

diction of the FCC, that the radio and television waves—the frequencies—comprise a finite and precious national resource and are to be managed and licensed only for the benefit of the public and only in the public interest.

In this view, with which I doubt many would disagree, a frequency is licensed consistently with the public interest only when the best qualified broadcaster offering the best available programming is awarded the license. Anything less than the best available service is patently not in the public interest.

Your proposal to restrict new applicants to situations in which the Commission has already determined that renewal to the incumbent would not serve the public interest effectively prevents the Commission from ascertaining what the public interest requires. In other words, if the job being done by the incumbent is not so grossly inadequate in the Commission's view as to require that his petition for renewal be denied, then the Commission may never know and would be precluded from finding out whether a superior prospective licensee exists. The effect of such a rule requires little elaboration. Mediocrity would be firmly entrenched; potentially superior service would be ruled out. What is needed, in my opinion, is more rather than less competition for the privilege of providing radio and television programming to the public.

I am not unmindful of the possibility that irresponsible applications may be filed in bad faith by applicants who have neither the intention nor the ability to back up their promises. The cure for this is to devise rules by which such applications can be sifted out and rejected, not to freeze existing license relationships forever.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

JOE McCAFFREY, 25 YEARS AS A
CORRESPONDENT ON CAPITOL
HILL

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 25th anniversary of Joe McCaffrey's career as a press,

radio, and television correspondent on Capitol Hill. One of the Capitol's favorite people, Joe McCaffrey effectively conveys his solid grasp of the essence and feel of Congress in his perceptive radio and television commentaries to the public.

It has been my great pleasure to have been able to follow Joe's quarter of a century work in covering congressional activities. I not only have enjoyed listening to his evening reports over radio and television through those years, but I have treasured the fact that through this long period I have had the opportunity to have the frequent association with him.

As a former newspaper reporter and as one who has been in Congress during the same period Joe McCaffrey has been on the Hill, I think I am qualified to judge his record. Joe approaches his work with an objective point of view, always stressing the necessity of accuracy in reporting the news he relays to his listeners. He has always been impartial and fairminded in his treatment of the news.

Joe McCaffrey has always respected the trust and confidence Capitol Hill has placed in him. He has always respected the obligations and responsibilities of being a reporter and commentator. He is proud of his profession and he has brought additional honors to it.

Joe McCaffrey would be a valuable man to our educational systems throughout the country in teaching students about the legislative process, its people and its institutions. No one is more expert in the field. I have always been impressed with his intimate working knowledge of Congress and his thorough understanding of the substantive issues involved—issues that he must know so well to properly serve the people who daily wait for his reports. No commentator recognizes more than Joe McCaffrey does, the heavy responsibility that falls on him in keeping the people informed through objective, unslanted reporting of the news.

I am proud to join Joe McCaffrey's legion of friends in saluting him on his 25 years of great reporting as a Washington correspondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, few men, robed with such high office, have shown the common touch, the spark of simple humanity, which marked the tenure of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the United States. Not since John Marshall has there been a Chief Justice who has made such an important contribution to the development of constitutional law. His 16 years on the High Court spanned a difficult time in our history. From the very start he met difficult questions squarely, with the decision on school desegregation in *Brown v. Board of Education*. His overriding concern for equal rights was reexpressed, again and again in decisions on voting, legislative reapportionment and criminal due process. Always motivated by a strong belief in the sacred value of the individual, he consistently showed a responsiveness to the needs of our changing society, with a courage, integrity and humility, a warmth and gentleness and a wisdom that commands our respect. He was not a doctrinaire or arbitrary man. He bore the weight of bitter criticism silently and with dignity. At the end there were even some who accused him of being antagonistic to the great traditions which he himself helped to establish. He always remained above such partisan controversy, and ruled as he felt commonsense and justice dictated whether the result would please the liberal or the conservative faction. His departure brings the loss to the Supreme Court of a great statesman. Although he leaves public life, may his wisdom continue to guide us.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 26, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us.—II Corinthians 4: 7.

O God of everywhere and always, be unto us the God of here and now. We are grateful for our Nation and the people of our Nation, treasures in earthen vessels. Realizing that Thy presence and will are made known through men, let us not forget that we should be instruments of Thy purpose and that as a people we find our meaning in Thee. Help us especially to be instruments of Thy peace.

So guide us by Thy spirit that we may perceive in the events of our day Thy presence and Thy transcendent power. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MEDICARE COVERAGE

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am filing legislation today which authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreement with a State to provide coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged—popularly known as medicare—for annuitants of teacher retirement systems, and other public employee retirement systems. The bill permits States to take the initiative in negotiating with the Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare for coverage of such employees, and it

provides that States entering into such agreements shall reimburse the Federal hospital insurance trust fund for payments made to annuitants under such agreements and for the administrative expenses incurred by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in carrying out such agreements.

The bill requires no appropriation—neither at present nor in the future. The bill explicitly authorizes the Secretary to terminate any agreement once he ascertains that a State has failed to provide for full compliance with the agreement. Thus it will be up to the States to pay the cost of the program. It will not cost the Federal hospital insurance trust fund a cent. A State which elects to participate will reimburse the social security medicare trust fund for all benefits paid out plus all administrative expenses. My own State of Connecticut, for example, has already passed such a law and now only awaits congressional authorization

so that its public employees and public school teachers can get the benefit of participation in the Federal medicare program but at no expense to the Federal medicare trust fund. Favorable congressional action, therefore, will serve to cut redtape, strengthen the social security system, and bring the benefits of medicare to an important portion of our population. Nothing could be fairer or more progressive than that.

Public school teachers in 12 States are presently covered by teacher retirement funds which are excellent in every respect except that they exclude the teachers from medicare hospital insurance. The 12 States are California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Texas. The number of public school teachers involved nationwide is approximately 750,000. The number of public school teachers involved in Connecticut is 34,221. This will allow the States to bring these teachers under the protection of medicare.

A large number of State and local government employees are also excluded from the medicare program by virtue of their membership in public employee retirement systems rather than the social security system. Under this bill the States and localities will be able to make sure that all persons under a State or local government retirement system and their qualified dependents will have hospital insurance protection by purchasing this protection on a coverage group basis.

I introduced legislation of this nature in 1967. This revised bill includes even tighter provisions against the possibility of any State defaulting. I urge the passage of this amendment to our social security system. The Nation's public school teachers and the public employees of State and local governments have every right to enjoy the benefits and the security of medicare hospital insurance protection. The States will be able under this legislation to purchase this protection. Congress should endorse this reasonable, just, and progressive measure.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADDITION TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of announcing an addition to the program for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) has advised that he will file a report on the bill extending the Export Control Act today, and plans to bring it up under unanimous consent tomorrow.

OMNIBUS CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1969

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the task of securing fundamental civil rights for all American citizens has not been fully met. Programs initiated over the past 15 years now require new strength, expanded application, and full funding. We must complete the work we started.

We have built solid foundations with the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act which even now are jeopardized because of the twin threats of nonrenewal and nonenforcement. These were only beginnings. Upon such foundations were to be constructed more comprehensive and broader programs guaranteeing full civil, legal, and human rights for each American. President Johnson in 1966 offered a far-reaching program to secure fair housing practices, Federal and State jury reform, protection from violence for persons exercising their civil rights, prohibition of segregation in schools and public facilities, and extension of the Civil Rights Commission. Despite House support, the Senate failed to secure passage.

Again in the 90th Congress, an attempt was made to enact this vital program, but a threat of extended debate was too great. Results were disastrous. The Civil Rights Commission was weakened and funds restricted. The only meaningful legislation enacted was a watered-down Fair Housing Act, and an act protecting from violence those exercising civil rights.

A strong Civil Right Commission is a prerequisite for effective enforcement of our civil rights. Strict enforcement procedures and expansion of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission are essential to fair employment practices. Need for nondiscriminatory procedures in jury selection is as vital for fair trials as a competent judge.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1969, companion to that introduced in the other body by Senator HART. This act would provide improved machinery for selection of juries, promote equal employment opportunities by providing enforcement powers for the EEOC, authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission, and extend the Voting Rights Act concerning discriminatory use of tests and devices.

The act contains five titles with the following provisions. Title I provides the same guarantee under law to litigants of State courts that those of Federal courts receive. It guarantees that juries be selected without discrimination as to race, color, creed, sex, national origin, or economic status. The jury must be selected from a true cross section of the communities' population.

Title II provides the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with authority to issue cease-and-desist orders judicially. This is authority enjoyed by most governmental agencies in order to enforce their findings. It would give to the Commission adequate enforcement authority to carry out its enormous assigned tasks of insuring nondiscriminatory employment practices.

Title III would authorize funds for the Commission on Civil Rights, which was created by the 1957 Civil Rights Act. Restrictions were recently placed upon the Commission, greatly curbing possibilities for further effective activity. This title would remove restrictions permitting full funding.

Title IV would extend for 10 years the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Under the present act, it will terminate in 1970, allowing restoration of restrictive local voting practices greatly reducing the number of persons who could actually vote. Many previously suppressed groups of people have finally been given an opportunity to elect truly representative people to public office. We cannot now turn against them by failing to act on this extension.

Title V provides that if any part of this act be determined by the courts to be invalid, the other parts would remain in effect.

Mr. Speaker, the low regard some national protectors of civil rights have for those same civil rights is becoming increasingly evident. Just recently it was reported that the Justice Department favors abandonment of the enforcement machinery of the Voting Rights Act. This act has doubled Negro voter participation in the South. Weakening it in this manner would eliminate the Federal Government's power to send voting examiners to voting trouble spots around the country.

We cannot afford to remove this Federal authority. This Congress was elected under an expanded franchise the Voting Rights Act provided to all our constituents. New ground has been broken. Old evils have been attacked. Should we now restrict voters from access to their right to express themselves democratically?

Our responsibility to support and strengthen the civil rights of all our constituents is clear.

DESEGREGATION GUIDELINES

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this administration will announce in the near future its intent to slow down the integration of schools across the Nation. Reports are that desegregation guidelines by which school systems have been guided toward equal educational opportunity for all children are to be altered. In fact, desegregation guidelines are to be "weakened," according to the terminology of most reports reaching me. I am deeply disturbed by this turn in events.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Attorney General of the United States—and, indeed, to the President of this country—that the Supreme Court ruled in 1954, some 15 years ago, that the racially segregated dual school system is unconstitutional. Almost 5 years ago, Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with title VI prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. And only this year, the Office for Civil Rights in

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that the desegregation figure in the 11 Southern States has reached just over 20 percent. In the school districts desegregating under title VI, the figure was about 25 percent.

Based on these statistics, there is no reason for this administration's move to slow down the effort. The progress of desegregation even under firm and strong guidelines has achieved only 20 percent to 25 percent completion in almost 15 years. Surely, this administration can see that desegregation of the schools is moving slowly—not speedily. They do, apparently, believe that it is moving faster than political promises to the South allow.

Recent weeks and months have brought a continuous flow of evidence that black people have reason to fear for the very fundamental rights to jobs and education guaranteed, reiterated, and pursued by past Presidents in the 1960's. Others share my concern.

Yesterday, I joined my black colleagues in the House of Representatives in a letter to President Nixon protesting any interference with the strong pursuit of desegregated schools. I insert it at this point in my remarks so that other interested Members of this body may be apprised of our views:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Reports that the school desegregation guidelines are to be weakened disturb us greatly. A generation of black children has suffered segregation and unequal education in southern schools since the Supreme Court decided *Brown vs. Board of Education*.

There are black people on the farms of the South, in hamlets, and in towns, who believe in their Federal government. On the basis of that faith and their desires to see their children educated, black fathers and mothers have braved vicious attacks of retaliation for choosing to send their children to so-called "white" schools.

Any departure from the present school desegregation guidelines, any weakening of the Federal intent to see an end to segregated schools this September—will be a betrayal of these black people. Any weakening of guidelines would reward white school officials and politicians who have resisted the law of the land.

Mr. President, you have been sworn to uphold the Constitution. The Constitution clearly requires an immediate end to segregated schools. If the leader of this Nation compromises the law and sells the birthright of black children for political considerations, what example of lawfulness will have been set for the people?

To abandon your responsibilities to carry out simple demands of the Constitution will be the clearest possible sign that there is little hope for lawful change. Your promises will be worthless rhetoric coming from a President who refused to protect the basic right to equal education.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. CLAY,
JOHN CONYERS,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
ADAM C. POWELL,
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM,
ROBERT N. C. NIX,
CHARLES C. DIGGS,
LOUIS STOKES,

Members of Congress.

FREEDOM FOR RADIO AND TV

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the broadcasting industry, both TV and radio, are in constant danger of being overregulated. There is a tendency here in Washington to harass, pry into, and snoop on the activities of this great industry. Time and again proposals are made which are reminiscent of the totalitarian, socialist regimes of other countries.

I firmly believe that the future of our country depends upon freedom of speech and freedom to program and the right to editorialize, as manifested by our broadcasting industry. This is as basic, elemental, and fundamental to our freedom as the first amendment to the Constitution. The broadcasting industry is performing unsurpassed public service. Editorial programs, cultural programs, news and weather broadcasts are a great public service to our people. The broadcasting business in America today requires great capital, planning, investment, and risk. Competition is keen. This year many stations will be up for renewal of their licenses before the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would amend section 309(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 that the Commission, in acting upon any application for renewal of license filed under section 308, may not consider the application of any other person for the facilities for which renewal is sought. If the Commission finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby, it shall grant the renewal application. If the Commission determines after hearing that a grant of the application of a renewal applicant would not be in the public interest, convenience, and necessity, it may deny such application, and applications for construction permits by other parties may then be accepted, pursuant to section 308, for the broadcast service previously licensed to the renewal applicant whose renewal was denied.

I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will favorably report this bill at an early date. The broadcasting industry needs assurance now that for responsible service rendered, they may continue to operate and serve our people.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PESTICIDES

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a National Commission on Pesticides.

There has been increasing concern of late about the potential damage to fish and wildlife, and even to human beings, of residually persistent agents in pesticides.

In California, the State department of agriculture has just announced that starting January 1, 1970, the use of DDT and DDD will be sharply curtailed, be-

cause of their potential hazards. Scientists had reported that because of the persistence of chlorinated hydrocarbons, such as DDT, residues were accumulating in the bodies of birds along the California coast, apparently threatening their existence.

Recently, too, the Food and Drug Administration confiscated coho salmon in Lake Michigan because of increased concentrations of DDT; under the guideline established by the FDA, if residues of DDT of more than five parts per million are found in fish, they will not be allowed to be marketed in interstate commerce. In the fish confiscated, residues ranged from 13 to 19 parts per million.

The State legislatures in Michigan and Arizona have banned the use of DDT, and investigations have just been conducted in Wisconsin with a view to similar action; a moratorium on its use has been put in effect in Sweden and in Hungary.

My review of these actions convinces me that it is urgent that we understand as fully as possible what hazards—to fish, wildlife, and man—are involved in the use of all pesticides.

But I want to stress, too, that it is important for us to keep in mind the great benefits we have reaped from the use of pesticides—and especially from the use of DDT.

Pests which for centuries have plagued mankind, carriers of the lethal diseases of malaria, yellow fever, typhus fever, plague, and many other scourges have been eradicated, to the relief of millions of persons throughout the world. Animals, wild and domestic, have been freed of parasitic insects, too.

So it is well that in our review of the benefits and hazards of pesticides—to man, to birds, to animals, and to our environment—we secure all the facts, that they be carefully analyzed, that we weigh potential dangers and possible benefits, and that the use of pesticides be prudently regulated to protect the public health and safety.

My bill also provides for research that will help us modify and perfect our fight against harmful pests, enabling us to be increasingly selective as we fight damage to crops and seek to eradicate disease-bearing insects.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is a companion to that introduced in the other body by Senator NELSON, who has for many years counseled more careful monitoring of our entire pesticide program. I hope that it will be the pleasure of the House to give the measure its careful review and approval.

