of them, now should be continued or expanded. To us that was very significant.

The second thing that was significant was that in the vote of the Senate, every Senator, regardless of party, from Virginia to Maine, and as far West as Illinois, every one of them voted for OEO.

Now, this includes men like Senator Scott of Pennsylvania, who used to be head of the Republican National Committee; Senator Dirksen of Illinois, who is the Minority Leader, and all of the Republicans as well as Democrats from Maine, Vermont, Rhode Island, New Jersey, New York, from the part of the country from which all of you come. I think it is fair to say that the United States Senate gave a 100 percent endorsement to what we have been attempting to do.

I should add one other thing, a third point. That the Senate not only authorized what President Johnson requested but they suggested about \$200 million more than what President Johnson had proposed be authorized for expenditure. So we conclude from this heartening vote in the Senate that we must be doing something right over at OEO, otherwise we couldn't have gotten that support after a long investigation such as was conducted.

I would like to say also that we have been heartened in the last two to three or four weeks by additional evidence as a bipartisan support for this program. It was just about a week ago that 22 Republican Mayors, which believe it or not is 60 percent of all the Republican Mayors in the cities of more than 100,000 population, 22 of them sent a letter to Senator Dirksen and Congressman Gerry Ford on the House side endorsing the OEO program completely. Like the Senate, they called for a continuation or expansion of every program we have inaugurated.

These are not the best known Mayors, perhaps, in America, but they were really significant to us, because a large proportion of them came right out of the heartland of Republicanism in the Middle West, where theoretically we were quite unpopular.

These Mayors all came forward in support of the program. In addition, we have had social workers, lawyers, the American Bar