ENFORCING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues title 2, United States Code, section 39, which provides that the Sergeant at Arms of the House shall "deduct from the monthly payments of each Member or delegate the amount of his salary for each day he has been absent

from the House unless such Member assigns as the reason for such absence the sickness of himself or of some member of his family."

This provision also is to be found as a part of rule VIII, section 656, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

At this point it should be noted that excuses for absence are distinguishable from leave of absence.

This provision of law actually has been enforced in the past. In the second session of the 63d Congress, the House agreed to a resolution directing the Sergeant at Arms to notify absent Members that their presence was required and directing him to enforce title 2, United States Code, section 39. The Speaker held that the Sergeant at Arms was required to carry out the statute and he, the Speaker, could issue no instructions to the Sergeant at Arms in respect thereto.

In this instance funds had already been withheld from Members' salaries, and reimbursement to Members whose salaries had been docked was denied.

It is common knowledge in the case of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, that he has absented himself from the 91st Congress for a long period of time. Records of the House indicate that he has not requested a leave of absence or offered any type of excuse during the session of Congress.

He was duly sworn into the 91st Congress on or about January 3, 1969, and has received salary payments each month since that time. He has, however, had certain sums deducted each month by the Sergeant at Arms to pay a monetary penalty previously decreed by the House.

It is my opinion that, based upon the statute and the rules of the House of Representatives, Mr. POWELL is not entitled to receive salary payments until he complies with the applicable statutes and rules of the House.

I am, therefore, this day by letter to the Sergeant at Arms requesting that he comply with the law by refusing to pay the salary of Mr. POWELL pending Mr. POWELL's compliance with the law.

There may be other Members of the House who are not complying and do not comply with this rule and statute. Compliance, of course, should be required of all Members.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM HENRY BATES

(Mr. SMITH of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on this, the day of his funeral, I join all of the colleagues of Representative William Henry Bates, of Massachusetts, and his host of friends in expressing sorrow at the untimely death of our friend. He was a man of intelligence and learning and compassion, a man of great loyalties to his friends, his constituents and his country, a man upon whom to depend—in short, a fine friend and a fine Representative. We are all richer for knowing him and for his service in the House of Representatives, and we are all poorer for his untimely leaving this life.

We shall all miss him.

VIETNAM

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself today to the President's news conference last week in which he was questioned by reporters about statements made by former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford relative to phasing out troops from Vietnam.

Since that news conference, many people have suggested that President Nixon misread Mr. Clifford's real intent. While none of us has any way of knowing whether or not this is the case, I am compelled to suggest that, in my judgment, the real point here has been apparently lost by what appears to be an attempt by some people to try to "drive a wedge" between the President and others who, in all good faith, are attempting to advance helpful and responsible suggestions on resolving the conflict in Vietnam.

In all candor, I doubt that either Mr. Clifford or President Nixon was knowingly attacking the other, nor can I accept that this was their intent. The fact is—the point should be stressed at this critical juncture in our Nation's history—that both of these men, in analyzing the situation over the years, have arrived at the same basic alternative solution for resolving America's overinvolvement in the war in Vietnam.

Therefore, I believe the President and Mr. Clifford are on the same wavelength in their thinking, and that even the question of how many troops can and should be withdrawn and the so-called timetable for phasing out is a moot point, in light of the fact that both men are in complete agreement on the question of phasing out. The real question is the method of implementation of the concept.

I submit, therefore, that this so-called controversy in many ways is parallel to and indicative of the dissent that has been generated in this country over the past few years on the question of the Vietnam war. And I deeply regret that, now that a program has been set in motion to bring about a solution, some still see fit to look for loopholes.

Who will disagree that both President Nixon and Mr. Clifford are doing the very best they can under the extreme pressures that surround each of them. Mr. Clifford, in the final months of his tenure as Secretary of Defense, had the foresight and courage to advance his thinking on the need to reduce the size and burden of the American commitment in Vietnam. President Nixon recognized and advanced the basic "phase-in/phase-out" concept before the Republican platform committee in Miami last year—before he was elected to the Presidency.

As most of the Members know, I have advocated, presented, and discussed this concept with both of these gentlemen during the past 3 years.

In the final analysis, neither man was compelled or boxed in to accept this alternative to the Vietnam stalemate that both inherited, and I believe the time is long overdue when men in re-

sponsible positions of leadership be supported and encouraged when they agree—especially when those two men represent different administrations and different political parties.

Quite frankly, I welcome the constructive suggestions and recommendations of former Secretary Clifford or any other responsible person who is motivated by a genuine desire to make a contribution toward resolving the Vietnam war. And, in this regard, it seems worth recalling that President Nixon said exactly the same thing in responding to questions relative to Secretary Clifford's comments.

Today, a divided and war-weary America stands at the crossroads.

We can either continue this incessant bickering over details or—we can join together, as a nation, and give our leaders and those in a position to advise them, the opportunity they must have to get this country back on the track again.

Surely, there is much to be gained from joining hands and joining forces at this particular point in time—such things as an end to the killing in Vietnam, the future well-being of our Nation, and peace in the world.

CAREER POSTAL EMPLOYEES PASSED OVER

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, top officials of the Post Office Department, including Postmaster General Blount, during the past 5 months have frequently praised career postal employees as highly competent, able, and dedicated public servants.

Spoken and written commendations are all well and good, but now comes the Department hierarchy with a disappointing vote of no confidence in our more than 700,000 career postal employees.

I refer to the announcement on Tuesday, June 24, of the appointment of the regional directors for the Post Office Department. Of the 15 appointees, I was shocked to learn that only three have had any postal experience, and even those three cannot be considered in the strict classification as career postal employees.

If, as we have been led to believe, the postal service is composed of competent, experienced, and dedicated Government employees, it defies the imagination that the Postmaster General would look outside the postal service for most of his 15 regional directors.

I have firsthand knowledge of the high caliber, experience, and dedication of many of the postal workers in Iowa, and I am particularly disturbed by the fact that the Postmaster General's appointee as director of the St. Louis regional office, which includes the State of Iowa, comes not from the postal service and has no practical experience related to the postal service. He is Harold S. Wagner, who is described as a former senior vice president of the Grocery Products Division of the Pet Milk Co.

It is significant to note that Wagner comes from Missouri, which is the State from which Postmaster General Blount

selected his Washington, D.C., director of regional administration. Can this be a use of the old "buddy system" or cronyism in building the hierarchy of the Post Office Department?

Under the criteria set up by the Postmaster General, I suppose it would be unfair to even suggest that there was a single experienced postal official in Iowa capable of serving as regional director.

Mr. Speaker, the selections just made should lay at rest for all time the professions of those who sponsor a corporate operation of the Post Office Department that it will rely heavily for its operation on able, dedicated, and experienced career postal employees.

THE CAPITOL STEPS

(Mr. SYMINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's RECORD contains the opinion of General Sessions Chief Judge Harold Greene upholding the right of peaceful demonstration on the Capitol Grounds. Parenthetically, I know Judge Greene as a friend, lawyer, and distinguished jurist. Perhaps his conclusion was inescapable given the current apparently inadequate administrative guidelines. Certainly the opinion is written with that felicity of expression which one associates with the loftiest sentiments of higher courts—courts which I hope would not follow it in every respect.

Passing the question whether current rules require clarification or amendment, and I think they do, or whether some area within the Capitol Grounds might prove convenient for the stated purpose, this case was decided with reference to the Capitol steps, and we are dutybound to question whether the steps themselves or other areas contiguous to the Capitol entrances are an appropriate locus—permanent or temporary—for the ad hoc expression of political views by any citizen or group of citizens.

The question must be considered with due sensitivity to the right to assemble, speak, and petition. As the body which must be most responsive to the exercise of this right and whose deliberations stand most to be affected by the described activities, we would hope our collective judgment in the matter might merit some consideration in the court of public opinion as well as any other courts that might be called upon to weigh the issues involved.

The Greene opinion would make the orderliness of the participants the only test of permissibility. Reading it and the supporting comments of some Members leads me to believe the definition of "orderliness" in the instant case is infused with a certain implicit acknowledgement, if not admiration, for the bona fides and traditions of the Quaker sect. We must recognize, however, that this decision, were it to become permanently controlling, would give access to the Capitol steps for the purpose of reading the names of our Vietnam dead—as well as for any other peaceful reading—to groups which do not enjoy such wide sympathy. The American Nazi Party might wish to assemble and quietly read

the same names to point up their contribution to the struggle against communism, or post a few sentries to stand permanent vigil on the steps just to remind us of their general program for America. With respect to the Quaker protest, counterreadings of this kind could be expected from such dedicated and widely supported groups as the American Legion and VFW, to say nothing of large numbers of parents themselves who may organize to object to the reading of names of sons who they may feel died believing in their cause, yet who must silently acquiesce to this negative interpretation of their sacrifice.

One sees also that the cumulative "orderliness" of thousands must perforce become in itself disorderly. If we are forced to accept the Capitol steps as a forum for peaceful protest, we can be sure none other will do. A protest will not be a protest until it has been recorded on those steps. The doorsteps of the Capitol will be a mecca for the malcontent. We would need to appoint a protest registrar to assign, in a highly competitive atmosphere, numbers, dates, and times. His regulations would win no greater acceptance than those of any other bureaucracy. Protest groups and individuals dissatisfied with their treatment, and deeming their administrative remedies exhausted, would tend to refer questions of justice in implementation to the same courts which approved the justice of the principle. For this reason, among others, one would hope the judicial branch would find it possible to forbear from interfering with reasonable housekeeping regulations of the legislative branch which relate to the control of those particular public properties the daily exploitation of which cannot fail to disturb its deliberations to an unnecessary degree. I say "unnecessary" because we must acknowledge a wide variety of irritants to be necessary and useful stimulants to a healthy and responsive legislative process. We are surrounded by them already.

It is argued that assembling on the Capitol steps is a way to get the attention of Congress. Indeed it is. But is it an essential way? The Quaker point of view, for example, could easily gain congressional attention by suitably large formations on the Mall or other nearby areas. Indeed, it seems the "attention gap" is continuously closed by citizen mail and media alike, as well as frequent personal observation of the Nation's ills. Newspapers, radio, and television have certainly brought to the attention of every Congressman the cries and agonies of a divided and disturbed Nation and a troubled world. Our mail is full of it. Visitors to our offices carry the message. A logical extension of the "attention" argument, given the awkward option of circumventing the Capitol steps, would be to permit peaceful representations in the gallery and corridors, to guarantee the attention of Congress.

One thing is clear, the Capitol steps offer a convenient locus for the participation of sympathetic Members of Congress in the protest of the day. But no one argues the need to so accommodate protesting Congressmen. Presumably, this Hall is a suitable place for that. I cannot conceive that daily rump sessions

on the steps contribute as much to the substance of the legislative process as they cost it in appearance.

Admittedly, there is no perfect solitude for the orderly work of Congress itself. It is an imperfect atmosphere—made so in part by the mere friendly interruption of curious citizens from all over the country. To deny access to the visitor and tourist would be too high a price to pay for normal working conditions. But to reject even the most orderly of frankly political behavior would not seem to be. In addition, to require the Nation's people, especially the young, who come in thousands, to run a daily gauntlet of silent or murmured protest, is to distort their understanding. I should think, of the processes by which Congress meets, and ought to meet, its responsibility to the 200 million citizens who could not be here, but who entrust their hopes to us.

A Hyde Park-type area within reach of interested Congressmen and public media might answer the purpose. Reasonable and understandable regulations are a necessity. But the management of the Capitol Grounds, at least where such management is not arbitrary or capricious given the overall responsibility of Congress, would be better left, I believe, to House rules subject to modification from time to time by the membership, rather than the dictates of any other branch of Government.

THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS— TITAN OF THE TABLOIDS

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the highly competitive field of American journalism, one newspaper leads the pack—in circulation, in eye-catching makeup and photography, in the development of breezy, informative, terse stories, in rousing editorials and exclusives and in public service. That newspaper is the titan of the tabloids, the New York Daily News, which today—June 26—is celebrating its 50th anniversary. It has the largest circulation of any newspaper in America—2,092,142 daily and 3,176,962 Sunday—and uses more than 350,000 tons of newsprint annually. Among hundreds of other awards, it has won Pulitzer Prizes for editorial writing, editorial cartoon, distinguished international reporting, and news photography. It has an information and travel bureau which answers 1,288,000 questions every year and a reference library with 7 million newspaper clippings, 3,500,000 photographs, 700,000 negatives, and microfilms of every edition going all the way back to the first in 1919. The News makes history, as well as records it.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is indeed an honor to pay tribute to New York's picture newspaper on its golden anniversary by including Warren Hall's sprightly and informative history of the News:

WOULD IT LAST? YOU BET IT DID—50 YEARS AGO, WHEN THE NEWS WAS BORN, THE ODDS WERE STRONGLY AGAINST ITS SURVIVAL

(By Warren Hall)

There were a lot of good bets you could make in New York in 1919. You could bet

that prohibition wasn't going to stop you from getting a drink. You could bet prices were about to soar; some places were already charging 20 cents for a hamburger. You could bet stocks were going up; the Dow Jones averages had hit a new high.

But for the sure-thing bettor, the guy who was willing to lay odds that Monday was the day after Sunday, there was a real jim-dandy. Five would get you fifty or a hundred or even more than the Illustrated Daily News, that funny-looking sheet that first appeared on June 26, wouldn't even last out the year.

Why should it? Seventeen English-language papers were being published in New York and every one of them looked a lot more like a newspaper than that silly little thing with 16 pages, each of them only 14 inches deep and four columns wide. "Illustrated" ought to mean something, but the first page of the first edition, for heaven's sake, was a picture of the Prince of Wales on a horse with a lot of fancy old-fashioned curlicues around it. And news? Hardly enough to last one stop on a subway. Mostly features like "Our Daily Pattern," "How to Keep Well," "Real Love Stories" and "Bright Sayings of Children." Call that a newspaper?

But there was more than that going against it. The masthead on page 5 said the publishers were R. R. McCormick and J. M. Patterson, who were easily identifiable as grandsons of the founder of the Chicago Tribune, playboy types, probably; the general manager was William H. Field, who had been business manager of the Chicago Tribune; the business manager was George Utassy, an old Hearst man; and the managing editor was Arthur L. Clarke.

Utassy and Clarke were the only ones who knew anything about New York; the rest of the staff were either casual pick-ups or had been drafted from the Tribune. And the word was that McCormick was interested only in the Tribune while the New York baby was being run—by remote control from Chicago—by Patterson.

Last the year out? Another couple of bucks, Spike, and you can make it Thanksgiving.

But even sure-thing bets can go wrong. As anybody who wants to look at a calendar or count on his fingers can easily determine, the News this year is celebrating its fiftieth birthday. It was a close thing, though, for a while. The first day's 150,000 copies were grabbed up quickly but interest soon lagged and there was one black day in August when only about 11,000 were sold.

Even Max Annenberg, the big-shot circulation manager from the Chicago Tribune, who had insisted on starting the paper off with a beauty contest (first prize, \$10,000) and had spent \$42,000 advertising it, was ready to give up. "Boss, we're licked," he told the general manager. "We better pick up the marbles and go home." But the paper held on. And then came the limerick contest.

It was a simple thing. Four lines of a limerick were published each day and \$100 was offered for the best fifth line to be supplied by a reader. The excitement it engendered was unbelievable. The first limerick brought 10,497 entries. People at parties would produce a News and the rest of the evening would be spent composing last lines. It was fun, and a lot of people got acquainted with the News that way. And most of them liked what they saw.

Presumably conceived during a wartime meeting in France between Patterson and McCormick, both Army officers, the News (the "Illustrated" was abandoned after a few months) started on the raggediest type of shoestring. Office space was rented from another newspaper, the Evening Mail, at 25 City Hall Pl. for \$166.67 a month with an arrangement to use the Mail's composing room and press room after that paper had finished its own operations for the day. It was an almost impossible situation and general manager Field began to look for some other arrangement. "Don't worry," Patterson said, "if we reach 100,000 by the end of

the year, we'll find our own place." Thanks mainly to the limerick contest, that goal was reached.

Advertising was so scarce, however, that one prized early ad was shifted by a Mail compositor to his own paper because he was sure the News didn't bother with such stuff.

The quarters into which the News finally moved in April, 1921—after 11 months of alterations—was almost a travesty. It had a frontage of 58 feet at 25 Park Place, ran through 128 feet to Murray St., was five stories high and about 40 years old. Basement and sub-basement had to be entirely rebuilt to accommodate the weight of the presses and most of the rest of the structure had to be drastically improved. And yet 25 Park Place was woefully inadequate by the time the building was occupied. Nobody could have foreseen the amazingly rapid strides taken by the newcomer. To be brief, in its fourth year the News attained the largest daily circulation of any newspaper in the country; by the seventh year the largest Sunday. For many years it has had more than twice the daily circulation of any U.S. paper.

The Sunday News was started two weeks after moving into Park Place and had 250,000 circulation in a month. The Evening Mail presses were still used for a time and by 1925 the Evening Telegram's presses had to be rented on nights when the press run was extra heavy. There had never been anything like it before and, the communications industry being what it is today, there probably never will be again.

Even though the News seemed to be, after a few changes, just what New Yorkers wanted, there were other fortunate factors. In other cities new papers were hotly fought by their rivals but the funny little newcomer to New York was blandly ignored at first. In fact, it was welcomed to the newspaper truck delivery system only because it shared the expense (until it developed its own delivery system, which was much more efficacious).

(For a time there seemed to be an unusual number of false fire alarms on Murray St. about the time the trucks were starting out with News deliveries but if they were efforts to hold up distribution of the paper they were too little and too late.)

Let no one get the idea that making the News what it is today was any kind of a lead-pipe cinch. The struggle to convince advertisers to use "The Stenographers' Gazette" was colossal and seemingly interminable. Paper supply was a constant problem—would there be enough rolls for the next week? Development of a staff that could turn out breezy, informative, terse stories was a city editor's nightmare. And then there was the problem of pictures.

A half dozen photographers were hired but they had to work with awkward equipment and in inadequate darkrooms. Events of importance were happening all over the world but getting pictures of them to New York seemingly took forever. For a while the News and the Chicago Tribune ran their own picture agency, Pacific and Atlantic photos, with men stationed in many parts of the globe and their deeds of derring-do to outrace rivals made the pony express resemble a canter through the park.

The News helped develop two methods of "telegraphing" pictures and then the Associated Press came along with its remarkably clear wirephotos which the News had exclusively in New York for five years.

Meanwhile, gradually, the paper was developing its own Pulitzer-prize winning photographic staff, now numbering half a hundred, who collect awards unceasingly and probably, as a group, are without rivals. At the same time the News was pioneering in color pictures for gravure reproduction.

J. M. Patterson, who really did control the paper from Chicago for a while, moved to New York in the mid-20s and guided its destinies with a sureness that many rival publishers haven't hesitated to call genius. The

editorials he created by mental osmosis or thought transference were read even by those who turned first to the comic strips, most of which he also originated. He died in 1946.

So, when the News moved in 1930 to its big new building at 220 E. 42nd St., the paper was a unique editorial edifice so impressive in achievement that it matched its new home as an architectural masterpiece.

One lesson the sure-thing bettor must have learned after half a century—sometimes dark horses can sprout wings.

FIRSTS AND OTHER FACTS EXCLUSIVE TO THE NEWS

The News was the first New York City newspaper to grant editorial and commercial employes a five-day, 35-hour work week.

The first to give its employes a non-contributory pension and welfare plan.

The first to start a company blood bank in cooperation with the Red Cross.

Pioneered and perfected the Spectra-Color process which permits inclusion of pre-printed, four-color gravure inserts in the daily paper. (Our front and back pages on the Apollo 10 moon mission last month were examples.)

Started "A Friend in Need" department, now in its 50th year of service to New Yorkers.

Devised the split-run technique of production ("your ad in every other copy").

Has America's largest circulation—Daily 2,092,143 and Sunday 3,176,962 (latest annual averages).

Among hundreds of other awards, has won Pulitzer Prizes for editorial writing, editorial cartoon, distinguished international reporting, and news photography (in 1956, the first time the honor went to a newspaper's entire staff instead of a single cameraman.)

Uses more than 350,000 tons of newsprint annually. (Two huge newsprint mills at Bale Comeau, Canada, are owned by the Chicago Tribune-New York News Syndicate Inc.)

Has an information and Travel Bureau which answers 1,288,000 questions every year.

Has a reference library with 7,000,000 newspaper clippings, 3,500,000 photographs, 700,000 negatives, and microfilms of every edition of The News going all the way back to the first, June 26, 1919.

Has a fleet of 11 radio cars to speed reporters and photographers to the scene of stories. Owns and operates two airplanes for photos.

With a view toward further expansion, has acquired a 23-acre site zoned for industrial development in Long Island City, Queens.

GRAND OPENING—NEW PIER 21

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1969, the Pouch Terminal, Clifton, Staten Island, N.Y., opened a new pier No. 21 which was the first new pier facility in the Port of New York opened by a private operator in my memory.

The pier structure is 830 feet long and 160 feet wide with a 131,750-square-foot area. It contains the most modern equipment, including 30-foot-wide stringpieces for handling containers as well as palletized and general cargo. The shed itself features loading platforms, truck levelers, automatic door and sprinkler systems, powered ventilation and many more new features. The pier also features a heliport which is located at the sea end. It is the only steamship pier in the Port of New York with a heliport.

The piers at this terminal are the closest in the port to the sea, and are virtually on the deep water channel. Cargo vessels are afforded the shortest possible

turnaround time. With the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, the longest of its kind in the world, and the Clove Lakes Expressway, the terminal is easily accessible to all major highways and expressways.

In my remarks at the opening I complimented the Staten Island International Longshoremen's Association for their great productivity rate which is the highest in the port, and which also has a minimum of work stoppages—a clear understanding that good labor-management relations are necessary for success in business.

My congratulations to Mr. A. T. Pouch, Jr., president of Pouch Terminal; the Pittston Stevedoring Corp.; and the Barber Steamship Lines whose action today will insure the continuance of Staten Island as a necessary and expanding part of the port facilities in New York.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN AIR RIGHTS HOUSING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major obstacles to the construction of low- and moderate-income housing in our central cities is the excessively high cost of land. One new tool which we in New York City have been experimenting with for the last several years to overcome this obstacle is the use of air space over public buildings for low- and moderate-income housing.

I personally have been involved in the fight for air rights housing since 1963, when the Post Office Department announced its intention of expanding the present Morgan Street Post Office into the adjoining block and thereby displacing a last number of low- and moderate-income families from their perfectly sound housing. At the time, the idea of building low- and moderate-income housing above the air rights of the new postal facility was put forth as a means of permitting those displaced from their homes to relocate in the same neighborhood.

This idea seemed an extremely logical and commonsense idea, one of those ideas which when someone proposes it, you wonder why you didn't think of it first. And most importantly, the community was excited about the idea. I was able to get the Post Office Department to "seriously consider" the proposal to construct the Nation's first combination postal building with an apartment development rising above it, and the then Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Robert C. Weaver, to undertake discussions with the New York City Housing Authority on this question. Secretary Weaver indicated to me that he "was intrigued with the idea as an interesting approach." The task force Postmaster General Blount has engaged to review this project has similarly expressed to me an interest in the concept.

Another example of the utilization of the concept of air rights housing comes in connection with the proposed construction of middle-income apartments over the Food Trades High School, located on 10th Avenue between 50th and 51st Streets in my district. The board

of education recently agreed to include such housing in its plan, and the plan was accepted by the zoning board.

These and other experiences with this concept suggest that it can serve as an extremely useful tool in making more low- and moderate-income housing available in central cities. The Federal Government, as a major builder in many central cities, can do much to encourage the development of this concept by vigorously encouraging its implementation in connection with new Federal construction, where it is feasible. The Federal Government, as the operator of numerous low- and moderate-income housing programs, can similarly encourage this concept by putting mortgage guarantees and other programs at the disposal of air rights housing projects constructed over Federal air rights.

To eliminate the one possible legal obstacle to the active involvement of the Federal Government in this field, I have today joined in cosponsoring H.R. 12462, legislation to eliminate the requirement imposed by 40 U.S.C. 484(e) (3) (G) that the Federal Government must receive fair market value on surplus property disposed of through noncompetitive bidding. In certain cases, this requirement might make it economically difficult to develop low-income housing over Federal air rights.

However, in most cases, even with this requirement in effect, it is economically feasible. All that is needed is the active encouragement and support of the Federal Government. To this end I recently wrote the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Honorable George Romney, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration, urging them to establish as Federal policy the utilization of air rights over Federal buildings, where appropriate, for low- and moderate-income housing.

We need not wait for passage of H.R. 12462. There is much that can be done now by administrative action. Indeed, executive initiative in this area is imperative, for even if H.R. 12462 were passed today, it would be meaningless unless the executive acted vigorously to encourage air rights housing.

My letter to Secretary Romney follows:

JUNE 24, 1969.

HON. GEORGE W. ROMNEY,
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development,
Department of Housing and Urban Development,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: One of the major obstacles to the construction of enough low and moderate income housing to meet the demands of our central cities is the excessively high cost of land.

There is a simple course of action which the Federal government can take to overcome a part of this problem, which is suggested by the experience of New York City. This is the utilization of air rights over public buildings for low and moderate income housing.

The construction of public facilities in the central city frequently imposes a severe hardship on those living in the site to be taken over. The hardship is particularly great since the land most frequently taken is in low and moderate income communities. Relocation causes tremendous problems to those forced from their homes. The facilities constructed hurt all, however, by eliminating potentially available residential hous-

ing. This contributes to the rising cost of the remaining units.

I have been advocating for more than the last six years, the utilization of air rights over public buildings in my District as a means of permitting those displaced from their homes to relocate in the same neighborhood. The New York City Board of Education has agreed to construct middle income apartments on the air rights over the proposed Park West High School located on 10th Avenue between 50th and 51st Streets. This comes after more than two years of efforts on my part. The high school is located in the Chelsea community in New York City, which is in desperate need of new housing. Land costs per dwelling unit in the area vary between \$4,590 and \$7,920. This makes the development sites solely for low or moderate income housing extremely difficult. This approach represents a common sense way of meeting the communities need for residential and educational facilities.

There is also the example of the proposed Morgan Post Office extension, to be located on 28th and 29th Streets between 9th and 10th Avenues. This facility has displaced a large number of families from low and moderate income housing. Since 1963, I have been advocating utilization of the air rights over the proposed postal facility for low and moderate income housing. As far back as March 1965, the Post Office Department indicated it was seriously considering my proposal. Your predecessor, Robert Weaver, indicated that he was intrigued by my idea. When I again requested the consulting firm hired by Postmaster General Blount to investigate the future development of the Morgan facility, it, too, saw it as an approach deserving of serious consideration.

I am writing to urge you to take advantage of this concept and to establish as Federal policy, this common sense approach. The air rights over new Federal facilities, where feasible, should be used for the construction of low and moderate income housing. I have been in communication with your predecessor on this subject as aforementioned, however, I never received a definite answer. I would greatly appreciate a clear statement on this question from you and from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, to whom I have also sent a copy of this letter. Only by the full use of available facilities by the Federal government as well as other sectors of our society, can the goals set forth by Congress in the 1968 Housing Act to bring decent housing to all be accomplished. This is an added tool to accomplish what I know you seek as I do.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, two documents have been released which, when set side by side, show dramatically the existence of widespread hunger and malnutrition in many counties in which food production is deliberately curbed at high cost to the taxpayer.

The first document is a table produced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "Food Assistance Programs, Percent of Persons Participating in County and City Administrative Units." This table lists more than 2,500 counties in the country which have either a commodity distribution or food stamp program. The sad fact is that in the aver-

age county in the United States, less than 20 percent of the families with incomes of under \$3,000 annually are receiving food benefits under either program.

The second document recently released is a 5-pound, 2-inch-thick book listing by name, address, and amount received, over 100,000 farmers in the United States, each of whom collected more than \$5,000 last year for not growing crops. This list of names shows that farmers in some of the counties with the worst records of feeding their poor received hundreds of thousands of dollars in Federal payments not to produce food.

After research with the Department of Agriculture, Office of Economic Opportunity, Bureau of the Census, and Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, I am convinced that these documents present the most accurate information presently available. Admittedly, it does suffer from certain limitations. It should be pointed out that the number of poor in each county has been derived from the 1960 census, the most recent year for which statistics are available. In the intervening years, the number of poor families have undoubtedly declined, and in addition many of these families may have changed their residences from one county to another.

Nevertheless, making adjustments for such limitations, these statistics disclose shocking facts.

These facts have special significance at this time because the Congress is now considering the imposition of a \$20,000 annual limitation on total payments any

farmer may receive and a substantial expansion and reform of Federal programs of food aid to the poor. An official study completed last fall in the U.S. Department of Agriculture concluded that such a payment limitation on Federal farm payments could effect budget savings as high as \$300 million per year. President Nixon has recently asked for an additional \$270 million to expand and reform the existing food-aid program. Therefore, it is apparent that the savings to be derived from placing a \$20,000 ceiling on payments to wealthy farmers could be used to fund an expanded program to feed the poor.

Here are the grim facts:

First. Relatively few poor families are served by Federal food-aid programs. According to the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, the average county with a food stamp program reaches only 10 percent of its poor families; the average county with a commodity distribution program reaches only 18 percent.

Second. The low percentage of poor families served is especially shocking in some of the leading food-producing States in the Nation, such as Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Third. In these very States where the poor go hungry, the number of farmers receiving over \$5,000 and the total amounts received last year skyrocketed—in one case by as much as five times that of the previous year. The following table sets this out clearly for these nine States:

Participation in median food program	Percent	Farm payments over \$5,000			
		Number of payees		Total amount paid (in millions)	
		1967	1968	1967	1968
Illinois	8	1,305	4,248	\$10.0	\$34.8
Indiana	7	829	2,881	6.6	24.3
Iowa	10	1,179	6,047	8.8	46.1
Kansas	7	7,598	8,806	63.5	75.2
Michigan	22	428	745	3.1	5.7
Minnesota	11	1,087	2,394	8.3	17.6
Missouri	18	2,546	3,906	24.3	35.7
Ohio	11	527	1,429	3.9	11.5
Wisconsin	13	194	518	1.5	4.2

Fourth. Total payments nationally under the various farm programs have risen steadily since 1966, the year for which this data was first made public. According to the Department of Agriculture, it may be expected to increase still further this year if Congress does not step in and bring this situation under control by enacting a limitation on farm payments.

Farm payments over \$5,000—total figures

Number of payees	Total amount paid
87,527 (1966)	\$1,018,676,430
91,887 (1967)	1,114,617,466
107,745 (1968)	1,330,633,218

In recent years, total payments in excess of \$5,000 to farmers have increased annually by \$100 to \$150 million.

Fifth. In certain counties where participation in Federal food-aid programs was abysmally low, payments to farmers for non-production was unconscionably high. The following counties fed fewer than 1 percent of their poor families, yet wealthy farmers in those counties received large farm payments from the Government:

Counties with less than 1 percent participation in food-aid programs	Farm payments over \$5,000	
	Number of payees	Total amount paid
Illinois:		
Bureau	102	\$797,041
Clark	55	451,659
DeWitt	45	402,440
Edwards	7	55,004
Grundy	57	419,667
Iroquois	93	733,080
Logan	53	473,509
McDonough	32	216,433
McLean	111	911,187
Piatt	52	436,011
Putnam	6	39,446
Shelby	62	464,999
Washington	6	47,072
Will	20	143,202
Indiana:		
Benton	91	697,710
Floyd	1	6,695
Huntington	9	59,656
Wabash	14	129,464
Wells	8	50,352
Iowa:		
Adams	18	114,913
Shelby	109	776,379
Kansas: Kingman	83	605,700
Maryland: Worcester	8	54,253
Missouri:		
Caldwell	15	100,162
DeKalb	19	134,421
Gentry	32	235,660
Linn	17	148,410
Nodaway	67	552,226
Perry	7	138,105
Schuyler	8	52,260
Virginia: Mecklenburg	1	6,279

The data I am placing in the RECORD today makes it apparent that simply having a food-aid program in a county is often little better than having no program at all. A program which feeds as few hungry families as is presently true in the average food-aid program in the United States is worse than a failure. It is a cruel joke, falling woefully short of serving the needs of the hungry and the poor, and at the same time deceiving every thoughtful American citizen who has a conscience. It masquerades under an undeserved label, pretending to be something that it is not.

This data raises a serious moral question and a serious question of priorities. There is something very wrong when a nation fails to feed its hungry, yet at the same time pays its farmers not to produce food. After I placed in the May 12th RECORD the list of the 425 counties without any food-aid program whatsoever, I received many requests for copies of that list from concerned citizens all over the Nation. Often those writings expressed shock and surprise that their own counties failed to provide food for the hungry. Yet each wanted to do something about this deplorable situation.

I am encouraged when this is the response of concerned citizens. I am hopeful that this will also be the response of a concerned Congress.

The statistical data on hunger and farm payments follows. In preparing the table from which the percentage figures are taken, the Consumer and Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture stated that its computation was based on program participation as of February 1969, and information from the 1960 census on families with incomes under \$3,000. The data on farm payments is from part 3, Senate hearings on Agriculture and related agencies appropriations for fiscal 1970.

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
ALABAMA				
Autauga	46		39	\$636,030
Baldwin	43		6	40,380
Barbour		10	31	343,941
Bibb	27		11	193,248
Blount	18		32	378,397
Bullock		41	10	82,077
Butler	35		21	231,934
Calhoun	18		19	181,348
Chambers	33		14	137,930
Cherokee	25		93	946,252
Chilton	28		15	144,006
Choctaw		15	5	52,831
Clarke		5	8	73,864
Clay	30		1	5,247
Cleburne	30			None
Coffee	25		46	377,013
Colbert	42		87	1,332,749
Conecuh	28		22	234,170
Coosa	27			None
Covington	27		27	250,771
Crenshaw	36		20	159,634
Cullman	28		43	401,147
Dale	28		21	231,841
Dallas		24	62	1,071,629
De Kalb	16		48	349,781
Elmore	33		51	645,003
Escambia	41		28	261,377
Etowah	24		29	262,396

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
ALABAMA—Con.				
Fayette	27		21	\$206,238
Franklin	16		24	188,008
Geneva	22		60	506,213
Greene	42		26	349,950
Hale	24		34	452,248
Henry	47		52	431,766
Houston		9	59	485,527
Jackson	23		62	584,764
Jefferson		8	7	75,897
Lamar		9	24	190,935
Lauderdale	23		76	889,802
Lawrence	35		138	2,232,953
Lee	36		22	302,036
Limestone	26		150	2,231,961
Lowndes	92		36	382,590
Macon	74		42	581,420
Madison	25		185	2,754,897
Marengo	63		22	242,910
Marion	16		25	165,475
Marshall	27		48	387,486
Mobile		19	4	27,778
Monroe	55		49	418,197
Montgomery		10	16	240,025
Perry	28		24	318,722
Pickens	16		30	363,947
Pike	10		23	181,746
Randolph	28		3	21,775
Russell	14		25	351,596
St. Clair	18		3	57,867
Shelby	24		31	377,011
Sumter		19	22	195,849
Talladega	38		25	304,771
Tallapoosa	27		16	252,160
Walker		19	6	59,016
Washington		16	6	49,356
Wilcox	68		17	168,292
Winston	23		2	20,719

ARIZONA

Apache	5			None
Cochise	18		119	1,888,979
Cocino	9		5	25,000
Gila	26			None
Graham	63		52	515,168
Greenlee	18		10	71,747
Maricopa	30		451	12,540,974
Mohave	18		3	100,751
Navajo	40			None
Pima	31		53	1,926,962
Pinal	58		320	14,825,088
Santa Cruz	32		1	14,928
Yavapai	10		6	36,442
Yuma	21		147	5,036,490

ARKANSAS

Arkansas		6	16	138,038
Ashley		18	95	1,455,058
Baxter		9		None
Benton		8	1	5,030
Boone		3		None
Bradley		6	1	5,081
Calhoun		5	3	29,239
Carroll		4		None
Chicot		28	94	1,277,632
Clark		11	9	78,411
Clay		21	43	312,493
Cleburne		11	1	7,719
Cleveland		13	2	18,494
Columbia		4	4	40,825
Conway		9	14	147,452
Craighead		9	198	1,738,177
Crawford		7		None
Crittenden		36	215	4,774,906
Cross		18	85	1,305,826
Dallas		6	3	40,560
Desha		15	120	1,650,780
Drew		14	38	482,693
Faulkner		4	11	118,372
Franklin		13		5,533
Fulton		22		None
Garland		5		None
Grant		8		None
Greene		8	48	368,842
Hempstead		4	2	16,665
Hot Spring		10		None
Howard		8	3	29,166
Independence		8	14	94,002
Izard		9		None
Jackson		16	92	1,069,793
Jefferson		14	212	3,386,275
Johnson		8	3	18,841
Lafayette		14	53	715,000
Lawrence		10	32	239,759
Lee		34	149	1,975,157
Lincoln		24	109	1,527,615
Little River		6	17	187,823
Logan		7	2	11,795
Lonoke		8	142	1,799,593

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
ARKANSAS—Continued				
Madison	14			None
Marion		6		None
Miller		3	24	\$280,320
Mississippi		23	492	8,225,650
Monroe		36	104	1,165,402
Montgomery	17			None
Nevada	16		1	11,603
Newton	42			None
Ouachita		5	5	54,954
Perry		14	1	5,429
Phillips		37	255	4,098,653
Pike	12		1	7,445
Poinsett		23	214	2,767,159
Polk		6		None
Pope		6	3	33,166
Prairie		9	23	214,658
Pulaski		8	56	748,568
Randolph		7	20	152,904
St. Francis		38	172	3,085,219
Saline		6		None
Scott	8			None
Searcy	27			None
Sebastian		4		None
Sevier		4	1	5,141
Sharp		9		None
Stone		14		None
Union		6		None
Van Buren	23			None
Washington		4	1	5,851
White	17		20	142,348
Woodruff	34		99	1,105,907
Yell		6	17	171,632

CALIFORNIA

Alameda		30	1	6,766
Amador		6		None
Colusa		19	11	96,213
Contra Costa		61	1	6,183
El Dorado		41	2	12,500
Fresno		35	487	16,392,595
Humboldt		25		None
Inyo		12		None
Kern		43	665	17,634,788
Kings		11	247	10,279,927
Lake		25		None
Lassen		30	5	55,013
Los Angeles		20	17	208,697
Madera		48	196	3,570,338
Mendocino		3		None
Merced		2	119	2,028,899
Modoc		6	10	73,177
Monterey		40	15	117,818
Napa		25		None
Plumas		20		None
Sacramento		42	21	163,679
San Francisco		17		None
San Joaquin		38	27	280,078
San Luis Obispo		20	52	548,805
San Mateo		13		None
Santa Barbara		35	4	59,644
Santa Clara		32		None
Santa Cruz		20		None
Shasta		57		None
Sonoma		20		None
Stanislaus		30		None
Sutter		5	22	204,811
Tehama		14	4	34,056
Tulare		10	625	10,210,013
Tuolumne		36		None
Ventura		28		None
Yolo		32	13	293,735
Yuba		3	1	5,022

COLORADO

Adams		33	114	1,176,753
Alamosa		14	2	14,049
Arapahoe		15	60	570,810
Archuleta		14	1	6,847
Baca		4	268	2,709,264
Bent		18	61	687,872
Boulder		8	4	29,263
Chaffee		6		None
Cheyenne		6	141	1,565,971
Clear Creek		8		None
Conejos		40	1	5,165
Costilla		48		None
Crowley		13	38	318,498
Custer		4		None
Delta		7		None
Denver		28		None
Dolores		14	15	118,454
Eagle		11		None
Elbert		3	46	412,411
El Paso		12	23	169,123
Fremont		8	3	25,236
Garfield		5	2	15,405

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
COLORADO—Continued				
Gilpin			(1)	None
Grand			4	None
Gunnison			12	None
Huerfano			17	7
Jefferson			8	6
Kiowa			6	217
Kit Carson			10	332
Lake			20	None
LaPlata			14	6
Larimer			29	10
Las Animas			16	36
Lincoln			7	108
Logan			8	70
Mesa			(1)	1
Mineral			(1)	8,697
Moffat			14	23
Montezuma			12	3
Montrose			10	None
Morgan			15	73
Otero			21	14
Phillips			4	95
Powers			14	229
Pueblo			31	31
Rio Blanco			8	3
Rio Grande			19	None
Routt			8	20
Saguache			10	2
Sedgwick			3	69
Teller			9	None
Washington			4	173
Weld			9	173
Yuma			3	163

CONNECTICUT

Hartford (district)		26	3	21,947
Litchfield		3		None
New Haven (district)		23		None
Waterbury (district)		38		None
New London		16		None
Tolland		5		None
Windham		28		None

DELAWARE

Kent		35	14	101,043
New Castle		51	15	116,280
Sussex		28	24	186,758

District of Columbia: Washington

District of Columbia: Washington		23		
----------------------------------	--	----	--	--

FLORIDA

Alachua		23	32	270,875
Baker		37		None
Bay		12		None
Bradford		33	2	13,250
Broward		10		None
Calhoun		41	4	32,315
Columbia		35	19	157,467
Dade		11		None
De Soto		20		None
Dixie		30		None
Duval		18		None
Escambia		26	2	11,770

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
FLORIDA—Con.				
Taylor	28		None	
Union	27		1	\$5,034
Volusia	9		None	
Wakulla	41		1	6,264
Walton	30		2	10,180
Washington	35		2	11,413
GEORGIA				
Appling	24		3	18,952
Atkinson	47		4	34,409
Bacon	25		3	20,837
Baker	50		14	154,555
Baldwin		14	6	46,553
Banks	18		None	
Barrow	17		3	43,390
Bartow	14		56	781,752
Ben Hill		12	11	118,179
Berrien		4	12	91,800
Bibb		13	4	23,492
Bleckley		13	35	337,113
Brantley	32		None	
Brooks	43		34	316,358
Bryan	38		2	12,711
Bulloch	25		63	520,936
Burke		22	151	2,153,442
Butts	35		5	38,990
Calhoun		8	37	458,830
Camden	47		None	
Candler	33		14	115,375
Carroll		6	2	14,953
Catoosa		11	None	
Charlton		35	None	
Chatham		10	None	
Chattahoochee	68		None	
Chattooga	22		7	72,207
Cherokee	11		None	
Clarke	12		1	14,232
Clayton	13		None	
Clinch		14	None	
Cobb	12		None	
Coffee	24		16	109,688
Colquitt		12	70	666,384
Columbia	25		None	
Cook	20		4	31,438
Coweta		7	8	110,498
Crawford	41		8	68,746
Crisp		9	53	583,311
Dade	14		None	
Dawson		13	23	181,661
Decatur	19		None	
De Kalb		18	36	455,789
Dodge	41		143	1,830,775
Dooly		14	10	87,403
Douglas	13		None	
Early	49		89	887,553
Echols		37	None	
Effingham	48		6	39,951
Elbert		9	14	139,035
Emanuel	29		48	456,651
Evans	32		7	55,235
Fannin	15		None	
Fayette		6	1	5,805
Floyd	20		23	268,364
Forsyth		3	None	
Franklin	12		9	75,416
Fulton	23		None	
Gilmer		5	None	
Glascok	32		15	150,634
Glynn	16		None	
Gordon		5	20	240,265
Grady	12		14	117,481
Greene		6	1	6,171
Gwinnett	15		2	29,762
Habersham		5	1	11,391
Hall	6		None	
Hancock	27		5	60,912
Haralson	19		1	6,491
Harris	35		1	8,082
Hart		8	21	257,074
Heard		13	None	
Henry	19		18	191,584
Houston		14	32	450,213
Irwin	35		23	187,452
Jackson	16		3	24,969
Jasper		14	4	35,498
Jeff Davis	21		4	35,741
Jefferson	37		90	1,129,195
Jenkins		12	46	483,675
Johnson	18		51	599,881
Jones	11		None	
Lamar	6		2	14,118
Lanier	12		3	19,993
Laurens	12	117	1,343,776	
Lee		34	27	266,666
Liberty	36		None	
Lincoln		10	1	5,425
Long	48		None	
Lowndes		11	11	81,360

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
GEORGIA—Con.				
Lumpkin		11	None	
McDuffie		4	8	\$102,978
McIntosh	34		None	
Macon	61		61	798,802
Madison		4	16	150,574
Marion	38		11	105,179
Meriwether		14	15	201,597
Miller	29		16	174,317
Mitchell		22	89	861,798
Monroe	24		None	
Montgomery	34		8	66,092
Morgan		12	24	391,728
Murray	11		2	12,477
Muscogee	18		None	
Newton	22		8	75,791
Oconee		8	22	275,233
Oglethorpe		6	10	103,645
Paulding	26		None	
Peach		7	16	144,871
Pickens		5	None	
Pierce		11	5	46,499
Pike		12	12	171,808
Polk		7	14	130,496
Pulaski		17	39	425,965
Putnam		14	1	9,188
Quitman	78		4	40,070
Rabun		21	1	7,074
Randolph	36		43	493,270
Richmond		6	8	83,051
Rockdale	26		3	35,649
Schley	35		11	89,468
Scriven	41		75	911,227
Seminole		15	19	209,364
Spalding		9	3	33,849
Stephens		6	None	
Stewart	39		13	180,118
Sumter	37		68	722,767
Talbot	33		1	5,736
Taliaferro		56	None	
Tattall	30		13	95,314
Taylor	38		44	444,123
Telfair	27		15	139,903
Terrell	58		79	953,494
Thomas		16	44	460,505
Tift		7	14	124,362
Toombs		12	25	212,663
Townsend		12	3	None
Treutlen		12	3	34,943
Turner	28		31	262,655
Twiggs		21	14	121,089
Union	21		None	
Upson		7	None	
Walker	23		2	16,637
Walton		7	58	595,075
Ware	32		3	18,732
Warren		18	23	338,659
Washington		15	49	622,238
Wayne	33		4	25,676
Webster	40		15	105,771
Wheeler		10	13	99,671
White	16		2	None
Whitfield	38		43	377,003
Wilcox		7	1	6,298
Wilkes	47		4	28,357
Wilkinson	34		73	687,425
Worth				
HAWAII				
Hawaii		14		
Honolulu		(1)	1	5,000
Kauai				
Maui		14		
IDAHO				
Benewah	16		42	414,768
Bonner	21		None	
Boundary	17		12	108,434
Clearwater	71		5	29,133
Freemont	12		45	350,250
Idaho	19		74	664,564
Kootenai	26		36	314,727
Latah	10		120	1,025,642
Lewis	24		90	725,081
Nez Perce	47		129	1,377,644
Teton	14		31	299,530
ILLINOIS				
Adams		6	48	398,139
Alexander		12	10	157,319
Bond		3	10	61,435
Brown		2	9	72,137
Bureau		1	102	797,041
Calhoun		6	9	82,935
Carroll		3	41	301,897

Footnotes at end of table.

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
ILLINOIS—Con.				
Cass		3	31	\$254,523
Champaign		4	94	683,097
Christian		2	80	614,391
Clark		1	55	451,659
Clay		5	2	10,559
Ciinton		2	5	34,054
Coles		3	90	661,480
Cook		18	28	260,389
Crawford		3	39	293,015
Cumberland		3	20	145,252
De Witt		1	45	402,440
Douglas		5	41	334,315
Edgar		4	6.8	538,556
Edwards		1	7	55,004
Effingham		5	8	56,399
Fayette		5	33	241,222
Ford		2	28	207,224
Franklin		11	21	159,063
Fulton		3	41	423,124
Gallatin		6	27	297,225
Greene		4	54	530,930
Grundy		1	57	419,667
Hamilton		2	8	48,746
Hancock		2	45	344,876
Hardin		10	3	22,449
Henderson		14	57	446,346
Henry		5	82	627,158
Iroquois		1	93	733,080
Jackson		9	31	285,310
Jasper		2	22	154,385
Jefferson		9	16	142,070
Jersey		2	36	345,563
Jo Daviess		3	19	146,214
Johnson		6	None	
Jane		2	84	814,656
Kankakee		7	78	768,091
Knox		4	37	302,140
La Salle		2	70	530,513
Lawrence		12	42	371,651
Lee		9	114	816,048
Livingston		2	80	636,734
Logan		1	53	473,509
McDonough		1	32	216,433
McHenry		4	104	912,270
McLean		1	111	911,187
Macon		9	53	435,025
Macoupin		3	56	438,452
Madison		13	25	174,057
Marion		8	9	61,039
Marshall		3	17	145,353
Mason		4	57	457,642
Massac		8	6	70,042
Menard		2	18	135,121
Mercer		10	78	638,716
Monroe		4	26	205,541
Montgomery		2	50	446,392
Morgan		3	42	340,937
Moultrie		3	36	263,798
Ogle		5	77	599,967
Peoria		12	34	462,389
Perry		3	52	436,011
Platt		1	56	412,438
Pike		5	6	35,542
Pope		9	6	8

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
INDIANA—Con.				
Clark	13		10	\$78,270
Clay	10		17	164,674
Clinton	2		32	233,000
Crawford	12		3	23,686
Daviess		4	5	51,759
Dearborn		10	3	23,195
Decatur	7		41	313,726
De Kalb	4		17	114,596
Delaware	11		15	98,968
Dubois	3		15	99,312
Elkhart	5		23	161,907
Fayette	9		14	91,458
Floyd		11	1	6,695
Fountain	7		57	445,077
Franklin	10		10	96,282
Fulton	2		53	381,147
Gibson		6	63	552,966
Grant	10		13	95,684
Greene	12		41	336,057
Hamilton	3		24	209,796
Hancock	5		21	167,958
Harrison		5	9	60,026
Hendricks	3		23	149,096
Henry	6		39	293,699
Howard		6	25	209,093
Huntington	1		9	59,656
Jackson	13		34	274,185
Jasper	3		162	1,683,392
Jay	4		9	69,053
Jefferson	8		3	16,854
Jennings	12		18	130,569
Johnson	9		15	103,651
Knox		6	110	1,107,143
Kosciusko	3		32	303,521
Lagrange	2		14	94,800
Lake		26	64	650,934
La Porte	11		124	1,070,808
Lawrence		11	19	143,767
Madison		7	28	213,749
Marion		9	9	70,156
Marshall		4	34	312,852
Martin	17		10	65,236
Miami	6		17	112,217
Monroe	12		2	12,348
Montgomery	3		28	208,826
Morgan	10		21	136,798
Noble	6		22	164,862
Ohio	8		3	30,962
Orange	13		6	43,974
Owen	10		15	104,182
Parke	13		60	534,275
Perry		18	3	19,493
Pike		10	13	36,035
Porter	5		59	472,674
Posey		9	45	445,041
Pulaski	3		81	775,303
Putnam		3	33	243,454
Randolph	7		21	158,328
Ripley	6		9	63,716
Rush	3		56	418,068
St. Joseph	10		51	479,160
Scott	19		4	26,066
Shelby	4		21	141,115
Spencer		11	21	180,246
Starke	15		66	686,158
Sullivan	13		51	475,296
Switzerland		6		None
Tiptecanoe	7		96	800,344
Tipton		5	18	122,178
Union	4		19	143,860
Vanderburgh		11	7	88,717
Vermillion	14		32	308,272
Vigo	21		64	635,094
Wabash	1		14	129,464
Warren	2		86	675,570
Warrick		9	16	160,326
Washington	8		9	67,912
Wayne	13		32	250,197
Wells	1		8	50,352
Whitley	2		20	152,619

IOWA

Adair	2	41	287,938
Adams	1	18	114,913
Allamakee	8	9	59,852
Appanoose	9	13	121,049
Audubon	3	46	352,636
Benton	2	77	567,258
Black Hawk	34	95	681,428
Boone	16	53	414,926
Buchanan	9	62	465,051
Buena Vista	2	45	314,653
Butler	2	70	496,028
Bremer	3	34	233,014
Calhoun	3	30	213,222
Carroll	6	52	407,710
Cass	5	59	468,028
Cedar	6	81	590,297
Cerro Gordo	7	175	1,486,736

IOWA—Con.

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
Cherokee			3	62
Chickasaw	10		46	\$471,698
Clarke		2	10	315,727
Clay		5	70	73,347
Clayton		5	6	540,215
Clinton		7	92	32,934
Crawford	7		121	688,656
Dallas		5	59	912,071
Davis		6	14	419,795
Decatur		6	14	96,291
Delaware		5	48	104,802
Des Moines		4	41	353,958
Dickinson		3	39	278,567
Dubuque	15		15	110,864
Emmet		3	52	378,871
Floyd		4	96	835,288
Franklin		2	132	1,123,096
Fremont		4	159	1,428,704
Greene		3	48	375,753
Grundy		2	45	329,265
Guthrie		2	43	339,186
Hamilton		5	48	336,578
Hancock		2	81	592,454
Hardin		3	90	694,198
Harrison		4	173	1,332,382
Henry		2	29	206,235
Howard		3	41	315,754
Humboldt		6	34	246,400
Ida		2	77	626,990
Iowa	5		65	644,653
Jackson		6	37	262,481
Jasper		5	63	467,046
Jefferson		5	28	192,593
Johnson		5	71	534,661
Jones		4	68	480,003
Keokuk	9		46	364,494
Kossuth		6	99	688,266
Lee		6	29	251,771
Linn		9	75	579,508
Louisia	17		49	393,088
Lucas		11	12	82,859
Lyon		2	57	387,099
Madison		3	43	330,996
Mahaska	15		35	232,807
Marion		8	25	167,008
Marshall		4	81	550,012
Mitchell		2	71	531,590
Monona		5	134	1,237,102
Mills		5	142	1,281,259
Monroe	16		11	77,545
Montgomery		2	52	379,752
Muscatine	18		57	426,986
O'Brien		2	47	325,993
Osceola		2	43	279,650
Page		4	58	392,832
Palo Alto	10		65	502,180
Plymouth		2	124	857,092
Pocahontas		4	47	350,850
Polk		28	46	330,095
Pottawattamie	10		125	973,213
Poweshiek		2	75	516,719
Ringgold		4	17	116,838
Sac		3	51	398,330
Scott		20	46	349,711
Shelby		1	109	776,379
Sioux		3	111	793,753
Story		7	80	584,257
Tama		3	73	535,593
Taylor		3	25	196,095
Union		5	18	132,931
Van Buren		3	17	123,222
Wapello	14		15	116,892
Warren		5	29	184,210
Washington		2	62	485,494
Wayne		4	11	70,016
Webster	25		57	427,901
Winnebago		3	104	770,792
Winnesiek	9		11	67,193
Woodbury		18	187	1,524,116
Worth		3	86	689,123
Wright		4	66	470,141

KANSAS

Atchison	7	13	95,658
Bourbon	2	17	145,151
Cherokee	8	19	138,278
Clark	5	53	432,199
Crawford	5	14	99,484
Elk	4	3	18,526
Ford	7	183	1,422,771
Grant	18	165	1,698,475
Greenwood	5	2	12,135
Hamilton	11	169	1,695,852
Harper	4	159	1,120,546
Hodgeman	3	122	935,388
Kearny	9	156	1,642,796
Kingman	1	83	605,700
Labette	4	13	107,130
Leavenworth	4	23	151,900

KANSAS—Con.

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
Meade	3		138	\$1,226,065
Sedgwick	25		103	760,224
Shawnee	16		20	164,495
Sherman	15		188	2,040,276
Wilson		3	19	142,426
Wyandotte	39		1	10,684
KENTUCKY				
Adair		8	1	6,459
Allen		4	2	14,908
Anderson	4			None
Ballard	8		11	106,838
Barren	13		2	11,686
Bath		19	1	5,423
Bell		34		None
Boone	6		2	11,204
Boyd	27			None
Boyle	13		1	7,153
Bracken	13		1	1,860
Breathitt		48		None
Breckinridge	18		6	54,154
Bullitt	12			None
Butler		10	3	29,577
Caldwell	17		5	35,828
Calloway	8		2	11,816
Campbell		12		None
Carlisle	16		13	94,456
Carroll	12		2	13,712
Cartter		17		None
Casey		13	1	9,056
Christian	14		34	256,221
Clark		9		None
Clay		43		None
Clinton		23		None
Crittenden	12		7	58,263
Cumberland		18	1	10,212
Daviess	20		26	217,873
Edmonson	25			None
Elliott		30		None
Estill		26	2	11,574
Fayette	9			None
Fleming	16			None
Floyd		24		None
Franklin	19			None
Fulton	40		29	296,725
Gallatin	18			None
Garrard	11		2	14,372
Grant		6		None
Graves	9		10	82,002
Grayson	13		4	29,391
Green	13			None
Greenup	20		2	15,

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
KENTUCKY—Continued				
Owen	15			None
Owsley		42		None
Pendleton	14			None
Perry		38		None
Pike		14		None
Powell		31	1	\$6,328
Pulaski		12	2	12,657
Robertson	12			None
Rockcastle		29	1	5,530
Rowan		16	1	5,341
Russell		13		None
Scott	11		1	5,090
Shelby		3	1	6,775
Simpson		5	5	33,730
Spencer	10		2	22,148
Taylor	10		3	23,747
Todd		5	17	120,016
Trigg	21		6	96,250
Trimble	10		1	6,122
Union	13		30	268,355
Warren	9		4	23,588
Washington	16		1	6,272
Wayne		20		None
Webster	18		20	166,066
Whitley		23		None
Wolfe		33		None
Woodford	18			None

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
LOUISIANA				
Acadia	18	17		146,737
Allen		16	1	8,593
Ascension	46			None
Assumption		25		None
Avoyelles		31	45	434,088
Beauregard		8		None
Bienville	44		2	20,820
Caddo		6	84	1,929,557
Calcasieu		19		None
Caldwell		15	30	390,316
Cameron		6	None	None
Catahoula	48		24	416,594
Claiborne	45		1	12,037
Concordia		20	34	452,165
De Soto		8	3	62,504
East Baton Rouge		9	1	6,629
East Carroll		26	126	2,186,641
East Feliciana	61			None
Evangeline		41	21	171,875
Franklin		29	143	1,361,479
Grant	45		15	197,611
Iberia		8		None
Iberville		25		None
Jefferson Davis		11		None
Lafayette		18	14	126,574
La Salle	28		1	5,325
Livingston	71			None
Madison		22	86	1,155,103
Morehouse		22	131	2,011,824
Natchitoches		18	52	947,654
Orleans		6		None
Pointe Coupee		26	17	173,534
Rapides		12	90	1,071,083
Red River		26	32	516,186
Richland		25	160	1,803,840
Sabine	45			None
St. Bernard	53			None
St. Charles	36			None
St. Helena		14		None
St. James		13		None
St. John the Baptist		18		None
St. Landry		29	59	706,665
St. Martin		25	5	67,992
St. Mary	37			None
Tangipahoa	53			None
Tensas		18		None
Union		13	92	1,245,024
Vermilion		7	1	26,152
Vernon		13	1	11,462
Washington	45			None
West Baton Rouge	61			17,945
West Carroll		21	52	405,010
West Feliciana	68		1	50,725
Winn		10		None

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
MAINE				
Androscoggin		19		None
Aroostook	35			None
Cumberland	18			None
Franklin	4			None
Hancock	14			None
Kennebec	18			None
Knox	27			None
Lincoln	7			None
Oxford	10			None
Penobscot	14			None

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
MAINE—Con.				
Piscataquis		21		None
Sagadahoc		24		None
Somerset		2		None
Waldo		7		None
Washington		10		None
York		11		None
MARYLAND				
Allegany		8		None
Anne Arundel		12		None
Baltimore		5	1	\$12,918
Caroline		8	5	33,417
Carroll		4	1	7,917
Charles		31		None
Dorchester		3	10	75,490
Frederick		3	1	6,301
Garrett		9		None
Harford	10			None
Kent		4	28	230,711
Montgomery		9	5	59,334
Prince Georges		15		None
Queen Annes		4	19	149,527
St. Marys		10		None
Somerset		3	2	11,535
Talbot		3	14	111,483
Wicomico		7	3	35,073
Worcester		1	8	54,253

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
MASSACHUSETTS				
Bristol				None
Essex				None
Franklin				None
Hampshire			2	13,764
Middlesex				None
Norfolk				None
Plymouth				None
Suffolk				None
Worcester				None

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
MICHIGAN				
Alcona	24			None
Alger		19		None
Allegan		12	4	26,453
Alpena	25			None
Antrim	24			None
Arenac	21		1	6,865
Baraga	39			None
Barry		10	18	124,789
Bay	29		3	19,783
Benzie	29			None
Berrien		14	12	99,978
Branch	15		35	249,888
Calhoun	37		29	201,510
Cass	17		28	271,023
Charlevoix	16			None
Cheboygan	26			None
Chippewa	30		1	9,683
Clare		15		None
Clinton		7	14	100,677
Crawford		19		None
Delta	27			None
Dickinson	29			None
Eaton		6	23	170,455
Emmet	15			None
Genesee		19	15	129,802
Gladwin	20		2	26,607
Gogebic		13		None
Grand Traverse		16		None
Gratiot		10	23	151,482
Hillsdale		6	16	112,522
Houghton		24		None
Huron		4	15	90,615
Ingham		16	20	181,874
Ionia	12		32	232,435
Iosco	21			None
Iron		13		None
Isabella		11	3	26,575
Jackson		15	13	88,044
Kalamazoo		9	26	189,460
Kalkaska		52	1	8,123
Kent		29	3	15,834
Keweenaw		47		None
Lake	35			None
Lapeer		9	6	32,075
Leelanau		10	1	6,138
Lenawee		16	133	1,111,786
Livingston		16	5	32,051
Luce		31		None
Mackinac		13		None
Macomb		11	3	19,933
Manistee	25		1	6,262
Marquette	16			None
Mason	20		1	7,807
Mecosta	11		3	19,512
Menominee	16			None
Missaukee	32			None

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
MICHIGAN—Continued				
Monroe		7	66	\$539,069
Montcalm	15		8	45,891
Montmorency	22			None
Muskegon		25	3	25,468
Newaygo	23			None
Oakland		9	6	41,691
Oceana	22			None
Ogemaw		17		None
Ontonagon		10		None
Osceola	20			None
Oscoda	43			None
Otsego	11		5	30,337
Ottawa	16			None
Presque Isle	19			None
Roscommon	29			None
Saginaw		28	24	190,628
St. Clair		14	11	75,339
St. Joseph		6	50	399,617
Sanilac	5		5	34,017
Schoolcraft	32			None
Shiawassee	21		15	109,676
Tuscola	15		9	122,035
Van Buren		7	17	103,570
Washtenaw		4	23	166,102
Wayne	13		8	91,444
Wexford	26		1	5,673

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		Number of payees	1968 farm payments over \$5,000
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps		
MINNESOTA				
Aitkin		8		None
Anoka		25	5	30,389
Becker		13	5	35,954
Beltrami		17		None
Benton		8	4	21,864
Big Stone		9	26	217,591
Blue Earth		8	90	640,717
Carlton		24		None
Carver		5	5	42,506
Cass		12	2	12,062
Chippewa		3	28	192,879
Chisago		8		None
Clearwater		25		None
Cook		34		None
Cottonwood		5	77	503,751
Crow Wing		13	1	7,378
Dakota		12	39	308,103
Douglas		12	2	12,733
Faribault		10		83
Grant		11		16
Hennepin		15	8	56,329
Hubbard		15	2	10,540
Isanti		8		None
Itasca		18		None
Jackson		4	89	656,818
Kanabec		7		None
Kandiyohi		8	74	525,307
Kittson		6	56	469,018
Koochiching		22		None
Lac qui Parle		3	39	266,686
Lake		8		None
Lake of the Woods		13		None
Le Sueur		5	45	354,419
Lincoln		8	25	184,608
Lyon		12	76	522,405
Mahnomen		24	3	23,205
Marshall		7	47	379,406
Meeker		7	31	220,548
Mille Lacs		10		None
Morrison		57	2	19,609
Mower		56	88	672,648
Murray		31	31	221,366
Nicollet		40	53	403,377
Nobles		16	36	263,048
Otter Tail		16	4	21,656
West Otter Tail		9	55	55,253
Pennington		28	3	22,510
Pine		36		None
Pipestone		17	15	112,118
Polk		27	2	85,972
Pope		20	13	11,813
Ramsey		26		None
Red Lake		9	3	17,740
Redwood		4	68	448,555
Renville		5	92	966,870
Rock		4	34	241,727
Roseau		5	2	10,735
St. Louis		21		None
Scott		10	9	64,314
Sherburne		11	3	17,458
Sibley		5	46	353,379
Stearns		9	8	55,234
Stevens		7	31	200,488
Swift		7	60	461,133
Todd		13	2	12,341
Traverse		10	26	213,606
Wadena		7		None
Waseca		9	66	469,192

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
MINNESOTA—Continued				
Washington	12	17		\$119,507
Wright	6	18		124,271
Yellow Medicine	4	78		534,350
MISSISSIPPI				
Adams	35	4	4	52,825
Alcorn	19	24	24	190,986
Amite	51	2	2	16,809
Attala	26	37	44	435,798
Benton	64	40	40	319,385
Bolivar	48	349	7,079	7,079,077
Calhoun	32	44	44	405,834
Carroll	54	55	55	690,606
Chickasaw	21	34	34	495,749
Choctaw	43	5	5	47,450
Claiborne	31	9	9	139,000
Clarke	52	3	3	22,815
Clay	40	22	22	288,575
Coahoma	49	229	6,442	6,442,521
Copiah	41	13	13	183,562
Covington	25	11	11	168,484
De Soto	50	74	1,550	320,000
Forrest	18	1	1	5,782
Franklin	34			None
George	51			None
Greene	53			None
Grenada	22	50	50	550,468
Hancock	20	1	1	5,000
Harrison	12			None
Hinds	24	43	43	739,527
Holmes	48	107	2,169	494,000
Humphreys	40	155	3,233	169,000
Issaquena	61	38	38	703,015
Itawamba	9	11	11	98,452
Jackson	14			None
Jasper	31	2	2	14,602
Jefferson	73	3	3	20,154
Jefferson Davis	31	10	10	101,037
Jones	27	12	12	97,234
Kemper	44	10	10	71,850
Lafayette	31	32	32	408,143
Lamar	19			None
Lauderdale	32	5	5	42,704
Lawrence	48	3	3	20,217
Leake	60	38	38	331,854
Lee	17	56	56	527,541
Leflore	43	209	5,192	999,000
Lincoln	18	1	1	25,911
Lowndes	19	40	40	476,333
Madison	30	80	1,232	718,000
Marion	15	5	5	43,883
Marshall	73	106	1,452	102,000
Monroe	20	74	859	606,000
Montgomery	25	23	197	72,000
Neshoba	23	4	4	26,515
Newton	26	2	2	11,641
Noxubee	75	22	22	488,741
Oktibbeha	21	5	5	41,280
Panola	31	132	1,940	417,000
Pearl River	22			None
Perry	31	1	1	11,848
Pike	19			None
Pontotoc	23	35	35	268,042
Prentiss	14	29	29	247,512
Quitman	36	192	3,198	77,000
Rankin	54	25	372	231,000
Scott	24	21	21	170,977
Sharkey	89	83	2,246	672,000
Simpson	14	8	8	59,598
Smith	31	7	7	68,880
Stone	30			None
Sunflower	35	373	7,455	579,000
Tallahatchie	44	189	4,000	711,000
Tate	50	83	1,057	994,000
Tipah	29	36	303	806,000
Tishomingo	18	8	76	123,000
Tunica	53	109	3,102	665,000
Union	16	37	388	929,000
Walthall	57	2	14	1,062,000
Warren	15	18	374	492,000
Washington	29	238	6,536	673,000
Wayne	43	8	66	308,000
Webster	25	21	220	998,000
Wilkinson	66	2	32	369,000
Winston	40	17	132	526,000
Yalobusha	24	46	670	582,000
Yazoo	40	151	2,885	973,000
MISSOURI				
Benton	14	12	12	78,038
Bollinger	27	2	2	13,542
Buchanan	19	31	31	271,348
Butler	35	25	25	175,516
Caldwell	1	15	15	100,162
Cape Girardeau	18	12	12	89,387
Carter	49			None
Christian	17			None

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
MISSOURI—Continued				
Clay	10	31		\$268,971
Dade	13	16		105,400
Dallas	24			None
Davies	11	32		242,329
De Kalb	1	19		134,421
Dent	25	1		6,705
Douglas	21			None
Dunklin	34	263		2,193,375
Gentry	1	32		235,660
Greene	23	4		25,966
Harrison	10	19		152,334
Hickory	18	3		19,118
Howell	21			None
Iron	43			None
Jackson	17	45		483,013
Jefferson	17	3		28,378
Lewis	13	39		352,349
Linn	17	17		148,410
Livingston	16	37		342,334
Madison	14			None
Marion	26			None
Marion	16			None
Marion	12	17		126,453
Mercer	10	10		106,612
Mississippi	54	220		2,839,454
New Madrid	44	332		3,500,583
Nodaway	1	67		552,226
Oregon	27			None
Osage	13	4		24,682
Ozark	23			None
Pemiscot	52	331		3,459,623
Perry	1	7		138,105
Pike	15	35		289,326
Polk	27			None
Putnam	14	14		98,811
Ralls	11	30		220,086
Reynolds	70			None
Ripley	38	2		14,828
St. Charles	45	30		240,634
St. Clair	12	17		115,665
St. Francois	31			None
St. Louis	20	20		165,960
Schuyler	1	8		52,260
Scott	42	111		1,134,696
Shannon	36			None
Shelby	19	25		213,194
Stoddard	37	180		1,761,093
Stone	21			None
Sullivan	11	18		136,316
Texas	23			None
Washington	44			None
Wayne	43	2		13,996
Webster	17			None
Worth	9	14		98,688
Wright	22			None
MONTANA				
Cascade	27	140		1,385,068
Deer Lodge	18	1		10,391
Flathead	30	13		110,219
Glacier	8	64		544,017
Lewis and Clark	8	10		115,090
Lincoln	38			None
Roosevelt	65	223		1,970,893
Silver Bow	22			None
Valley	12	197		1,602,692
Wibaux	17	39		293,685
NEBRASKA				
Antelope	3	59		446,241
Boone	4	98		784,535
Boyd	6	8		53,811
Box Butte	4	65		539,094
Buffalo	4	126		1,073,077
Butler	2	32		215,943
Cedar	4			None
Clay	3	221		1,775,383
Cuming	3	39		347,644
Custer	3	160		1,255,646
Dakota	8	33		319,345
Dawson	4	152		1,318,820
Deuel	3	53		477,308
Dixon	5	50		376,360
Dodge	5	58		508,619
Douglas	23	38		348,596
Franklin	2	95		752,152
Gage	3	97		723,686
Garfield	4	1		5,343
Gosper	3	59		423,073
Greeley	9	52		456,396
Hall	5	130		1,029,115
Harlan	6	88		685,236
Holt	2	22		230,771
Howard	3	46		336,419

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
NEBRASKA—Continued				
Johnson		1	33	\$226,426
Kearney		3	140	1,074,919
Keith		5	74	679,512
Knox	13		23	150,717
Lancaster		6	157	1,214,094
Madison		1	77	598,800
Merrick		3	135	1,118,448
Morrill		4	19	131,627
Nance		1	73	611,042
Nemaha		3	53	452,298
Phelps		4	115	883,150
Pierce		1	26	167,949
Pawnee		3	40	282,844
Rock		6		None
Sarpy		9	22	157,753
Saunder		3	112	862,143
Scotts Bluff		10	11	83,416
Sheridan		7	30	246,235
Sherman		2	34	236,870
Stanton		3	32	246,767
Thayer		2	178	1,372,232
Thurston	48		71	544,040
Valley		3	67	543,420
Washington		2	57	454,656
Wheeler		3	1	6,533
York		2	141	1,142,685
NEVADA				
Churchill	21			None
Clark	13		1	100,000
Elko	20		5	32,206
Eureka	16			None
Humboldt	51		12	118,556
Lincoln	15			None
Lyon	29			None
Mineral	34		1	7,559
Ormsby	9			None
Pershing	27		3	90,790
Washoe	18			None
White Pine	28		1	5,260
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
Belknap	18			None
Carroll	14			None
Cheshire	19			None
Coos	23			None
Grafton	7			None
Hillsborough	11			None
Merrimack	15			None
Rockingham	5			None
Strafford	8			None
Sullivan	12			None
NEW JERSEY				
Atlantic		20		None
Bergen		6		None
Burlington			3	97,003
Mount Holly (city)	(1)			
Mount Laurel (city)	(1)			
North Hanover (city)	(1)			
Camden		18		None
Cape May		15	1	7,185
Cumberland		21		None</

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
NEW MEXICO—Continued				
Chaves	18		159	\$1,937,407
Colfax	19		7	66,042
Curry	19		563	8,416,516
De Baca	11		12	88,736
Dona Ana	34		164	1,689,112
Eddy		25	106	1,246,558
Grant	25		4	31,480
Guadalupe		41	2	14,405
Harding		12	11	101,702
Hidalgo	34		34	438,096
Lea		13	123	1,523,452
Lijcoln		10	3	22,215
Luna	41		85	908,758
McKinley	47		1	5,280
Mora		44		None
Otero		18	12	104,721
Quay		21	193	2,038,622
Rio Arriba		60	2	None
Roosevelt		20	257	2,563,625
Sandoval		49		None
San Juan	50			None
San Miguel		50	3	32,986
Santa Fe		47	3	30,936
Sierra	23		8	72,842
Socorro	56		13	127,198
Taos		4	3	21,395
Torrance		32	7	45,187
Union		8	43	392,537
Valencia	47			None

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
NEW YORK				
Albany	13			None
Allegany	22			None
Broome	22			None
Binghamton (City)	46			None
Union (City)	(1)			None
Cattaraugus		12	1	5,012
Cayuga	28		8	59,697
Auburn (City)	29			None
Chautauqua	(1)		2	14,927
Jamestown (City)		(1)		None
Chemung	32		1	5,219
Clinton		14		None
Columbia	19		1	5,041
Cortland	27			None
Delaware	25			None
Erie		20	1	8,957
Essex	30			None
Franklin	44			None
Fulton	38			None
Genesee	28		9	80,017
Greene	13			None
Hamilton	31			None
Herkimer	18			None
Jefferson	28			None
Lewis	50			None
Livingston	19		17	146,758
Madison	30		2	13,934
Monroe	25		15	124,330
Montgomery	22		1	5,278
Nassau	20			None
New York City	27			None
Niagara		24	12	87,289
Oneida	27		1	6,478
Onondaga	39		3	30,958
Orleans	30		14	131,848
Oswego	40			None
Oswego (City)	(1)			None
Rensselaer	32			None
St. Lawrence	39			None
Saratoga	14			None
Schenectady	11			None
Schoharie	29		2	27,643
Schuyler	30			None
Seneca	24		11	77,545
Steuben	33		2	13,426
Suffolk	29			None
Tioga	34			None
Tompkins	20		3	33,936
Ulster	12		2	12,587
Warren	27			None
Washington	33			None
Wayne		8		None
Westchester	18			None
Wyoming		5	2	10,404
Yates	25		3	24,188

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
NORTH CAROLINA—Continued				
Avery	23			None
Beaufort	11		25	\$234,236
Bertie		32	13	131,208
Bladen		29	6	34,216
Brunswick		12	1	14,438
Buncombe	12			None
Burke	5		1	9,586
Cabarrus		4	4	28,424
Caldwell	6			None
Camden	30		17	170,963
Carteret	11			None
Caswell	16		1	9,878
Catawba		4	1	6,126
Chatham		6		None
Cherokee	13		1	6,389
Chowan		11	6	35,528
Clay	17			None
Cleveland		5	52	546,625
Columbus	23		7	54,253
Craven	18		2	10,160
Cumberland	17		26	225,547
Currituck	24		14	122,815
Dare		8		None
Davidson	6			None
Davie		5		None
Duplin	14		15	102,607
Durham		14	1	7,177
Edgecombe	31		62	650,991
Forsyth		7		None
Franklin		17	7	41,826
Gaston	11		1	7,915
Gates	19		6	42,071
Graham	17			None
Granville		9		None
Greene		26	3	21,038
Guilford	14		1	5,117
Halifax		24	128	1,261,506
Harnett		4	23	179,438
Haywood	20			None
Henderson	8			None
Hertford	38		9	64,953
Hoke	34		41	517,202
Hyde	46		7	61,374
Jackson	15			None
Johnston	12		8	64,383
Jones	40		7	45,979
Lee		15		None
Lenoir	17		15	157,612
McDowell		7		None
Macon	10			None
Madison	23			None
Martin		25	12	86,128
Mecklenburg	20		6	39,530
Mitchell	30			None
Montgomery	13		8	138,932
Moore		7	3	20,509
Nash		18	26	194,484
New Hanover		8	1	5,659
Northampton		19	106	1,045,900
Onslow	11		4	29,798
Orange		6	1	6,248
Pamlico	15		7	51,970
Pasquotank	17		16	128,377
Pender	15			None
Perquimans	23		13	110,826
Parson		13		None
Pitt	37		25	239,284
Richmond		4	13	143,747
Robeson	17		98	1,788,040
Rockingham		3		None
Rowan	7		5	44,380
Rutherford	7		6	38,887
Sampson	15		29	195,661
Scotland		18	52	968,812
Stokes	9			None
Surry		5	1	7,311
Swain	22			None
Transylvania	10			None
Tyrrell	40		9	58,831
Union		6	26	251,943
Vanze	28		2	11,330
Wake	18		1	18,229
Warren		29	2	11,565
Washington	39		11	134,435
Watauga	15			None
Wayne	22		14	103,826
Wilkes	11			None
Wilson	21		6	36,604
Yadkin	6			None
Yancey	18			None

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
NORTH DAKOTA				
Barnes		13	88	604,462
Benson		21	115	836,446
Billings		5	20	129,349
Bottineau		5	230	1,804,592

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
NORTH DAKOTA—Con.				
Burke			5	\$622,872
Burleigh		24		50
Cass		14		114
Cavalier		18		105
Dickey		12		29
Divide		7		144
Dunn		5		77
Emmons		25		34
Foster		9		48
Golden Valley		(?)		70
Grand Forks		18		98
Grant		5		66
Griggs		7		25
Hettinger		7		211
Kidder		4		42
La Moure		11		68
Logan		7		13
McHenry		10		93
McIntosh		7		10
McLean		5		203
Mercer		6		61
Morton		12		66
Mountrail		12		152
Nelson		3		56
Oliver		7		20
Pembina		11		101
Pierce		9		71
Ramsey		4		162
Ransom		5		38
Richland		7		69
Rolette		15		71
Sargent		10		43
Sheridan		8		34
Sioux		3		26
Stark		13		102
Steele		4		22
Towner		9		870,108
Traill		9		30
Walsh		16		93
Ward		21		186
Williams		13		184
OHIO				
Adams		21	2	14,347
Allen		10	2	12,562
Ashland		2	3	18,319
Ashtabula		10	3	18,485
Athens		12	1	5,012
Belmont		7		None
Brown		14	9	26,901
Butler		9	27	212,251
Carroll		4		None
Champaign		4	49	449,539
Clark		9	62	578,097
Clermont		23	5	30,703
Clinton		19	39	309,964
Columbiana		10	1	5,683
Coshocton		3	19	166,789
Crawford		5	26	191,198
Cuyahoga		36	1	5,299
Darke		7	12	78,919
Erie		8	15	127,524
Fayette		17	66	500,973
Franklin		22	23	218,494
Fulton		2	36	288,447
Geauga		8		None
Guernsey		6	2	11,466
Hamilton		21	14	110,531
Hardin		3	50	357,842
Harrison		4	1	5,192
Highland		17	15	95,434
Hocking		8	4	25,599
Holmes		2	5	44,510
Huron		6	25	174,726
Jackson		41	1	7,211
Jefferson		21		None
Knox		5	11	83,330

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
OHIO—Con.				
Portage		8		None
Preble	7		44	\$316,501
Richland	6		13	111,755
Ross	13		66	527,505
Sandusky	6		29	246,604
Scioto	19		6	44,574
Shelby	4		10	74,759
Stark		11	4	25,106
Summit		17	1	5,478
Trumbull		15	2	13,699
Tuscarawas		7	7	54,889
Union	7		22	163,470
Van Wert		4	10	85,418
Vinton		9		None
Warren	9		11	84,757
Washington		5		None
Wayne		4	17	126,364
Wood		8	35	259,531
Wyandot		7	38	383,273

OKLAHOMA				
Adair	71			None
Alfalfa	11		153	1,061,094
Atoka	34			None
Beckham	28		100	790,416
Blaine	20		105	778,367
Bryan	20		27	233,964
Caddo	37		171	1,323,464
Canadian	12		106	843,369
Carter	33		1	7,161
Cherokee	37			None
Choctaw	41			None
Cimarron	19		179	1,678,167
Cleveland	20		3	23,353
Coal	43			None
Comanche	16		29	211,668
Cotton	20		101	814,601
Craig	18		4	26,338
Creek	32			None
Custer	22		171	1,451,470
Delaware	45		1	5,319
Dewey	14		61	469,341
Ellis	11		44	304,458
Garfield	17		124	963,245
Garvin	30		8	65,363
Grady	30		55	457,772
Grant	9		172	1,284,275
Greer	26		98	788,847
Harper	16		60	421,454
Haskell	48		4	60,352
Hughes	36		2	15,776
Jackson	30		247	2,494,234
Jefferson	27		13	88,198
Johnston	43		2	14,561
Kay	24		148	1,077,319
Kingfisher	13		80	582,079
Kiowa	26		212	1,735,366
Latimer	52			None
Le Flore	45			None
Lincoln	22		1	6,574
Logan	27		28	190,055
Love	33		3	18,009
McClain	20		52	365,611
McCurtain	53		20	229,936
McIntosh	45		5	44,745
Marshall	38		1	7,590
Mayes	30		1	6,068
Murray	30			None
Muskogee	42		34	352,257
Noble	18		68	533,220
Nowata	32		2	11,022
Okfuskee	40		6	42,860
Oklahoma	37		4	23,910
Okmulgee	40		9	75,438
Osage	21		16	127,272
Ottawa	24		19	138,492
Pawnee	23		8	56,859
Payne	17		6	44,533
Pittsburg	26		1	5,258
Pontotoc	25			None
Pottawatomie	26		4	30,553
Pushmataha	36		1	5,125
Roger Mills	12		43	313,612
Rogers	23			None
Seminole	40			None
Sequoyah	65		4	70,722
Stephens	23		12	81,084
Texas	24		283	2,649,874
Tillman	41		290	2,518,194
Tula	25		2	22,206
Wagoner	36		16	165,239
Washington	19			None
Washita	11		222	1,582,140
Woodward	12		60	420,440

OREGON				
Baker	26		12	98,363
Benton	19		9	88,282

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
OREGON—Con.				
Clackamas	38		2	\$12,233
Clatsop	22			None
Columbia	47			None
Coos	57			None
Crook	40		3	19,024
Curry	56			None
Deachutes	31			None
Douglas	48			None
Gilliam	4		115	1,237,743
Grant	37			None
Harney	25		2	12,746
Hood River	50			None
Jackson	24			None
Jefferson	49		33	288,338
Josephine	48		1	5,877
Klamath	27		12	95,476
Lake	37		14	130,913
Lane	56			None
Lincoln	34			None
Linn	45			None
Maiheur	32		8	58,502
Marion	39		13	93,695
Morrow	19		131	1,448,472
Multnomah		15	1	5,041
Polk	36		8	84,709
Sherman	16		132	1,264,254
Umatilla	30		236	3,005,316
Union	17		50	404,601
Wallowa	24		24	203,680
Wasco	31		83	754,008
Washington	24		14	107,888
Wheeler	10		5	42,357
Yamhill	28		8	54,498

PENNSYLVANIA				
Allegheny		23	1	None
Armstrong		13	1	9,299
Beaver		17		None
Bedford		16		None
Berks		8	5	38,600
Blair		9		None
Bradford		19	2	22,451
Bucks		17	6	50,852
Butler		11		None
Cambria		13		None
Cameron		15		None
Carbon		9		None
Centre		10	3	17,605
Chester		5	2	25,677
Clarion		22		None
Clearfield		15		None
Clinton		10	1	3,602
Columbia		5	5	38,501
Crawford		8		None
Cumberland		7	7	62,510
Dauphin		9	5	67,005
Delaware		20		None
Elk		7		None
Erie		10	2	18,067
Fayette		27		None
Forest		10		None
Franklin		13	5	44,957
Fulton		23		None
Greene		24		None
Huntingdon		14		None
Indiana		13		None
Jefferson		11		None
Juniata		7	1	5,606
Lackawanna		14		None
Lancaster		4	1	5,756
Lawrence		25		None
Lebanon		6	2	17,441
Lehigh		5	8	137,130
Luzerne		9		None
Lycoming		7	6	43,416
McKean		19		None
Mercer		9		None
Mifflin		10		None
Monroe		11	1	5,536
Montgomery		6	5	29,839
Montour		2	1	9,366
Northampton		11	15	238,499
Northumberland		8	2	12,031
Perry		8	1	5,782
Philadelphia		18		None
Potter		18	1	5,000
Schuykill		14		6,897
Snyder		9	1	5,721
Somerset		13		None
Sullivan		9		None
Susquehanna		9		None
Tioga		24		None
Union		16		None
Venango		16		None
Warren		11		None
Washington		16		None
Wayne		4		None
Westmoreland		12	2	11,586
Wyoming		6		None
York		14	7	45,784

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
RHODE ISLAND (none)				
SOUTH CAROLINA				
Abbeville			4	\$89,023
Aiken			8	60,833,978
Allendale			24	52,851,779
Anderson			3	44,429,283
Bamberg			18	42,553,179
Barnwell			18	61,633,132
Beaufort			20	3,22,359
Berkeley			24	9,115,844
Calhoun			19	70,814,414
Charleston			9	1,15,535
Cherokee			6	22,179,418
Chester			6	12,127,495
Chesterfield			13	52,659,598
Clarendon			31	114,1,481,620
Colleton			16	27,287,654
Darlington			17	111,1,104,093
Dillon			40	60,720,777
Dorchester			19	21,159,646
Edgefield			13	34,393,552
Fairfield			8	4,31,440
Florence			26	51,518,385
Georgetown			36	None
Greenville			7	9,71,465
Greenwood			3	6,71,753
Hampton			17	41,499,013
Horry			16	3,35,918
Jasper			16	6,45,205
Kershaw			11	38,353,894
Lancaster			7	14,128,908
Laurens			6	25,254,867
Lee			40	143,2,045,398
Lexington			5	28,256,435
McCormick			31	4,30,940
Marion			18	21,262,876
Marlboro			31	132,2,189,081
Newberry			7	6,44,404
Oconee			18	196,2,252,284
Orangeburg			5	2,10,941
Pickens			4	21,262,281
Richland			11	30,316,912
Saluda			5	19,202,145
Spartanburg			16	106,1,538,444
Sumter			5	3,24,576
Union			40	56,519,782
Williamsburg			14	20,217,204
York				

SOUTH DAKOTA				
Beadle			6	74,597,933
Bennett			3	45,350,169
Bon Homme			6	20,123,228
Brookings			8	19,123,945
Brown			7	175,1,322,300
Brule			13	22,172,180
Buffalo			10	8,62,764
Campbell			18	42,281,452</

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commod-ity distri-bution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
SOUTH DAKOTA—Con.				
Walworth	23		48	\$340,746
Ziebach		32	27	218,636
TENNESSEE				
Anderson		25		None
Bedford		3	3	26,206
Benton	16		2	12,590
Bledsoe		26	3	16,663
Blount		10		None
Bradley		8		None
Campbell		27		None
Cannon		12		None
Carroll	12		28	220,976
Carter		18		None
Cheatham	20		1	5,803
Chester		6	19	151,579
Claiborne		18		None
Clay		16		None
Coke		10	1	5,059
Coffee		8		5,507
Crockett		14	109	958,158
Cumberland		14		None
Davidson		4		None
Decatur	13		2	28,498
DeKalb		8	2	11,888
Dickson		6		None
Dyer	13		79	727,410
Fayette	39		143	1,759,574
Fentress	20		1	5,246
Franklin	10		8	138,740
Gibson	19		97	811,346
Giles		6	12	115,495
Grainger		14		None
Greene	5		2	11,090
Grundy		17		None
Hamblen	12			None
Hamilton		8		None
Hancock		23		None
Hardeman	51		75	796,758
Hardin		15	17	144,926
Hawkins		10	2	13,228
Haywood	41		142	1,358,543
Henderson	12		26	169,824
Henry	4		7	49,298
Hickman	14		2	11,166
Houston	13			None
Humphreys	12		9	61,924
Jackson	13			None
Jefferson	17		1	8,529
Johnson		11		None
Knox		9		None
Lake	31		81	1,130,853
Lauderdale	29		120	1,195,762
Lawrence	7		17	129,007
Lewis		9		None
Lincoln		7	16	156,213
Loudon	9		2	18,240
McMinn	7			None
McNairy	13		26	205,382
Macon		6		None
Madison	10		80	753,251
Marion		26	3	21,281
Marshall	11			None
Maury		5	7	57,444
Meigs	12		1	9,181
Monroe		9		None
Montgomery	6		13	98,454
Moore		6		None
Morgan	32			None
Obion	4		26	219,033
Overton	14		2	12,877
Perry	12		3	22,283
Pickett	14			None
Polk	8			None
Putnam	9		1	8,822
Rhea	17			None
Roane	17			None
Robertson	13		11	79,861
Rutherford		5	7	92,918
Scott	39			None
Sequatchie	23		1	7,137
Sevier	6		1	5,253
Shelby	8		105	1,349,588
Smith		7		None
Stewart	21			None
Sullivan	11		2	18,124
Sumner	9			None
Tipton	28		149	1,587,037
Trousdale	8			None
Unicoi	17			None
Union	24			None
Van Buren	11			None
Warren		6	2	10,603
Washington	8		1	5,901
Wayne	10		6	54,454
Weakley	5		8	59,564
White	1		1	5,722
Wilson	6		1	9,483

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commod-ity distri-bution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
TEXAS				
Anderson			6	2
Angelina			42	
Atascosa			12	26
Austin			8	15
Bastrop			18	14
Bee			4	33
Bexar				7
Brewster				12
Brooks			61	3
Brown			11	4
Burleson			28	73
Caldwell			16	40
Callahan			9	14
Cameron			14	402
Camp			24	
Carson			3	199
Cass			18	1
Cherokee			11	1
Childress			7	1
Cochran			18	291
Coke			8	5
Comanche			10	2
Cooke			11	10
Cottle			24	121
Crosby			6	548
Culberson				15
Dallam			2	239
Dallas			12	47
Dawson			15	558
Delta			16	63
De Witt			16	10
Dickens			19	129
Dimmit			30	4
Duval			51	
Eastland			11	3
El Paso				13
Falls			17	105
Fannin			21	83
Fayette			9	11
Fisher			10	269
Floyd			10	695
Foard			12	35
Franklin			15	
Freestone			19	4
Frio			32	53
Galveston			10	
Goliad			34	10
Gonzales			20	8
Grimes			25	11
Grayson				54
Denison (city)	(1)			
Guadalupe			8	47
Hale			13	1,059
Hamilton			5	2
Hardeman			13	87
Hardin			19	
Harris			10	11
Haskell			14	250
Hays			19	13
Hemphill			7	33
Henderson			8	2
Hidalgo			17	466
Hill			13	164
Hockley			10	728
Houston			20	34
Howard			9	197
Hudspeth				17
Hutchinson			23	85
Irion			22	
Jackson			8	59
Jasper			20	
Jeff Davis				16
Jefferson			11	
Jim Hogg			58	
Jim Wells			25	46
Jones			18	273
Karnes			41	30
Kent			18	36
Kinney			55	
Kleberg			21	22
Knox			15	12
Lamb			8	966
La Salle			45	19
Lavaca			11	3
Lee			19	
Leon			27	3
Liberty			12	20
Limestone			19	44
Lipscomb			3	83
Live Oak			41	68
Lubbock			6	1,031
McLennan			6	98
Madison			25	4
Marion			33	
Martin			7	260
Matagorda			17	39
Maverick			44	13
Medina			16	14

Footnotes at end of table.

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commod-ity distri-bution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
TEXAS—Con.				
Milam			19	101
Montague			13	10
Moore			4	182
Morris			19	None
Motley			22	67
Nacagdoches			14	None
Newton			23	None
Nolan			15	112
Nueces			8	150
Orange			10	None
Panola			18	None
Pecos				12
Polk			19	67
Potter			7	35
Presidio				36
Rains			15	1
Real			33	None
Robertson			41	73
Sabine			10	None
San Augustine			18	None
San Jacinto			39	None
San Patricio			27	220
Scurry			16	246
Shelby			8	None
Smith			2	None
Starr			67	19
Stonewall			18	53
Swisher			17	667
Tarrant				6
Terrell			5	6
Terry				596
Titus			15	None
Tom Green			11	80
Travis			20	73
Trinity			23	1
Tyler			14	None
Upshur			20	None
Val Verde			23	1
Del Rio (city)				1
Walker			14	11
Walker			38	1
Ward			27	2
Washington			23	11
Webb			40	6
Willbarger			13	98
Willacy			39	207
Williamson			10	183
Wilson			15	11
Zapata			57	4
Zavala			28	49
UTAH				
Beaver			5	1
Box Elder			5	75
Cache			3	11
Carbon			10	None
Daggett			(9)	None
Davis			11	1
Duchesne			11	1
Emery			6	2
Garfield			8	1
Grand			11	None
Iron			6	4
Juab			4	17
Kane			2	None
Millard			2	13
Morgan			4	2
Piute			8	None
Rich			1	10
Salt Lake			18	10
San Juan			26	12
Sanpete			6	1
Sevier			5	None
Summit			4	3
Tooele			10	1
Utah			10	9
Wasatch			6	None
Washington			4	2
Wayne			1	None
Weber			19	None
VERMONT				
Addison			(1)	None
Middlebury			(1)	None
Bennington			(1)	None
Bennington			(1)	None
Caledonia			(1)	None

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

HUNGER AND FARM PAYMENTS—Continued

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
VERMONT—Continued				
Essex			None	None
Newport	(1)		None	None
St. Johnsbury	(1)		None	None
Franklin			None	None
St. Alban's	(1)		None	None
Grand Isle			None	None
St. Alban's	(1)		None	None
Lamoille			None	None
Morrisville	(1)		None	None
Orange			None	None
Hartford	(1)		None	None
Montpelier	(1)		None	None
St. Johnsbury	(1)		None	None
Orleans			None	None
Newport	(1)		None	None
Rutland	(1)		None	None
Rutland	(1)		None	None
Washington			None	None
Montpelier	(1)		None	None
Morrisville	(1)		None	None
St. Johnsbury	(1)		None	None
Windham			None	None
Brattleboro	(1)		None	None
Springfield	(1)		None	None
Windsor	(1)		None	None
Hartford	(1)		None	None
Springfield	(1)		None	None
VIRGINIA				
Accomack	7		3	\$17,150
Amelia		5		None
Amherst	11			None
Appomattox	17		1	11,283
Bath	16			None
Bland	11			None
Brunswick	15		4	32,188
Buchanan	21			None
Buckingham	15			None
Caroline		2		None
Carroll	9			None
Charles City		5	5	30,839
Charlotte	9			None
Craig	13			None
Cumberland	15		2	10,950
Dickenson		23		None
Dinwiddie	6			None
Essex	3		9	73,502
Fairfax	5			None
Floyd	5			None
Fluvanna	18			None
Franklin	6			None
Giles	18			None
Goochland		2	1	5,225
Grayson		4		None
Greene	19			None
Greenville	16		16	165,335
Halifax	18		1	6,401
Highland		1		None
Isle of Wight	27		7	58,049
King and Queen	14		3	17,456
Lee		14	1	6,394
Louisa	11			None
Lunenburg	13			None
Madison		4	1	6,714
Mecklenburg		1	1	6,279
Middlesex		5	1	8,007
Nansemond	33		12	77,260
Nelson	12			None
Northampton	13			None
Northumberland		2	5	33,719
Nottoway	20			None
Page	24			None
Patrick	4			None
Pittsylvania	22			None
Powhatan	14			None
Prince Edwards	18		1	5,660
Rappahannock	17		1	7,772
Richmond	20		1	7,816
Russell	20			None
Scott	16			None
Smyth		4		None
Southampton		9	24	187,249
Surry	15		7	41,156
Sussex	29		5	43,152
Tazewell		15		None
Washington		6		None
Westmoreland		3	5	33,641
Wise		13		None
Wythe		2	1	7,085
WASHINGTON				
Adams	35	301		3,395,620
Asotin	28	43		380,816
Benton	37	86		1,219,137

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
WASHINGTON—Continued				
Chelan			34	2
Clallam			31	None
Clark			24	None
Columbia			31	134
Cowlitz			21	None
Douglas			28	176
Ferry			2	15,226
Franklin			35	103
Garfield			16	131
Grant			28	194
Grays Harbor			49	None
Island			5	None
Jefferson			18	None
King			20	None
Kitsap			14	None
Kittitas			18	10
Klickitat			28	72
Lewis			21	1
Lincoln			6	416
Mason			32	None
Mt. Rainier			21	10
Okanogan			15	None
Pacific			18	2
Pend Oreille			22	None
Pierce			3	None
San Juan			32	None
Skagit			18	None
Skamania			68	None
Snohomish			23	1
Spokane			29	200
Stevens			16	6
Thurston			20	None
Wahkiakum			33	None
Walla Walla			35	285
Whatcom			20	None
Whitman			14	705
Yakima			46	29
WEST VIRGINIA				
Barbour			18	None
Berkeley			9	1
Boone			36	None
Braxton			23	None
Brooke			26	None
Cabell			14	None
Calhoun			28	None
Clay			46	None
Doddridge			11	None
Fayette			25	None
Gilmer			23	None
Grant			8	None
Greenbrier			14	None
Hampshire			9	1
Hancock			14	None
Hardy			11	None
Harrison			9	None
Jackson			18	1
Jefferson			9	7,761
Kanawha			20	None
Lewis			14	None
Lincoln			41	None
Logan			37	None
McDowell			36	None
Marion			10	None
Marshall			14	None
Mason			14	5
Mercer			18	None
Mineral			18	None
Mingo			52	None
Monongalia			8	None
Monroe			15	None
Morgan			6	None
Nicholas			22	None
Ohio			12	None
Pendleton			10	None
Pleasants			14	None
Pocahontas			14	None
Preston			14	None
Putnam			17	None
Raleigh			21	None
Randolph			21	None
Ritchie			11	None
Roane			19	None
Summers			28	None
Taylor			11	None
Tucker			15	None
Tyler			12	1
Upshur			19	None
Wayne			40	None
Webster			38	None
Wetzel			22	None
Wirt			8	None
Wood			10	None
Wyoming			41	None
WISCONSIN				
Adams				
Ashland			29	11
				2
				13,823
				None

State/Adm. unit	Percent participation in food programs		1968 farm payments over \$5,000	
	Commodity distribution	Food stamps	Number of payees	Total paid
WISCONSIN—Continued				
Barron			6	2
Bayfield			10	None
Brown			14	3
Buffalo			11	5
Burnett			7	None
Chippewa				2
Clark			8	2
Columbia			4	31
Crawford			11	1
Dane			16	58
Dodge			5	17
Door				None
Douglas			4	None
Dunn			7	6
Eau Claire			10	4
Florence			40	None
Fond du Lac			7	7
Forest			13	None
Grant			6	9
Green			3	16
Iowa			3	5
Iron			6	None
Jackson			16	3
Juneau			13	3
Kenosha			32	17
Kewaunee			3	None
La Crosse			12	5
Lafayette			14	17
Langlade			7	None
Lincoln			13	None
Manitowac			13	2
Marathon			10	None
Marinette			11	None
Marquette			4	None
Menominee			85	2
Milwaukee			25	3
Monroe			7	2
Oconto			11	None
Oneida			18	None
Outagamie			10	6
Ozaukee			8	1
Pepin			10	4
Pierce			4	25
Polk			11	2
Portage			12	1
Price			8	None
Racine			30	31
Richland			5	None
Rock			19	106
Rusk			11	None
St. Croix			4	18
Sauk			7	13
Sawyer			27	None
Shawano			9	None
Sheboygan			7	2
Taylor			14	None
Traverse			4	8
Vernon			4	None
Washburn			27	None
Washington			9	1
Waukesha			9	16
Waupaca			9	1
Waushara			10	4
Winnebago			8	6
Wood			16	None
WYOMING				
Albany			9	None
Big Horn			16	2
Campbell			6	23
Carbon			16	5
Converse			6	5
Crook			2	8
Fremont			4	None
Goshen			10	45
Hot Springs			3	None
Johnson			6	2
Laramie			34	30
Lincoln			3	1
Natrona			16	None
Niobrara			4	5
Park			9	1
Platte			10	33
Sheridan			8	7
Sublette			4	None
Sweetwater			17	None
Teton			13	None
Uinta			2	None
Washakie			10	None
Weston			11	6

1 Not available.
 2 Included with Billings County.
 3 Combined with Uinta.
 4 Welfare district.

THE TRAVESTY IN RHODESIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Diggs) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it would be recalled that on Friday, June 20, 1969, the world witnessed yet another display of desperate courage by the Ian Smith regime in Rhodesia in the conduct of a referendum by which the people of that territory are said to have decisively voted to turn that colony into an independent Republic. By that act, the Smith government has severed all remaining links with Britain. And as we sit here today, it is very likely that a new constitutional bill is being placed before the Parliament of Rhodesia to give "legality" to the results of that referendum.

Our State Department has correctly labeled this referendum a "travesty." Commenting on the referendum, a State Department spokesman stated:

The United States deplors the fact that constitutional proposals clearly designed to intensify and institutionalize political control by the small white minority are now about to be given effect as a result of the referendum.

He also indicated that the closing of the U.S. consulate in Salisbury accredited to the British Governor was under study.

The Rhodesian problem and its related facts have been well-known to us all since UDI in 1965. Opinions, for and against, have been expressed by many in this House and elsewhere. The protagonists of the drama have adopted several disingenuous devices to circumvent the basic issue that has given rise to the crisis, namely: the creation of conditions which should lead to ultimate independence of that country with majority rule.

Today, there is rejoicing in certain quarters that the destiny of 4.8 million Africans in Rhodesia should perpetually be subjected to the whims and caprices of a white-settler minority of some 228,000 people. There is joy over the fact that out of that huge population, only a little over 9,000 Africans are eligible to exercise their political right under an electoral system which would, for the rest of the 20th century—if not forever—make it absolutely impossible for the Africans to take effective and meaningful part in the Government of their own land.

What is even more disquieting is the fact that some people who pride themselves in the knowledge, principles, and practice of democracy should find nothing obnoxious about the Rhodesian situation, nor incongruous with those principles they so admirably espouse. It appears our so-called free men do cherish freedom and recognize the sanctity of freedom for themselves and their kith and kin but not for others.

It is equally disheartening to note that by adopting half-hearted and ineffective measures, the British Government, which has primary responsibility for the colony, has woefully failed to end the Smith rebellion. No doubt, the

weakness displayed by the British Government and its pleasant idleness have emboldened Mr. Smith and his followers to pursue with matchless effrontery a policy which does not safeguard the rights of the majority of the people of Rhodesia and is completely insensitive to intelligent and just world opinion about the political and social conditions in that territory.

Strangely, by the intransigence of the Smith regime and its reactionary supporters, some are tempted to draw parallels least appropriate between the Rhodesian situation and that of the 13 American Colonies in 1776. I submit that these parallels are not only inappropriate because of the differing circumstances of the two cases but that they seem to be a dishonest evasion of historical truths of the American revolution and show scant regard for political realities of our day, in general, and especially of Africa.

It might here be recalled that the chief immediate cause for the 1776 rebellion was the continued imposition of taxation by Britain on the Colonies when those Colonies were not represented in the legislature that ruled over them. However, the Rhodesian situation is one in which the African majority do pay taxes commensurate with their meager earnings but they are practically not represented in the government that rules over them.

In other words, while the Thirteen American Colonies in the 18th century considered their interest uncatered for in the British Parliament that governed them from some 6,000 miles away, the interests of the Rhodesian-Africans are neglected by the Government which is supposed to be their National Government while those of the white settler minority are jealously guarded. Hence the conflict in the former was primarily one between the mother country and the colony whereas the latter is an instance of gross violation of the rights of the majority by the minority within the borders of one territory. It is this one fundamental issue which has sparked off the protracted debate between the British Government and the Smith regime.

Again, the times have changed and while colonialism is no longer fashionable, the practice of minority rule over the vast majority is considered grossly unjust and most unacceptable. These are the basic differences between the American Revolution and the Rhodesian rebellion.

The present political picture of Rhodesia is full of repelling prospects and the white settlers and their supporters would do well to note that they are embarked upon a long and hazardous political adventure. If they are really keen on reading and learning from history, one would hope that in due course when the indigenous people of Zimbabwe and Africans more effectively assert themselves in that territory, Mr. Smith and his group would have the opportunity to draw the appropriate historical lessons about the measures for dealing with op-

pressive and unpopular regimes. Then, and only then, would they realize that they had attempted to live in a dreamland and pretended to be riding the surf while in effect they swam perilously against strong currents.

Meanwhile, I would like to urge that the U.S. consulate be withdrawn immediately. It is clear that the prospect of a settlement between the illegal white regime in Rhodesia and the British Government is no longer possible. We should move decisively by withdrawing our representative.

Second, I would urge that our Government support action in the United Nations which would lead to the blockading of the sanction-breaking ports in the Portuguese-held territory of Mozambique and the minority-ruled country of South Africa. If a minority white regime is a travesty in Rhodesia, so are the same kind of regimes also a travesty in Mozambique and South Africa. We should support U.N. action against these countries which have aided and abetted the violation of the mandatory sanctions voted by the U.N.

Third, I would urge that our Government use all its diplomatic resources to protest the violation of sanctions by those states which are not upholding the sanctions on Rhodesia voted by the U.N. These states include not only South Africa and Portugal, but France, Switzerland, West Germany, and Japan.

These steps are the minimal measures which the United States can take to show its support for majority rule and non-racialism in southern Africa.

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8644) to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-330)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8644) to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JAMES B. UTT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT GORE,
FRED HARRIS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
WALLACE BENNETT,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8644) to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The Senate amendment No. 1 repeals section 403(d) of the Social Security Act. This section imposed (for any quarter after June 1969) certain limitations on the number of dependent children under 18 who, because of a parent's absence, may receive AFDC with Federal financial participation. The limitations are relaxed for certain States which, in compliance with a judicial decision, effectuated a policy of providing AFDC to persons not otherwise eligible for such aid.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Under section 1113 of the Social Security Act the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide temporary assistance to certain citizens of the United States and to dependents of citizens of the United States. Subsection (d) of such section provides that no temporary assistance may be provided under section 1113 after June 30, 1969. Senate amendment No. 2 extends the period through June 30, 1971.

The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JAMES B. UTT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PODELL, for Friday, June 27, 1969, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY); to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DIGGS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS), for 30 minutes, on June 27; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. MCKNEALLY.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. SKUBITZ in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MANN in six instances.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. CORMAN in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. PATMAN in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

890. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Cispus Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center, Randle, Wash., operated by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, under an interdepartmental agreement with the Office of Economic Opportunity, pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

891. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Program and Policy, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report on the programming and obligation of contingency funds for the third quarter of fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 451(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

892. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a visiting scientist and scholar program in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 247. Joint resolution relating to the administration of the national park system; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 8644 (Rept. No. 91-330). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 12451. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12452. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 12455. A bill to establish a National Commission on Pesticides, and to provide for a program of investigation, basic research, and development to improve the effectiveness of pesticides and to eliminate their hazards to the environment, fish and wildlife, and man; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12456. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require an investigation and study of the decomposability and destructibility of materials; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 12457. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 12458. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and other acts, to provide adequate food and nutrition among low-income households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12459. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the granting of authority by the Federal Communications Commission for the broadcast of pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 12460. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12461. A bill to amend chapters 31, 34, and 35 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and persons under such chapters; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 12462. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain airspace for use for housing purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12463. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind per-

sons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 12464. A bill to provide that U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving interstate compacts relating to the apportionment of the waters of interstate river systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12465. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 12466. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOKES:

H.R. 12467. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BROWN

of California, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.J. Res. 798. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Commission of the United States, the Republic of South Vietnam, and the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam to study the ecological effects of chemical warfare in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. CAREY, Mr. COHELAN, Mr.

DULSKI, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H. Res. 457. Resolution urging the President to resubmit for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

230. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, relative to welfare assistance, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Thursday, June 26, 1969

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

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, who knowest how busy we must be this day, if we forget Thee, do not forget us. Enable us to walk and talk and work mindful of Him who under heavy burdens and in the midst of controversy kept a tranquil heart. When the evening comes, and we pillow our heads and sleep, nature's great restorer, comes over us, may we hear Thy gentle voice saying, "Well done, good and faithful servant." Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 790) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 25, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the executive calendar. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The bill clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Meacham, of Alaska, to be Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Charles H. Meacham is 43 years old, married and has two sons. He is an Alaskan and has been nominated to be Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife in the Department of the Interior.

The Commerce Committee has reported favorably on his nomination and he now awaits the action of this body.

Chuck Meacham is uniquely qualified for this important Federal position.

Raised in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, he is a former marine raider in the South Pacific theater. He will bring to this position 19 years of varied experience in fish, wildlife, research, and management, both in California and Alaska. He has served as the Alaska Director of International Fisheries, and is an adviser to the Commissioners of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, a member of the U.S. Fishing Industry Advisory Committee of the U.S. State Department and Alaska's senior member of the Alaska-Japan Fisheries Panel Joint Research Venture.

Mr. President, the fact that we are acting on this nomination is an historical accident. When the Division of Fish and Wildlife was elevated to the secretarial level, and the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife was created, the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife still remained subject to confirmation.

This fact does not diminish the duty we have. I mention this only to indicate that Mr. Meacham's major duties will be in the area of international conferences, and that he has demonstrated his ability in this area to an unquestionable degree.

An objection was raised prior to the hearings on Chuck Meacham. The objection is based on his role during an incident on the Kuskokwim River.

Mr. President, approximately 1 year ago a group of fishermen in the Bethel area formed a cooperative and invited a Japanese freezer ship to the area to purchase and process their catch. The Japanese said they would come to Alaska if the Governor approved. The Governor of Alaska, Walter Hickel, after considering the long-range aspects of the North Pacific Treaty arrangements with Japan, and after consultation with his director of international fisheries, Stanton Patty, did not consent to the proposed transaction.

Mr. Meacham was sent to the area to carry out the Governor's directions. He made no policy. His sole role was that of an able junior officer responding to his superior's orders.

The Kuskokwim incident had two